A CLASSIFICATION OF MANAGERIAL
HUMAN RELATIONS PROBLEMS

by

Charles H. Savage, Jr.

A THESIS
submitted to
OREGON STATE COLLEGE

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

MASTER OF ARTS
IN GENERAL STUDIES

June 1957
APPROVED:

Redacted for privacy

Assistant Professor of Economics
Advisor for Thesis

Redacted for privacy

Chairman of School Graduate Committee

Redacted for privacy

Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis is presented June 15, 1956
Typed by Betty Dettman
The writer is appreciative of the guidance offered by Dr. Clark Spurlock, Acting Director of the Portland Extension Center, General Extension Division, The Oregon State System of Higher Education; Mr. George V. Guy, Assistant Professor of Education at Portland State College; and particularly Dr. Hugh Lovell, Assistant Professor of Economics at Portland State College, who served with genuine concern as thesis adviser.

He is also indebted to the many business executives, who must obviously remain anonymous, for the thought and care that they put into the interviews which were the source of the case studies used.

Miss Betty Dettman, of the University of Portland staff, was particularly helpful in editing and preparing several drafts of the manuscript.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAPTER</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goals of the Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How the Data Was Gathered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Invitations Not Taken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>The Relationships Problems of the New Manager</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Succession from Within</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Succession from Outside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accession into a Newly Created Position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Succession for Remedial Purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Administering the Relationship Needs of Subordinates</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Group Enforces Its Membership Standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lapses in the Will to Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Individual and the Changing Scene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boundaries to the Administration of Emotions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>The Manager's Relationship to the Management Group</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Getting Along with the Boss</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When the Boss Makes a Mistake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Getting Along with the Boys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allegiance to the Team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Manager and the Changing Scene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Summary and Conclusions</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibilography</td>
<td></td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I

THE GOALS OF THE STUDY

This is a study of the relationships problems of a group of industrial managers. It relates and classifies the burning, unresolved issues in the field of human relations uppermost in the minds of a cross section of executives at the time that they were interviewed. It is presented on the basis that these unresolved issues should be the logical starting place for any efforts at improving administrative skill in the relationships area.

Roethlisberger has pointed out that "Many people who are engaged in human relations training for supervisors and executives in business and elsewhere assume that it is a simple matter." (17, p. viii) This study does not bear out this assumption. The relationships needs of industrial situations are complex to a frightening degree. A high order of insight and skill is required in effecting their disposition. It is hoped that this study will demonstrate that fact and thus provide a realistic and helpful point of departure for those who would attempt to prepare managers for such service.
TIME Magazine has proclaimed that more adeptness at human relations would be the great achievement of the second half-century.¹ Management everywhere has hastened to get on the bandwagon; and there has been no lack of courses, seminars, and devices offered by those who are in the business. Some of these offerings appear to be of rather doubtful value. On the fact that human relations has become a management fad, however, there seems to be little doubt.

A few voices are beginning to be heard which raise questions about the integrity of some of the human relations training efforts and the theory upon which they are based. William Knowles, for instance, points out that the term itself has become a meaningless phrase:

Anything in the personnel field which is linked with human relations arouses interest. An examination of much of the writing under the human-relations banner, however, reveals it to be the same contents done up in a bright new package. Under these circumstances, "human relations" is merely a catch phrase used to merchandise a product. (8, p. 98)

Knowles believes that management, swept up in its desire to put the new "science" to work, has been more

¹ For an early account of the surprisingly current human relations techniques of one man, read Xenophon's "The Character of Cyrus the Younger" in "The Anabasis."
concerned with the label than with the contents of the bottle. Elton Mayo, after a lifetime of observation that has been fruitful of much helpful research in the area, concluded that efforts to bring human relations to maturity too rapidly had done much damage:

...the unfortunate effect has been to encourage too much jerry-building of imposing facades in the social area. The pedestrian step-by-step development of a simple unquestionable skill, if it exists, is concealed by these elaborate fronts. It is kindness to suppose that the pretentious facades are perhaps only camouflage and that somewhere behind them real work is going on. (11, p. 21)

This study was undertaken in fulfillment of Mayo's wish that "pedestrian" effort be the mode. It does not attempt to evaluate any of the human relations efforts now current, nor does it propose another to take their place. It does review the relationships needs of a cross-section of industrial managers in the administration of their human relations circumstances and, in so doing, uncovers some of the realistic "targets" towards which training efforts should be directed. It is hoped that the modest conclusions of this study might serve as a standard or measure against which the training efforts of others might be evaluated. Do these efforts aid the trainees in the administration of problems such as those
uncovered? Are they directed at the administrative shortcomings which they were authorized to remedy?

METHOD

In order to survey the relationships needs that were assumed to be the basis for management training in this area, some forty industrial managers were interviewed. These managers were from all levels of industrial activity: some were front lines supervisors; some, top management; some were employed in large corporations; some, in small offices; some were men; some, women; some were young managers starting their careers; some, on the brink of retirement; some interviews were made in large industrial centers in the East; many, of course, in the small and medium-sized companies in the city of Portland in which this study was written. Although there was no deliberate establishment of a sample, the coverage was large and varied enough to be fairly comprehensive. For instance, there were interviews with engineers, production people, salesmen, office managers and general administrators.

In the course of the interviews each manager was asked to identify in detail a particularly intense relationship conflict which he had encountered. He was asked to relate the situation anecdotally, recalling the actual
dialogue as he remembered it and the events growing out of the conflict episodes. He was encouraged to recall his own feelings at the time of these events; note was made of these feelings as being legitimate data for purposes of the study. He was not encouraged, however, to estimate the feelings of the other principals to the conflict, since such estimates would have questionable validity at best. Where possible, supporting comments from the other principals or witnesses to the situation were solicited and included in the report. Names of companies and individuals involved were, of course, disguised in order to protect the anonymity of the firms and their personnel.

What resulted from this phase of the study were reports of a series of industrial relationship situations, resulting from anecdotal interviews with one or more of the parties who were principal to the events described. Insofar as is possible under such circumstances, the author attempted to perform a purely reportorial function and to preclude from the reports his own interpretations and evaluations. While it may be pointed out that the perceptions of the principals on which the reports are based may not always correspond with the "facts" of the case, they are, nevertheless, a record of the first-hand impressionistic observations of the managers themselves and therefore
constitute the psychological starting point from which these managers had to operate.

After these reports had been received, edited, and released by the managers concerned, the author made classifications of the problems described in order that they might be treated systematically for purposes of this study. It was discovered helpful, for instance, to treat separately the problems of the new manager as being different from those of the established manager. The direction from which the pressure presented itself, whether from subordinates, superiors, or peers, was another meaningful classification and constituted the basis for several chapter headings; and, within each of these classifications, groupings have been established based upon the nature of the problem that presented itself.

An attempt was made in presenting the classifications to keep the discussion firmly rooted in the stubborn facts of the situation by selecting eighteen cases as illustrations of the material reviewed. These illustrative situations have been treated at some length in the body of the study, even to the extent of including company and personal background and the actual dialogue of the conflict situation as it was reported during the interview.

In the course of organizing these interviews and summarizing and classifying the relationship needs as
the managers themselves described them, certain definitions began to emerge. We discovered, for instance, recurring elements in the problem situations that troubled the new managers and certain similarities in their responses, mostly intuitive and ill-considered, to these situational elements. Patterns of meaning developed that suggested alternative responses that were not strictly spontaneous and intuitive. These human relations functions of the business manager, together with some roughly-drawn methods of fulfilling them, were summarized in the final chapter of the study.

INVITATIONS NOT TAKEN

In a work of this length there were many attractive by-paths that could not be followed. The quantitative support that might have come from a more systematic and extensive observation, for instance, had to be foregone in the interest of securing sufficient depth in the interviews to portray the totality of the situation and the depth of personal feeling. In this regard there was some comfort in George Homan's comment:

Sociology may miss a great deal if it tries to be too quantitative too soon. Data are not nobler because they are quantitative...no one who studies a group will go far wrong if he gets close to it, and by whatever means are available, observes all he can. (6, p. 22)
On the other hand, it was not possible to have the satisfaction that comes from a detailed case study, done at great depth—studies like Zalesnik's intensive report of one assembly foreman's predicament in "Foreman Training in a Growing Enterprise" (20), or Gouldner's companion volumes describing the problems of a single new manager in "Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy" (4) and "Wildcat Strike" (5). Yet, while such studies are an intellectual treat for the careful student of industrial relations, they do not simulate the partial, incomplete manner in which problems are presented to the industrial manager and the training director in the real-life setting. Perhaps there was some solace in having to forego this attractive pursuit in Korzybski's point that rarely, if ever, does the administrator have all of the information, the observable and verifiable facts, necessary to make a complete decision based upon the total evidence. (9, pp. 423-433)

Moreover, while the range of problems as to the direction from which it assails the manager is quite comprehensive, it is obvious that it was possible only to spot-check at best the vast range of situations of every shade and condition that might confront the manager. Again, it is necessary to plead simulation of the atmosphere in which industrial training must be carried on.
It has been said, also by Korzybski, that no two events in nature are identical. (3, pp. 137-139) This statement has particular application in the field of human relations and can have particular meaning for the training director in establishing the objectives for his efforts.

In conclusion, two other necessary limitations should be restated. There has been no attempt to apply any of the developed standards to any of the particular human relations training techniques that are in vogue, nor has there been proposed any alternative technique that might fulfill these standards. It is hoped, of course, that others might make such use of the conclusions for such purpose.
CHAPTER II

THE RELATIONSHIPS PROBLEMS OF THE NEW MANAGER

Upon his promotion, the new manager faces a host of intense relationships problems that require a particularly high degree of administrative skill in their disposition. This demand is made upon the new manager, unfortunately, when his practice of relationship skills is apt to be below normal.

Machiavelli in "The Prince" points out that "There is nothing more difficult to carry out, nor more doubtful of success nor more dangerous to handle, than to initiate a new order of thing." Elton Mayo holds the development of skill in moving from one group to another to be one of the great problems of our industrial civilization (11 pp. 76-77). Alvin Gouldner describes at length the harried efforts of one manager to establish rapport and to relieve the status-generated pressures in a gypsum plant (4, pp. 59-101). It is in the period following the accession of the new manager that the times are out of joint, long-held expectations of both parties are subjected to jarring jolts and the disrupted social equilibrium of the group painfully attempts to re-establish balance. The focal point in this melee is the new manager typically beset with a new set of pressures, both internal and external,
with which he is unequipped to deal.

As management constantly shuffles personnel in an effort to improve operations and to fulfill the manpower requirements of an evolving technology, membership in a work group becomes a frightfully transient experience, conflicting with the individual's desire for social permanence in his work situation. To all of these personal insecurities, the new manager is subject. In addition, he must contend with pressures growing out of his status position. Typically, one of the reasons for his selection for promotion was a high degree of security and control in his previous situation; the new circumstance into which he moves is neutral at best and frequently charged with emotional undertones. The group to which he comes as leader is absorbed with its own interpretations of the change and looks to the new manager to set the pace and to determine the conditions of his own installation, reserving for itself, however, the right to pass judgment upon his most innocent and well-intended moves.

Nor are the expectations of his subordinate group the only ones with which he must contend; the new manager holds himself accountable to higher management which has favored him with selection. A further dimension to the complexity with which he must contend grows out of the
manner in which top management created the vacancy which he is asked to fill: Was the change a remedial operation? Is he expected to bring harmony to a disturbed situation? Suggestions passing through the new manager's mind create an inordinate sense of urgency to show early, tangible results, understandable even though generative of further blocks to the development of group relationships which can be the only vehicle for bringing about the results desired. Under such circumstances, it is not uncommon for the new manager to misinterpret higher management's desires. The pressure to show tangible results even at the expense of building the work team may be more imagined than real; and yet, this is frequently the pressure to which he makes primary response. It is the response to this pressure, and to the others listed above, that brings about the new manager behavior described in the situations that follow.

**SUCCESSION FROM WITHIN THE GROUP**

Promotion from within, while a laudable policy, is not without its particular types of problems. The difficulties which Howard Nixon encountered following his promotion to the position of office manager at the Dawson Distributing Company affords an opportunity to examine

---

2. The names of companies and individuals have been disguised.
some of these forces at work. Prior to his promotion, Howard had served as assistant to Jack Maguire, his predecessor, whose advancement to the position of credit manager had created the vacancy.

Maguire had managed the office in a stern, detached manner. Unpopular with the girls whom he supervised, he had nevertheless created the impression of carrying out his assignment with dispatch. Howard, on the other hand, had an open and easy manner and was well liked by his subordinates; they enjoyed teasing him in a friendly manner. Their doubts, however, about his ability to fill his new position were expressed in comments such as the following: "He'll never make it," "He hasn't got what it takes," and "He's just not cut out for that job."

The teasing continued after Howard's promotion. When he appeared in a new gray flannel suit one morning, one of the girls called to him, "What's up, Howard? Have you gone to work nights as an undertaker?" The girls made a game of taking advantage of him in ways that they knew would be difficult for him to police; they prolonged their coffee breaks, arrived back from lunch late, found reasons for refusing work when other departments were overloaded. Howard felt this state of affairs intensely; he did not know what he might do about it. His indecision ended with the issue raised by the actions of Blanche, his senior
stenographer.

Blanche occupied a unique position at the Dawson Distributing Company. She had the ability to build the rough outlines dictated to her into polished letters covering various technical aspects of the transactions described. Many of the details on costs and terms she worked out for herself from her intimate knowledge of company policy and procedure. Moreover, she had an easy-going, almost brash manner that the men seemed to enjoy. These qualities tended to attract to her desk a far greater volume of work than her position involved—work that kept her steadily at her job, frequently during lunch hours. In time, Blanche was doing the work of two or three other girls. While this fact did not endear her to her clerical associates, Blanche tended to relate more to the men in the department than to the women. On occasion she complained about the state of affairs, but on the whole gave the impression that she rather relished the superior status that her unique position accorded her.

Jack Maguire, Howard's predecessor, had recognized the state of affairs and made certain concessions to it: he had winked an eye at company regulations when she took off an afternoon each Christmas season to attend a party at an office in which she had been previously employed; the work slowed almost to a standstill at this time of the
year, and Maguire had considered it politic to permit this infraction of the rules to go unchallenged. Howard, however, chose to take a different stand when the issue of time off for the Christmas party was raised. Informed casually by Blanche that she planned to take an afternoon off, Howard pointed out that it would be impossible for him to make an exception in her case: "If I did it for you, I'd have to do it for everyone. One of the bookkeepers asked me for time off to go shopping only yesterday." Blanche chose to disregard Howard's instruction and to take off as was her custom. Her action presented the office manager with the occasion he had been awaiting to establish his authority and to take action against the attitudes which he felt had been undermining his position.

It is interesting to note that the incident against which Howard chose to take his stand was in many ways irrelevant to the condition that he was protesting. There is considerable evidence that Blanche played no part in the behavior which was Howard's concern—the late coffee and lunch-hours, the refusal of extra job assignments, the teasing and the other matters against which Howard wished to strike out. Quite the reverse was true since Blanche had set herself apart from the other girls. Nevertheless, her actions, growing out of her needs for recognition for her superior efficiency, came at a time when Howard's
personal needs for status-establishment were most intense. Reprisal against her, while not a frontal attack upon the real sources of his agitation, was less fraught with consequence to him since her relation to the other girls was that of an isolate. Having failed to accommodate herself to the standards of the group, she could expect neither the sympathy nor the support of the group should she be disciplined.

At this point it might be well to identify several conditions that prevail relationship-wise in the "promotion-from-within" type of situation in which Howard was involved:

(1) The first is the change in role expectations on the part of the two principals. We refer only to Howard and the other clericals since Blanche appears to be an innocent bystander in the underlying adjustment processes. This first condition has particular application in the "promotion from within" category. The previous roles which Howard had played before his promotion and to which the rest of the group have become accustomed, were no longer appropriate. Higher management had placed a new set of expectations upon him, and to these, also, he was required to make response. There exists a lag between the change which has taken place in Howard and the group's adjustment to it. He feels this lag most intensely. He doesn't know how to eliminate it and is searching for an
opportunity; Blanche's insubordination affords him the occasion for which he has been waiting.

As the group's expectation of Howard's role is undergoing change, his concept of the role performance of the girls is also changing; any deviation from office protocol is viewed as something that makes him less the supervisor. He now expects the employees to arrive back from lunch and coffee breaks on time; he expects extra work assignments to be accepted cheerfully; and he is not certain that the friendly teasing is not undermining the concept of supervision which he sees it necessary for him to fulfill. Metamorphosis to such a new relationship can be a socially painful experience due to the variance in the role expectations of the two parties.

(2) Another condition in evidence in this case is what Gouldner refers to as the Rebecca Myth (4, p. 79). Some years ago Daphne DuMaurier wrote a novel about a young woman who married a widower only to be plagued by the memory of his first wife, Rebecca, whose virtues were still widely extolled. The human tendency to look back upon "the good old days" is another of the circumstances with which the new manager must deal. The former manager is, to some extent, idealized—even if he was disliked while present. Although detached and unfamiliar, Jack Maguire had been indulgent towards such acts as
Blanche's insubordination. Howard is in competition with what was, thus adding additional complexity to his administrative tasks at a time when his limited capacity is already strained.

SUCCESSION FROM OUTSIDE THE GROUP

The new manager who is brought from outside the group faces a different set of relationships problems, some of them growing from the fact that the succession is from without. The conflicting interests that swirled around the head of David Murrow after his appointment as general manager of the Middle States Machinery Company afford an illustration of these problems and the manner in which they present themselves.

Murrow first met George Bruce, president of the Middle States Company, at a national technical convention which the new general manager had addressed. Bruce had been impressed with Murrow's scientific approach to the establishment and utilization of standards in the control of the production processes. Although an established and talented general administrator, Bruce considered himself to be especially limited in the field of scientific standards. When he was invited to Washington, therefore, to take a high government post, Murrow's name came to mind as the man best fit to take over the direction of the
business in his absence.

Bruce had founded his company in 1936. Many of the men who had helped him get started were still with him. To these long-service employees, Bruce had been extremely loyal; many of them held responsible positions in his manufacturing organization. However, he saw no one among them to replace him in his absence or to bring into the organization the added administrative strength which he desired. He therefore offered the position of general manager to Murrow.

One of Murrow's first moves was to bring Frank Ireland into the organization. Ireland was an outstanding engineer with an advanced degree from a leading technical institute. Murrow told Ireland that any improvement in production controls and processes had to be preceded by the establishment of standards on the shop jobs such as would permit the general manager to measure performance and spot bottlenecks. Ireland put his crew to work immediately doing a time and motion study of all jobs in the shop. Projects of this scope were customarily cleared with the management council, an advisory board composed of all factory and functional executives and presided over by Murrow. Ireland convinced Murrow that, because of the involved nature of time study work and the urgency of getting the standards installed, the presentation of the project to the board
should be deferred. He felt that Murrow and himself, as graduate engineers, could best deal with the work in its initial stages. He also pointed out that the project would require so much of his attention that little time would be left to attend the meetings of the council, let alone to do the preparation required to make a comprehensive presentation of such a complicated program to a group of men with no formal engineering background. Murrow agreed to Ireland's proposition; he mentioned the project briefly at a council meeting and explained why he was not putting it on the agenda at that time.

Opposition to the time study project and the new engineer was not long in developing. Several prominent members of the council visited Murrow and informed him that Ireland's tactics had created widespread dissatisfaction throughout the shop. They pointed out that factory supervision knew little about the project and were unable to defend it when employees complained. These executives also stated that, in by-passing the council and dealing directly with Murrow, Ireland had created a dangerous precedent completely outside of company tradition and had undermined the work of the council. It was their opinion that antagonism in the shop had reached such an intensity that the situation could be resolved only by relieving Ireland of his duties, especially since relationships had
degenerated to a level that would make it impossible for the new engineer to establish the support that his task required.

Informed of the group's report, Ireland became furious:

"I'm out in the shop with my crew, working like a beaver from early morning until late at night, struggling with a task that is obviously in the company's interests, while those so-called 'executives,' who are supposed to be interested in company loyalty, are satisfied to sit back and take pot-shots at what I'm doing. Why in hell don't they get off their back-ends and give me a little support? Dave, if you give the slightest recognition to such childish carryings-on, you're not the man I think you are."

Murrow's predicament adds to our dictionary of relationships problems which the new manager has to face and, hopefully, administer:

(1) The resistance of the "old lieutenants" is another concept introduced by Gouldner, who raises the point: "Has the right to succession been established?" (4, pp. 73-77) The possibility that Murrow's "right to succession" might not be un-challenged is worth consideration. Under such circumstances, it is reasonable to expect that there were other heirs-apparent on the scene before Murrow was introduced. The issue which has been raised
against Ireland might constitute a disguised challenge to Murrow's legitimacy, a convenient issue on which the old lieutenants can close ranks and ward off any threats to the previously established order. A survey of the manner in which the issue was presented, the intensity of the feelings indicated by the drastic measures proposed and the rallying-around of the management council as the bastion of the older ways, give strength to this interpretation.

(2) The introduction of "strategic replacements" is another common device by which the new-manager-from-without attempts to establish the psychological security that comes with the knowledge that he has below him dependable sources of information and support. Gouldner suggests that under such circumstances the successor might rationalize "his status-generated needs for additional supervisors in terms of...technological innovations." ([4, p. 88]) This seems to be the case with Ireland's introduction into the firm. The two engineers put their heads together for the purpose of bringing about major changes in the work setting, completely oblivious of the social consequences of their actions. It is not too far-fetched to suppose that the companionship of another "outsider," and one who shared the same technical background as the general manager, provided Murrow with more
than technological support.

(3) There are, however, restraints upon replacement that further constrain Murrow's freedom of action in dealing with this situation in a manner completely to his own liking. He is not free to deal with the "old lieutenants" on a power basis telling them either to "like it or get out." As Smith and Nylon recognize, "To attempt to meet the situation by replacement is perilous. Extensive or unjust discharges cause the remaining management and employee body to fear the changes and in secret to work against them." (18, p. 129) For Murrow, however, there is an additional restraint. The man whom he has succeeded is not permanently out of the scene. The company president has gone to Washington for an indefinite period. There is doubt in the minds of both Murrow and the team as to the timing and the conditions of Bruce's return to leadership, thus introducing another factor into the power balance of status relationships.

Here then, are some of the conditions for administrative action on the part of this new manager. His needs for status support have been served by the addition of Ireland, whose position is now precarious. If Ireland goes, Murrow loses this support. On the other hand, Murrow's authority over the determination of the circumstances of support from the "old lieutenants" is not
complete. Bruce's uncertain future makes it unnecessary for them to come completely within his circle of support in order to secure their own future positions; and they still remain the vehicle through which the purposes of the organization are to be served. Murrow's is a delicately cross-pressured relationship problem; but it is not an uncommon one, and it raises the question of what human relationships training might contribute to the new manager's adequacy for the administration of such circumstances.

ACCESSION INTO A NEWLY CREATED POSITION

The problems encountered by the manager who moves into a newly created position are in some ways particular and require special attention. Frequently, under such conditions, the members of the group have enjoyed a high degree of self-direction and have created rather elaborate informal procedures and attitudes with which to meet the special circumstances created by the absence of close supervision. These were the informal procedures and attitudes with which Elizabeth Burns had to deal after her appointment to serve as administrative assistant to Professor Maynard, director of the Eastern Laboratories, a chemical research center attached to a large eastern university. The work at the laboratories consisted
of basic and developmental research and was carried on at four decentralized work areas as follows: two laboratories adjacent to the medical school; a laboratory and office concentrating on a particular study some miles to the south of the school; and a new administrative center, yet to be opened, some miles to the north.

Elizabeth Burns joined the organization several weeks before the opening of the new center. Maynard had decided to secure the services of a capable woman to supervise the scattered administrative and clerical activities of his organization and to make it possible for him to concentrate on other phases of his work. Miss Burns was the most capable person that the university's personnel office could locate: she had recently completed a successful assignment as organizational director of a major non-profit association in the city and, prior to that, had been secretary to the board of an outstanding women's college. "I am first and foremost a scientist," Maynard told Miss Burns; "and I must get back to the laboratory and the work of my colleagues. Business and financial details are, I realize, necessary evils to be attended to; but they must not be permitted to overshadow my primary obligations to research. It is necessary that I be available to a member of any of my scientific teams at any time, day or night; but business details can and must await their turn." Maynard
also pointed out that after she had established herself, he would also expect her to keep his briefcase up to date, manage his appointment schedule, take care of travel arrangements, and supervise the proper reception of foreign visitors. "You'll find that I'm a hard taskmaster when it comes to the quality of clerical work," he added. "Everything that goes out of the office must be extremely accurate and attractive in order to command the interest and respect of the recipient. I will tolerate no excuse for inferior work. If additional help or office equipment is needed to do that level of work, the money will be available. I hold you responsible for the execution of my wishes in this regard; if anyone questions your authority, you are to say 'Professor Maynard wants it done that way'.

Miss Burns had a background of experience in executing intricate operational assignments. The chance of participating in the vital work at the Eastern Laboratories was a challenge that she could not refuse. Maynard had her work with him at his summer home for several weeks; he was organizing the details of a new non-profit corporation that would administer his scientific patents and felt that the experience would serve to acquaint his new assistant with many of the problems with which she would be concerned. During this period she also served as his liaison with the architect, contractor, decorators and others who
were putting the finishing touches on the new administrative center.

Miss Burns' first operational assignment came one week before the new center was to be opened. She was asked to "feel out" the administrative and secretarial people who were to be moved to the new location. Generous to a fault with the time he spent on matters concerning the interior appointments and layout of his new building, Maynard had given little thought to the movement of personnel; nor had he notified the staff of Miss Burns' appointment and the nature of her responsibilities. She had been accepted as another secretary temporarily working with Maynard on some special projects. When she approached those who were to be moved, she encountered suspicions and resistances of which the following are typical:

**EMPLOYEE A:** I would prefer to stay where I am. Couldn't one of the other girls move?

**EMPLOYEE B:** I'll stay here where I know what the score is. If I did move I'd be just a switchboard operator and receptionist.

**EMPLOYEE C:** I'm afraid that if I did move I might have to do Professor Maynard's work. He's too fussy; even roughed drafts have to be prepared carefully.
EMPLOYEE D: We will agree to move; but I think you should know that our group is quite independent. Don't count on my assistant for phone coverage when we get over there; she's much too busy.

Miss Burns is faced with a difficult task: she has a week, or rather, that part of a week which she can spare from her other duties, to create some degree of personal acceptance of her supervisory role on the part of her subordinates and to cause these subordinates to cooperate in this major disruption of their work setting. Such a task would be difficult for an established manager; Miss Burns has not even been installed as the nominal manager, let alone have had time to spin the intricate web of relationships of which authority is woven. If she turns the problem back to Maynard, he might see this to be a failure in the first of her assigned tasks. Miss Burns must also weigh the consequences of moving in the heavy artillery, in the person of Professor Maynard or in the use of his expressed mandate, "Professor Maynard wants it done that way:" what effect will such actions have upon her eventual installation as an independent authority equipped to carry on in the administrative vacuum which Maynard's preoccupations have created? Some of Gouldner's terms are useful in setting up considerations that might
be helpful to Miss Burns in interpreting the relationship maze which she has been asked to untangle:

(1) The overturning of the indulgency pattern seems to be a primary objective of the new manager in this type of situation. Gouldner uses the term to describe the rather unstructured situation that develops when supervision is deliberately loose or otherwise preoccupied. Professor Maynard's desire to get back to the laboratory, his disdain for the administrative and clerical details which he has termed "necessary evils" have made it possible for the employees to develop their own methods of meeting his work requirements. Whatever organization existed, and there definitely was one, had grown spontaneously and with little direction from above. The organization was not now producing work that met Maynard's requirements; a somewhat more ordered organization was indicated, and this was Miss Burns' assignment.

(2) The establishment of close supervision, where none or little has existed, is an assignment calling for a high degree of social skills. The employees are committed to the prior arrangement; it has accorded them a satisfactory work atmosphere and has also, they feel, made it possible for them to contribute what they believe to be an adequate output of work to the purposes of the organization. The condition of close supervision that the new
manager proposes is at best an unknown quantity. What will be their position after the shuffle has been accomplished? Moreover, is there not some hint of criticism to the established order which they helped build in the proposal for a change?

On the other hand, close supervision is viewed by the new manager as a means of fulfilling the mission for which he was hired. How else can he control the situation and bring about the improved work standards which will attest to the effective execution of his assignment? Here then are two sets of expectations coming into head-on impact: the allegiance to the indulgence pattern on the part of the work group; and the commitment to close supervision on the part of the new manager.

Miss Burns feels the impact of these differing expectations. She is beset with an almost impossible time limit in the accomplishment of her purposes. She is also operating without the sophisticated support that a more sensitive superior would afford under such circumstances.

A. E. Housman's lines seem written for such an occasion:

I, a stranger and afraid
In a world I never made.

SUCCESSION FOR REMEDIAL PURPOSES

The period following ascendancy into positions of
greater responsibility is then one in which the full
talents and learnings of the new manager are sorely
tested. The exigencies of the situation are such that
the full powers of the manager are occupied in the basic
task of establishing rapport and acceptance with the
group into whose leadership he moves. There are times,
however, when a further dimension is added to the com-
plexities which the new manager is asked to administer.
Frequently, the vacancy exists and the opportunity for
promotion is offered because top management is casting
about for someone to bring order to a disturbed situation.
The appointee under such circumstances is given the
assignment of "cleaning up the situation" created by
his predecessor. His promotion underscores the partic-
ular nature of his assignment and also the fact that his
superiors will be keeping close watch on the measures
that he takes. The situation in which Ken Wells found
himself shows how these additional pressures can combine
with the others described previously to bring about
circumstances that may overwhelm even the manager who
brings a high level of human relations skill to his new
position. Wells was considered one of the most promising
young executives in the Parker-Kent retail organization.
For this reason management called upon him to take over
the disorganized situation that he was to inherit when
he became manager of the firm's Pleasant Valley store.

Parker-Kent had recently poured huge sums of money into the renovation of the Pleasant Valley location. The store was located in a growing suburban area, and the improvement was necessary in order to compete for the expanding business with the large chains that had been making substantial investments in neighboring facilities. Business had been carried on as usual during the renovation, and the presence of the construction crews had created inevitable confusion. The various system-wide buyers had kept pressure on in order to prevent the work at the store from interfering with their city-wide promotions; customers had difficulty finding advertised merchandise; accidents occurred in the cluttered aisles. The manager, a long-service employee with an indifferent record, seemed unable to administer the situation, although he and his assistants worked long hours. Tempers flared as the buyers stepped up the pressure; employee turnover increased; and, with the influx of untrained new sales clerks, the manager found that he had to spend more and more time finding stock for customers, moving merchandise that was piling up in the aisles, and spending so much time on routine disturbances that little was left for the planning and direction necessary to restore order to the operation. Profits sagged; and, with management's hope
for a return on its investment fading, it was found necessary to relieve the manager of his responsibilities. Wells was tapped as his successor.

Wells had been department head at another location. The environment which he quit to come to Pleasant Valley had been a particularly secure one: he had been a big profit-maker; he had the reputation of being a skilled supervisor of personnel, operating in this regard at a level that was even higher than the company standard; he made a point of conducting the affairs of his department from his desk, giving such expert attention to matters of buyer relationship, employee training and stock scheduling and promotion management that he had gained the respect of all familiar with his operation. It was reported, for instance, that the girls working under him had been in tears when word of his promotion had been received. It was generally agreed that Wells would be a match for the run-down conditions that he would meet at his new location and that management at last would realize a return on its additional investment.

Hardly had Wells taken up his new duties when he found his store deluged with a series of heavy promotions: the city-wide Easter sale, spring clearance sales, the "Paint-up, Clean-up, Fix-up" campaign, school graduation specials and, before he could catch his breath, stock
began piling in for the summer promotions. Wells found himself engulfed in a wave of events that left little time for the practice of his normal approaches to administration. Always one who prided himself on his ability to delegate, but with no time to train his green subordinates, he found himself chasing stock and moving cartons to make room for the new shipments that continued to pile up in the receiving room. A devoted advocate of time for the "over-view" which he considered to be a prerequisite of good management, he found himself swept up in a tide of trivia that demanded every minute of his time and kept him and his assistants busy in the store until late in the night. Tempers flared as physical weariness set in; tension dominated the most routine relationship; one crisis led to another without respite. Wells dropped fifteen pounds from his weight, and the recurrence of an old physical ailment made it necessary for him to take off a few hours daily in order to rest and regain his strength.

At the height of this situation, Jack Archer, one of the company's buyers and an old friend of Wells, stopped in for a chat. "Look here, Ken. You're running yourself into the ground. If you need more help, why in hell don't you get Callahan (the general manager) on the phone and tell him what you need." Wells agreed that he
needed help. He called Callahan, who told him that the man he mentioned was unavailable but that he would see what he could do to get someone else. Several days later, Wells learned that Archer had been in during his absence and had "hit the ceiling" when told that the additional assistance had not been obtained. Archer had informed one of the assistant managers that if current store management couldn't do the job that had to be done that it should move over and make room for one that could. "You guys used to be the fair-haired boys in this organization; now I wouldn't give two cents for your reputations. If you guys haven't got the gumption to stand up and holler for whatever you need to lick this thing and to holler until you get the help you need, then I say that you should get out and let somebody else take over." Wells was furious. He called Callahan and told him that he didn't intend to take any more guff from the buyers or to have his assistants subjected to the type of "tongue-lashing" that Archer had administered. Callahan suggested a meeting of all parties concerned to clear the air. Present at the meeting were Archer, Callahan and Wells and his two assistants. Wells summed up his feelings as follows:

Everyone's been giving us a bad time. It isn't just Jack (Archer). There's been a general lack of confidence
expressed in us. I didn't ask for this job in the first place, and I inherited a terrible mess. If I'm going to succeed in squaring things here, I've got to have the confidence of everyone involved. All that we've had so far is needling and needling heckling and heckling, pointing out obvious problems with no attempt to show any understanding or sympathy for the problems that we've had to face.

Archers position was:

You didn't get my sympathy; but you did get what you really needed, more help. (A third assistant, the man Wells had originally requested, had been assigned to the store prior to the meeting.) I'm sorry if my tactics cost me your goodwill; but I accomplished my purpose, and I got you the help that you needed to solve your problem.

In the case of Ken Wells we have a relationships conflict apparently arising out of the onslaught of circumstances of such force that they overwhelmed even a competent practitioner of the human relations skills. Confronted with a merchandising task that apparently calls for the last word in scheduling, direction and organization, Wells permitted himself to be drawn into the detailed routine which was to become a barrier between him and his solution of the store's problems. This overwhelming routine so absorbed his energies and attentions that even the normal pressures of the developing relationship were
precluded. It was as if, between the manager and the people to whom he would normally relate himself, there existed a void, a vacuum filled only by the exigencies and expediencies that had to be met in the minute by minute administration of the tasks of the store. It was this absence of relationship, so necessary to human course, that provoked Wells into using the basically friendly and helpful attempt at advice on Archer's part as the occasion for a break-through of needs long unfulfilled and the subsequent plea for support at the meeting which Callahan arranged to "clear the air."

In reviewing Wells' plight, we have an opportunity to isolate several tension-provoking features of his situation:

(1) **Top management's expectations**, real or imagined, tend to be viewed by the new manager with heightened awareness, particularly so if he was moved in as part of a remedial program. He cannot easily disregard the reason for his assignment and the conditions under which he was assigned; his very promotion symbolizes the power of top management and the consequences of failure. As Gouldner puts it, "He was on trial and, therefore, he was anxious, and anxious to make good." (4, p. 72) Wells' anxiety is perhaps underscored by his attempts to deny his independent authority. He said, "I didn't ask for
this job in the first place”; and, when he is rebuffed in his first attempt to secure an additional assistant, he retreats into hurt silence. The new manager in such circumstances feels himself to be very much under observation. He feels a sense of gratitude for his promotion; but this sense is not of itself something that builds self confidence and personal security. He also feels impelled to accomplish the expectations which top management has imposed upon him, as he sees these expectations to be.

(2) The task orientation functions, while legitimate, must at times be subordinated to the group maintenance functions of the manager. It would appear that the situation at the Pleasant Valley store first required a group-building phase during which the personnel, through whom the tasks of the store had to be accomplished, could establish a coordinated productivity. The new manager gave himself completely to the execution of the task, allowing no time for the study or cultivation of the group's development.

(3) Under stress, the new manager underwent a reversion to dependency status. As stated earlier, instead of a developing group relationship, a condition resembling interpersonal anarchy existed in the Pleasant Valley store. The new manager was threatened by no
subordinate status pressures, since it was impossible under the conditions in the store for group sentiment of any strength to develop. Such sentiment would have postulated group communications sufficient for the development of standards, norms and resistances. Under the frantic conditions at the store, it was difficult for such communications to take place.

In the absence of strong pressures from beneath, overwhelmed by circumstances that threatened his whole philosophy of managerial behavior and with heightened awareness of top management's observation and expectations, Wells reverted from being primarily a leader of his subordinate group to being primarily a member of his peer and superior group. In place of being supportive, he was looking for support from above. He was focused, not on threats to his status from below, but rather on threats to his membership from above. Psychological explanations could no doubt be established to explain an individual's reversion to previous status under such pressures, but they must be foregone in a study of this length.

SUMMARY

It seems to be apparent in reviewing the cases presented in this chapter that there are a number of tension-
producing factors that arise out of the role of successor that the new manager must play. These factors seem to grow primarily out of the situation and not to be necessarily related to the degree of supervisory skill that the new manager had previously demonstrated. The following factors have been isolated for the attention of those who might be attempting to contribute to improved administrative performance on the part of the new manager:

(1) **The change in role expectation.** This condition is particularly strong when, as in the case of Howard Nixon, the new manager is raised up from out of the group. A well-established expectation as to how the other party would behave is now overturned by the contingencies of the new relationship. The two parties do not come quickly into adjustment to the new circumstances, and the delay may be viewed by the new manager to be somewhat of a threat to his new-found and rather tenuous status position. As in Howard's case, he may feel impelled to take forceful action. This action may further complicate the development of the new position of interpersonal equilibrium.

(2) **The Rebecca Myth.** The work group, finding adjustment to the new manager circumstance difficult, may attempt to idealize the promotee's predecessor. This tendency to look back upon "the good old days" obstructs the
development of the new relationship and presents the new manager with another complexity in the circumstances that he must administer.

(3) **The resistance of the old lieutenants.** Although a matter of record, the new manager's installation as the new authority may not be a matter of fact. His appointment may have overturned the group's expectations as to who was "next in line" for the job. Particularly if he is an "outsider," his legitimacy as a successor may be questioned, and the old lieutenants' resistive behavior may take the form of a closing of ranks around others whom they considered to be the legitimate "heirs-apparent."

(4) **The introduction of strategic replacements.** Denied psychological support from the old lieutenants, the new manager may seek to introduce "strategic replacements," people who have served under him in his previous assignment and of whose support he is assured. Frequently, this is done on the basis that they are experts needed to bring about technological innovations in connection with the manager's assignment. Deeper study may reveal, however, that these replacements serve a deeper supportive function.

(5) **Restraints upon replacement.** However, there are other factors which constrain the new manager's freedom of action in dealing with the old lieutenants and
building the new informal group, oriented to himself, which he sees to be the basis for getting on with the task. He may further alienate the established managerial and worker bodies and cause them in secret to work against him; or, as in the case of David Murrow at the Middle States Machinery Company, his own permanence as the central leader may be so tenuous as to cause the old lieutenants to make a successful stand against his leadership.

(6) The overturn of the indulgency pattern. In the absence of close supervision, the members of a group may develop spontaneously, and with little direction from above, their own procedures and standards. A reason for the new manager's assignment, as in the case of Elizabeth Burns at the Eastern Laboratories, may be top management's desire to substitute more effective and formalized work procedures. The new manager's efforts to overturn the indulgency pattern is typically viewed with suspicion by the group. What will the changed circumstance mean in terms of their own revised relationship? Is the move a criticism of the arrangement which they helped create? These, together with the normal human resistances to change, create additional obstructions for the new manager.

(7) The establishment of close supervision. This condition, frequently seen by the new manager as essential
to his own establishment in a position of control and authority, results in the substitution of an entirely different set of work values and motivations for the employee. Where he previously was self-sustaining and self-motivating, he now must adapt his task approaches, seeking instructions and approval and coordinating with the plans of his superior. Such a setting can produce apathy and also presents the group with an opportunity to sabotage the group task through restriction of output.

(8) **Top management's expectations.** The expectations which surround his promotion, whether they were real or imagined, are factors of which the new manager is painfully aware. If he is moving into a new situation, the only relationship with which he has the intimate knowledge of acquaintanceship is the superior one, and it is the pressure from above to which he makes his primary response. This was the case of Ken Wells, the new store manager in the Parker-Kent case. He felt the upward relationship most acutely and, when he finally took rather impulsive action to relieve the tensions of his personal situation, it was in this direction that he moved.

(9) **Task orientation.** Administration seems to be a two-fold task requiring attention on the manager's part to both the task and social needs of his function. Frequently, group development becomes the medium for task
performance. Swept up in the routine at the Pleasant Valley Store, Wells was unable to devote any attention to the development of group relationship. As a consequence, task accomplishment suffered.

(10) The reversion to dependency status. The manager in control of his situation typically has an out-going preoccupation with the developing requirements of his subordinate group. From this relationship he gets the personal support and status-sustaining satisfactions that maintain him in his position. Under the onslaught of conditions that break down the subordinate group and destroy the manager's status support, he is apt to revert from his primary role of leadership of his subordinate group to one of membership in his peer and superior group. Under such circumstances, as in the case of Ken Wells again, his needs for support and expressions of confidence from above become heightened.

In this chapter it was also pointed out that the presence and intensity of these factors can vary in the following new manager situations: (1) where the new manager is promoted from within the group; (2) where the new manager is promoted from outside the group; (3) where the new manager is promoted into a newly created position; and (4) where the promotion was made for remedial purposes.
CHAPTER III

ADMINISTERING THE RELATIONSHIP NEEDS OF SUBORDINATES

In the problems that have been considered, the manager has been a party to the conflict: his position one of personal involvement marked by a degree of edginess that overshadowed his customary poise and restricted the exercise of his normal relationship skill. As the new manager establishes himself and consolidates his position, his sense of personal security and his poise return; but new blocks to the execution of his human relationship responsibilities develop.

During the new manager's period of installation, the social energies and attention of his group were directed to this single all-absorbing issue. As this relationship comes into equilibrium, or perhaps because it has, the group's attention returns to the never-ending considerations that arise out of the continuing process of its own development and maintenance and the manager's role one of administrator of the relationships of others.

During his period of establishment, the new manager felt most acutely the relationship problems in which he had become engrossed. In his new role, he may no longer feel these problems so intensely nor relate them so
directly to the purposes of his function. He may view evidences of interpersonal friction as interruptions in his basic administrative duties, to be disposed of as rapidly as possible so that he might get back to his "proper" tasks. Yet Chester Barnard, in discussing the conditions of cooperative action (2, pp. 46-47), views the administration of personal relationship to be among the primary functions of the executive. Impatience with relationship problems can be as damaging to the purposes of the established manager and his organization as was the status-involvement of the new manager; a consideration of a second major classification in the human relations problems of the manager, those growing out of the relationship needs of subordinates, is in order. In the cases that follow, the force of the impact of such problems upon the established manager becomes evident.

THE GROUP ENFORCES ITS MEMBERSHIP STANDARDS

Roethlisberger and Dickson in their classic study of group processes at the Hawthorne plant of the Western Electric Company illustrate in detail the manner in which groups develop unwritten rules, regulations, and restrictions to protect what appear to the members to be their own best interests (16). Disciplinary measures, even expulsion from the group, are imposed upon members who
refuse to act within these rules and regulations. Illustrations of this principle at work are found in the two cases that follow.

Mike Wright was one of a group of eight buffers. The buffing room was considered an unpleasant place to work because of the presence of a fine metal dust thrown off by the buffing machines. In order to compensate the men for this condition, management had established a generous time standard on the job which provided an easy rate of work and liberal time off during working hours. Mike seemed impervious to this special condition; he went at his work dexterously and methodically. Within a few weeks, he was not only earning his day rate in four hours' time but reaching as well the ceiling of the bonus that had been provided under the piece work arrangement; during this four-hour period, he turned out over twice the work that the other men did in a full eight-hour day. The other buffers attempted to persuade Mike to slow down. When he refused, they isolated him from all social relationships. While they were chatting during breaks, Mike would be at his machine setting up the parts that he would buff when work was resumed. He also fell into the habit of arriving late for work and leaving early, a practice which showed upon his time card. Under the company's automatic processing of tardiness and early exit, standard
warning forms were issued and, at the end of the established grace period, Mike's card was withdrawn from the time card rack.

Finding his card gone when he arrived late for work, Mike went to the buffing room, picked up his personal belongings and started for the exit. On the way he met Mr. Crosby, the plant superintendent, who asked where he was going at that hour of the morning. Upon hearing the story, the superintendent asked the buffer to go into his office while he checked into the situation. Crosby knew that Mike was the top buffer in the plant. Moreover, he had been under severe pressure to step up the output of buffed parts due to a company-wide production drive that was under way. He was troubled by the prospect of losing Mike's superior production. He was also conscious of the fact that Mike's relationship to the group was a complicated one and that he might be stirring up a "hornet's nest" if he got involved in it. Moreover, he was anxious to get back to a hundred and one production problems that were awaiting his attention. Crosby was hesitating on the threshold that led to the area of subordinate relationships. He was weighing the disadvantages of becoming involved against the rather indistinct advantages that might accrue to production as the result of action on his part in this sphere.
George Roper, foreman of the headlining section on the assembly line of a major automobile plant, faced a somewhat similar decision. At each headlining section station, four men known as "tackspitters" entered the vehicle slowly moving down the line and, spitting tacks onto the magnetized heads of their hammers, proceeded to fix the headlining fabric into place under the roof of the automobile. It was close, strenuous work; but as the team picked up rhythm, there was time between vehicles for a smoke or a chat.

One of the headlining teams consisted of three white employees and a Negro, Fred Williams. Roper was approached by the three white members of the team who told him that they refused to work with Williams. He had started wearing a strong perfume, they stated, which was particularly offensive because of the close working conditions in the automobiles, and had resisted all efforts on their part to get him to desist.

Roper was aware of no racial discrimination on the part of the members of the team; the men had worked together for some time without incident. He knew that the Negro-white ratio in the plant was about one to eight, roughly approximating that of the community. He was disturbed by the prospect of a major incident since a shut-down of the headlining station would hold up work along the entire assembling line. Moreover, the plant had recently been the
scene of a number of particularly costly unauthorized work stoppages, and the memory of this strife was still very much in the minds of those who had been concerned.

The foreman was at a loss as to how he might relieve tensions in such a potentially explosive situation. Finally he approached Williams, who replied, "There is nothing that says what I can or cannot wear."

Both Crosby and Roper are faced by administrative blocks familiar to most manager: they are up against the fact that there are times when production can be sidetracked by group maintenance processes. On such a premise human relations practice becomes, not only an expression of ethics and ideals, but also a method of achieving operational efficiency from which the manager may not legitimately shrink; for either of these managers to avoid these issues on the plea that they must get "back to production" is rationalization of the highest order. The "production" to which they refer lies, not in what they might wish to return to, but rather in the interpersonal issue that has presented itself; and, this being the case, the underlying motivations of the manager in withdrawing from this production-related relationships issue might well bear investigation.
LAPSES IN THE WILL TO WORK

In a final lecture to a group of executive trainees, Professor Hower proposed a number of administrative assumptions among which was the following:

People, unless discouraged from doing so, will do their best to achieve what the purposes and circumstances of the organization require. (1, p. 100)

If this assumption is correct, then the administrator must somehow account for the operational lapses of employees who have previously demonstrated loyalty to their organizations and dedication to their tasks. Illustrations of managers faced with such lapses are found in the cases that follow.

Rose was the "utility girl" on one of the assembly lines at the General Appliance Company. Frances was her line supervisor. Since the work had been somewhat seasonal, Rose joined the company usually for about six months' work each year in the period preceding the Christmas buying season. In the years preceding the one in which the situation here described occurred, she had been an assembler; but this year, because she had arrived back to work after the line was set up and also because of her experience and willing attitude, she had been made the line's utility girl. This position called for a great
deal of flexibility and knowledge of the various jobs; the utility girl would fill in for any of the assemblers who happened to be absent. Rose worked well at the assignment and Frances frequently complimented her on her cooperation.

Prior to Christmas, it was announced that the work of the line was not to be discontinued as in previous years. Other lines had been converted to war work in connection with the Korean effort, and not only was production on Frances' line to be continued, but it was to be increased. As one method of bringing about the desired increase, management had issued instructions that the supervisors were to tighten up on absenteeism and to discharge employees who were habitually absent; an employee was termed "habitually absent" if he were absent more than one day a week repeatedly or if he were absent one day a week regularly. When this condition arose, an employee was to be issued a written warning in the presence of his union steward and, if he persisted in his absenteeism, he was to be discharged.

The attendance records distributed by the personnel department in connection with this new program brought to light the fact that Rose had fallen into the habit of being absent one day a week, and that this practice had been going on for several months. Rose's conduct had been known to Frances; she had done nothing about it
because Rose did not have a regular station and many times her absence was not particularly felt. Moreover, Frances tended to overlook any inconvenience caused her by these absences since she felt particularly grateful to Rose for the exceptional help she rendered while at work.

As management's campaign against absenteeism continued, Frances felt impelled to speak to Rose. The timing of the first warning under the new procedure was left to the line supervisor and the foreman, since it was felt that the other company officials might not have access to all of the facts of the case. When approached, Rose reminded Frances that she had frequently asked for "a chair of her own on the line" and that, anyway, her absences could always be accounted for due to illness at home or some equally acceptable reason. Frances repeated an earlier promise to find Rose a place just as soon as an opening occurred and a replacement could be developed for the position of utility girl. Frances again expressed her gratitude to Rose for the yeoman service that she had been according the line; she pointed out that she did not wish to make an issue of the absences and was doing so only under the pressure of the company's new policy.

In spite of this discussion, Rose persisted in her absenteeism. Frances filed a warning slip with her
foreman. When Rose stayed away again the next week, Frances felt that the situation was out of her hands, much as she might have wished to retain her valuable services. When Rose returned to work after her absence, Frances asked her to go to the foreman's office.

In this case, pressures emanating from sources outside the immediate work group had evidently brought to light an unofficial adjustment that Rose had made to an unpleasant circumstance. Unhappy with her assignment and psychologically unequipped to protest her situation and to convince Frances of the strength of her displeasure, Rose had taken action in her own imperfect way. Frances, in turn, had been equally upset by the turn of events. At the time she was interviewed, her own failure to keep Rose as a participating member of the group was described by her as the most disturbing problem that she had encountered during a long and highly-regarded career with the company. In spite of her concern she appeared unequipped to interpret the circumstance in which she found herself. As was the case with the office manager in the report which follows, she had no frame of reference for dealing with administrative problems of this type, intense though they might have been.

Mrs. Myrtle Smith was one of a group of clerk-typists at a military establishment. All outgoing correspondence
in the department was checked by Major Black, her secondary 
supervisor, who frequently made changes, some of a minor 
nature, and sent the letters back for retyping. Following 
Major Black's assignment to the group, the amount of such 
work had greatly increased. Retyping correspondence had 
become a source of irritation with Mrs. Smith, who indicated 
that she could not understand the need for doing 
the work over a second time. She had brought her com-
plaints to Mr. Johnston, her immediate supervisor, at var-ious times and protested the need of retyping letters or 
reports when the change appeared to her to be inconseqwen-
tial. On such occasions, Mr. Johnston's only reply had 
been to insist that the retyping was necessary.

One afternoon Major Black gave Mrs. Smith a letter 
for retyping indicating orally the corrections that he 
wished made. Mrs. Smith looked at the letter and informed 
him that one of the other girls had typed it originally, 
and that she didn't feel she should be the one to do the 
retyping. Major Black took the letter to Mr. Johnston 
and informed him of the difficulty that he had encountered 
in getting Mrs. Smith to accept the assignment. Mr. 
Johnston immediately took the letter back to Mrs. Smith, 
instructed her to retype it, and told her that she should 
follow instructions given her. Mrs. Smith burst into 
tears and told Johnston that he could not make her do
anything. Mr. Johnston advised her in a loud voice that as long as she worked under his supervision she was to perform the assignments he gave her. Mrs. Smith replied, "If you want the letter retyped, get one of your girl friends to do it." She then left the office and did not report back to work until the following morning.

Apart from Johnston's clumsy handling of this problem, an examination of the nature of Mrs. Smith's disturbance is helpful. The woman is obviously put out, apparently for somewhat obscured reasons that pre-dated the Major Black episode and may have something to do with the manner and conditions in which she views her participation in the tasks of the group. Underneath the surface, forces are at play of which the manager is completely oblivious and which finally break through and find expression in full strength for the first time. Insensitive to these forces and to the opportunity which the episode presents him to get at the bottom of her discontent, Johnston permits himself to be drawn into an emotional exchange with tempers mounting with each comment.

Why did Johnston fail to identify and deal with the forces that came into play? How did he previously fail to catch what Stuart Chase has called the signals (3, pp. 13-24) that his subordinate was sending out to him and to which his response had been curt dismissal?
The inept response on the part of the two supervisors in the preceding cases brings us to another guidepost in effective managerial action: *in order to administrate effectively in the relationships area, the manager must operate at the psychological and sociological level.*

And, while it is not the purpose of this study to get into the question of training methods, it should be pointed out in setting up this principle that it is not necessarily recommended that such managers be subjected to formal courses in psychological or sociological theory in the traditional academic manner. It is hoped that training specialists can find ways of provoking more realistic approaches to and ways of looking at these kinds of administrative problems without exposing managers to the time-consuming rigors of formal courses in psychology and sociology.

**THE INDIVIDUAL AND THE CHANGING SCENE**

The distribution of personalities, expectations and behavior in a work group is a kaleidoscope that shifts and changes in the moment that it takes to examine and identify it. The National Training Laboratory in the experiments that it carries on at Bethel, Maine, has tentatively established some of the characteristics of the group at work (12, pp. 68-77). The leaders of this
program speak of the constant shifting within a group as members attempt to interpret the sequence of events in terms of their own motivations ("hidden agenda" is Bethel- ese for this tendency); sides are constantly choosing up, pro and con, with the membership of the teams shifting with each issue; conflict and support come into being briefly and the parties to the conflict and support are then redistributing in terms of the individual meaning that the members assign to the next developing topic. The only thing permanent, it would seem, is the process itself and the redistributions of personal positions that it generates.

Most managers seek to avoid responsibility for administering this interpersonal process, but it would appear that, since it exists and determines the productivity of the group, its administration is a management chore that may not be legitimately avoided. The manager has a responsibility for studying and providing services that will expedite those internal adjustments provoked by the very fact that a group has been assembled. He must seek to build into his own approaches and into the climate of the work situation flexibilities, traditions, devices that will make provision for the inevitable march of social issues that are a feature of collaborative action.

In the case studies that follow, we find managers who retreated from this phenomenon and others who tried,
with varying degrees of success, to deal with it. In none of the cases do we find the sophisticated administration of group process that permits the manager to deal sensitively and directly in bringing about the adjustments that would seem to have been indicated.

It was to such a task that Fred Welby, superintendent of construction at the Central Ohio Telephone and Telegraph Company, dedicated his time and his energies almost without reserve. Fred was an alert manager, devoted to the interests of his company and of his subordinates. His employing organization encouraged the type of attention that Welby devoted to the relationship problem described. These were conditions which should have assured the successful administration of the relationships difficulty which was encountered.

Joe English, whose attitudes and behavior were the subject of Welby's concern, had been general foreman of construction in the metropolitan division for several years. His job kept him in the field most of the time, supervising the work of the crews that were installing new equipment and doing maintenance and repairs.

Joe's approach to construction was what is known in the trade as "hell for stout": he would approve of no work that did not measure up to the exacting standards of strength, solidity and appearance that he wished to be
the trade mark on any work that he had undertaken. He would have a crew pull out completed work and do it over using stronger guy-wires, heavier clamps and larger anchors which his personal standards demanded; such work was generally done with heavier material than the engineering department had specified, which meant that the crew would have to stand by while one of their number drove back to the warehouse for the substitute material. After an episode such as this, English would report to his superintendent in a manner that indicated that he expected nothing but praise for his actions:

"Fred, will you look at the way those damn fools in engineering set up this job? Those guys just don't know the facts of life. We can't be a party to any work as flimsy as this. The crew had to stand around idle half the morning waiting for the new hardware I had to order."

On such occasions, Joe gave no indication that he considered his deviation from standard specifications anything but proper. He seemed to see himself as a champion defending the company's best interests against the deficiencies of the engineers.

Welby's personal observations that Joe's superior standards were subjecting the company to unnecessary expense were reinforced by figures prepared by his cost analyst which showed the construction costs for the
metropolitan division to be decidedly above average.

Welby considered what action he might take to point out tactfully to Joe the consequences of his actions. He prized Joe's initiative and sense of responsibility, qualities that were most important for a man who spent much of his time in the field without supervision or on emergency repairs at hours when no superior advice was available. On the other hand, Welby was convinced that, technically, the engineers' standards were adequate, and that the additional strength that Joe built into his jobs grew out of Joe's concern for his own reputation rather than out of the requirements of the work. He first tried to reason with Joe, using a catalogue of manufacturers' specifications and other statistical data that he had prepared. Joe's reaction was, "By God, Fred, I know what will hold and won't hold; I've been at this job for twenty years. I wouldn't be doing my job if I let them get away with the conditions they specify." Welby next set up a working model in the pole yard and, using a dynamometer to measure stress and strain, attempted to prove his point. English was unconvinced.

In desperation, Welby told English that cooperation with other departments was necessary and that staff channels and policies had to be observed. He ended the
conversation by instructing his general foreman that, in the future, all specifications changes were to be cleared with him before being instituted. Subsequent to this discussion, English observed specified standards. Welby had the feeling, however, that none of the man's original reservations had been disposed of, and that he was complying only because he had been instructed to do so. This disturbed the superintendent who wondered how he might have gotten to the roots of Joe's resistance.

This manager's failure did not grow out of any desire to neglect or avoid the relationships issue that presented itself. When he was interviewed, Welby was deeply concerned with his inability to administer English's reservations; he felt it reflected upon his own managerial ability. There was no time or effort that he would not have accorded if it would have better equipped him to deal with such administrative occurrences.

If there was ever a situation where straight logical explanation, often identified with employee communications, should have worked, it was in the English case. In view of Welby's elaborate attempts at logic and reasoning, his failure leads us to another guidepost in the interpretation of the manager's human relations problems: the manager cannot reason subordinates out of relationship difficulties. Another way must be found to replace the
straight logical approach.

Although Welby failed, he was looking for an answer; he was not shirking his administrative responsibilities in the servicing of his subordinate group's relationship needs. With guidance and support, it would appear that he could achieve the sophistication in such matters that he is looking for. The next case affords a picture of a manager studiously avoiding involvement in the adjustment difficulties of a subordinate. In the case, such involvement is avoided even though it threatens the fulfillment of a personal commitment that the manager made regarding the installation of expensive equipment, against the advice of his own superior.

Miss Prindle, the subordinate in the case, had been a pen and ink bookkeeper for some time with the Taylor Company, a distributing organization in a western city. A maiden lady, fifty years of age, she had established the reputation of being a conscientious and effective worker. Mr. Gardner, the office manager, had only one reservation about her services: she was extremely nervous and, if he called her attention to ways of improving her methods or corrected her work, she would break into tears. Scenes such as this deeply embarrassed Mr. Gardner, and he made every effort to avoid them.

One day the public accountant who worked with the
firm suggested to Mr. Gardner that a bookkeeping machine would speed up customer billing and the preparation of cost and sales statements. After several conversations on the matter, Gardner decided to recommend such an installation to the president of the company. The president did not share Gardner's enthusiasm; when Gardner insisted, however, he authorized the expenditure of $6000 but stated that he would reserve judgment on the investment until he had been shown definite results.

After much thought, Mr. Gardner decided that Miss Prindle was the person to operate the machine; she was the only one at her pay level who was free for such work and, furthermore, he did not wish to assign the task to someone with a job rating lower than hers. When Mr. Gardner approached her about the new assignment, Miss Prindle's reaction was not favorable. She cited many reasons why the machine would not speed up the operations that she performed. Gardner assured her that the change was necessary. Her attitude did not change after the machine had been installed. Her distaste was obvious as she sat at the keyboard equipped with its great variety of keys, punch bars, buttons, sliding carriages and bells; as she pushed each key, she could be seen to jump back.

Time passed and there was no indication that Miss Prindle was any happier with the new machine in spite
of several weekday afternoons she had spent at a school conducted by the company that made the installation. Mr. Gardner continued to show interest in her work and to question her occasionally about her progress. He did not discuss the situation with her at any length because he felt to do so would only result in another tearful scene of the type that he was most anxious to avoid. Gardner had definitely promised the president of the company that the new machine would speed up bookkeeping services; his promise was not being fulfilled. He was very sensitive to the pressure to produce the results that he had promised; and, at the first opportunity, discussed the matter with the representative of the firm which had installed the equipment. "Sit tight!" he was told.

"Miss Prindle will make it in time." That afternoon he broached the subject to the accountant who was visiting the firm. After viewing Miss Prindle at a distance for some time, the accountant commented: "She'll never make it. I'm afraid we'll have to let her go and hire someone else."

The block to Miss Prindle's adjustment appears to be the very emotions with which Gardner is so studiously avoiding contact. The office manager suffers a common managerial ailment—"emotio-phobia," it might be called—which grows out of the management myth that, somehow, the
expression of feelings by an employee is out of place in the business setting. Johnson feels that he would in some way be less the manager if he permitted Miss Prindle to break down and pour out the things that are the real source of her concern. The extent of this condition in industry can be estimated by the frequency of such remarks as: "After all, this is a business office," "Let's keep this discussion on a business plane," and "We accord every employee exactly the same treatment." This is a case where "good business" is just not good business. The fact does not sustain the myth. Miss Prindle appears to be looking for an opportunity to express her feelings about the change; these feelings are the block to her adjustment and must be given release if she is going to make the attitude changes that seem indicated; but the manager is constrained by the myth from taking the very course of action which can bring about the circumstances that he desires.

As the manager is not always equipped to deal with such problems as these at the feeling level, so too he frequently fails to estimate correctly the strength of the feeling content in moves that may be interpreted by his employees as threats to their status position in their group. It was such a failure that created for the foreman in the case that follows the difficulties that
are described.

Bert Hughes, foreman of the assembly department at the Mansfield Glass Products Company, had two working supervisors under his charge: Fred Kirby, the night shift supervisor, was considered to have more status than Tom Reeves, the day man, since he worked at a time when there was no foreman in charge. As evidence of this superior status, Kirby relieved Hughes when the foreman took his vacation. Tom Reeves, the working supervisor on the day shift, had the same background as Kirby; their job classifications were identical; they were both thirty years of age and had equal seniority with the company.

For some time Hughes had had the feeling that Kirby's work had not been up to standard. He hadn't taken time to study the reasons for his feeling, nor had he discussed it with the man himself. He knew that his night supervisor was ambitious; reports coming to the company indicated that he had already identified himself around town as an assistant foreman. As the time for his vacation approached, Hughes decided that he might try Tom Reeves as acting foreman this year. He felt it wise to experiment with a second foreman replacement in view of his feelings about Kirby and in the interest of developing greater management replacement depth.

Two days before leaving for his holiday, Hughes
discussed the plan first with Kirby, then with Reeves. These were the reactions that he received from the two men:

KIRBY: I'm not going to tell you that I'm happy that Tom is getting the assignment. I'll do whatever I have to while he's in charge; but I'm not going to put myself out to make a big success out of him.

REEVES: I appreciate the opportunity to get a crack at the job; but, frankly, if Fred's going to be out there torpedoing me while I'm in charge, I don't particularly want the assignment.

In view of the unexpected reactions to his announcement, Hughes was somewhat perplexed as to what action he should take.

Hughes' mistake was in not predicting the reaction that might normally be expected from the steps that he had taken. When one considers that Fred Kirby, up until now the crown prince and heir apparent, was in effect being demoted without previous notice to the number three status position, it is little wonder that his reaction was not even stronger than the one described.

In the cases of Welby, the construction superintendent, Gardner, the office manager, and Hughes, the assembly foreman, we have three managers whose total managerial
capacity is not being realized because of the existence of a blind spot in one of the areas which greatly determines group productivity. Welby is at least conscious of his difficulty but lacks the skills to operate effectively at the relationship level. The other two managers seem to be greatly taken aback by developments, surprised at what they have encountered and in search of some logical answer for this non-logical, and therefore improper, behavior on the part of their subordinates. This social blindness and lack of operational skill in administering problems at the feeling level is a common management ailment which offers a challenge to those concerned with the development of managers with rounded administrative capacity.

BOUNDARIES TO THE ADMINISTRATION OF EMOTIONS

In any discussion of the propriety of managerial action in the area of feelings and emotions, it is necessary to recognize that there exist boundaries beyond which such action may be seriously questioned. The human personality is a complex phenomenon and personality disturbances pass a point beyond which professional treatment is required. The complexity of our culture and, simultaneously, the refinement of our administrative techniques have combined to bring more and more of these pathological
personality disturbances to the manager's attention. The manager's function would appear to be that of identifying which of the disturbances require professional attention and, if such be the case, to attempt to bring about a referral. A case in point is the disturbance which presented itself to the manager of a feed mill operation conducted by the Trident Mills, Inc. The employee in question was Hutch, a lift truck operator.

Hutch was one of three lift truck operators employed by the Trident Mills, Inc. His was the most responsible of the three jobs; he loaded the sacked feed into freight cars for shipment and took care of the "front door trade," the truck pick-up of supplies by customers. In his tasks Hutch was assisted by two helpers, one of whom unloaded sacks inside the freight cars, while a second loaded the palettes in the warehouse.

The feed business underwent a temporary decline and Hutch's foreman asked him to work loading cereal cars until the feed business picked up. In his new assignment, Hutch was required to work alone, loading and unloading the light cereal cartons by himself. After finishing several cars in his new assignment, Hutch protested to his foreman:

Bill, I'm senior lift truck man here and, as long as one is available I
feel that I should have a job that would keep me up on a truck. I don't feel that it's right that I should be handling cases.

He went on to point out that he felt entitled to the lift truck job held by a junior employee and which involved shuttling back and forth bringing ingredients from the warehouse to the mill.

The foreman pointed out that the assignment was a temporary one and that the treatment he had accorded Hutch was the same that any employee in like circumstances would receive, adding "My policy is to treat everyone the same." Sometime later, Hutch asked the plant manager for an interview. The two men went to the grain office, a secluded spot frequently used for private conversations. After Hutch, who was visibly disturbed, composed himself, the following conversation took place:

HUTCH: Mr. Paulson, I want to know why Bill and you have it in for me. Is it because I've joined the Masons recently? You always said that you liked my work, and now I've been assigned to slinging cases.

MANAGER: Hutch, you have no reason to believe that either Bill or I have it in for you. We like you and we like your work. We've told you that repeatedly. We've given you the most responsible lift truck job. When business is slack in any department, we're
forced to reduce costs, and this may mean that a man will get different work assignments temporarily. What else can we do?

HUTCH: As the senior man, I think I have rights to the feed mill job.

MANAGER: Seniority has never entered into job assignments within a classification; although, when all other factors are equal, it is company policy to give preference to the desires of the senior employee. However, in this case the job you have is far more responsible than the others. A mistake in loading the feed cars or in handling the front door trade would be very damaging to our customer relationships. Your job calls for experience, ability, and knowledge. It also keeps you in close touch with management. Ben does a good job with the mill, but we just don’t feel that he could handle the job that you do. He likes his job and he’s suited to it. I’m sure that he doesn’t want to be changed; nor do we want to change him; and I’m not sure that you would be happy with his job if we did make the change. When the mill is shut down, he works on cereal cars, and that seems to be your objection to the present arrangement.

HUTCH: I hate to be taking your time, and I don’t want to be a troublemaker, Mr. Paulson. This isn’t a personal matter with me;
it's just a case of seniority, and I think that I have a right to the mill job on that basis.

**MANAGER:** Hutch, I can only repeat what I've told you. We have to take all the factors into consideration when we make our decisions.

**HUTCH:** I've been away from my work too long, and I have to get back. Will you tell Bill where I've been?

**MANAGER:** I will, Hutch. Harold (union business agent) was in to see me the other day, and we've scheduled a meeting for tomorrow morning. Maybe all of us working together can figure out an answer to this problem.

Paulson had the feeling at the end of the interview that most of what he had said had been lost on Hutch. He considered the man to be one of his most valuable employees and wanted to help him. It was his opinion that Hutch's problem was a personal one, and that his reaction to the changed circumstances on the job had become the occasion for the airing of deeper problems. This estimate was subsequently confirmed. The man had become subject to serious psychological disturbances growing out of a combination of personal circumstances that included the chronic illness of his wife, which kept him up night
after night and left him physically and mentally fatigued. After Paulson had started to look at Hutch's trouble as a psychological condition, he uncovered evidences of irrational persecution phantasies indicating a deeper personal instability. He was able to put the employee in touch with a professional agency equipped to deal with such matters.

The area of emotional disturbance in which the manager can legitimately operate is a limited one. The manager needs guidance that will help him to identify these limits, to operate with assurance within his legitimate bounds and to understand the techniques of referral when such seem indicated.

**SUMMARY**

While the new manager is establishing himself, he acts as though he believes that relationship factors were legitimate concerns in the business scene. In the cases reviewed in the chapter devoted to the new manager's relationships, such concern was frequently the basis for administrative action. Yet when such relationship development occurs within a subordinate group, the manager adopts a contrary attitude and one that is supported by the myth that action in the relationship area is not a legitimate part of the management function.
On the other hand, the hesitancy of some managers to operate in this area grows, not out of the lack of desire, but out of the absence of skills appropriate to such action.

In several of the cases it was obvious that the unwillingness to act was restricting the productivity of the group. Under such circumstances it would appear that the relationship area is an appropriate one for managerial action. The question would appear to be: How to inspire managers to act effectively in this area and how to equip them with the operational skills necessary for success in dealing with disturbances growing out of relationship failures. The following factors were identified for the consideration of such management specialists as are concerned with such matters:

(1) **Production can be sidetracked by group maintenance processes.** Concern with production must vie with relationship concerns for the complete attention of the employee. When the latter becomes inflated as the result of unresolved relationships problems, concentration on the former is reduced. This fact alone, and there seem to be others, requires that the manager attend to and act in the area of subordinate relationships.

(2) **In order to administrative effectively in the relationships area the manager must operate at the**
psychological and sociological level. Unless the manager approaches the disturbance in these terms, the results of whatever action he takes will be unavailing, at least, and possibly conducive of further aggravation.

(3) The manager cannot reason subordinates out of relationship difficulties. Fred Welby's logic in the Ohio Telephone Company case was ordered and overwhelming. He backed it up with carefully contrived demonstrations that left no room for argument. But the effort was unavailing. His subordinate's problem was not one or logic and, while he was talking apples, the employee's mind was on oranges. The manager cannot meet emotion with logic.

(4) The management myth; the expression of feelings by employees is out of place in the business setting. Feelings, like Mallory's mountain, are there; and they must be dealt with. The manager who wishes to administer his complete assignment, and deal with all of the various obstructions to production, be they social or technical, may run counter to a popular executive belief.

(5) The area of emotional disturbance in which the manager can legitimately operate is a limited one. Hutch's request for a different lift truck assignment turned out to be the expression of a deeper pathological personality disturbance. The manager's function, under such circumstances, is to recognize his own limitations
and to refer the employee for professional ministration. The boundary is not clear-cut. Assistance in its definition can better equip the manager to deal confidently within his proper limitations.

In this chapter we have considered with illustrations the responsibilities of the established manager in providing administrative services to the members of his subordinate group in making the relationships adjustments that evolve naturally from the nature of group process. In the next chapter, we turn again to the manager's personal relationships, considering this time the problems that typically proceed from his membership on the management team.
CHAPTER IV

THE MANAGER'S RELATIONSHIP TO THE MANAGEMENT GROUP

One of the foibles of the human mind is the assumption that, at the next level below our own, group processes are quite different and somehow less important. The manager's membership experiences would appear to hold valuable lessons as to the manner in which he should relate himself, as nominal leader, to his own subordinate group. But it would seem that these are lessons rarely learned. The status-protecting functions of the human mind appear to be such as to make it difficult for the manager to acknowledge the unity of sociological experience at all levels of business society. The sensitive interpretation and administration of relationship processes, our closely-held convictions tell us, should extend as far down as the group of which we are members; beneath that, different conditions prevail. The fallacy of this position is obvious upon a moment's reflection, but in practice, the myth is too satisfying and supportive to be lightly dismissed. Roethlisberger elaborates upon this point in discussing the membership role of the manager (17, pp. 152-154).

Any consideration of the manager's top-side
relationships is, for the reasons stated above, actually a restatement, from a different vantage point, of the principles considered in the last chapter. However, the membership role demands of the manager a different and equally intricate set of social skills as the cases that follow demonstrate. The acquisition of insight and supportive skills in this area would appear to be equally the concern of the specialist in executive development.

GETTING ALONG WITH THE BOSS

Every man carries into his work situation an image of the perfect boss. The roots of this dream go far back into psychological beginnings, perhaps too far back for adequate consideration in the practical situations of the business scene; but the expectation persists and permeates the relationship with work superiors. The case of Harold Gordon provides an opportunity for an examination of these expectations and the struggle for their fulfillment. This case is particularly demonstrative, since Gordon was at an age when these expectations might be in full force, and the situation into which he moved was one least fitted to provide for their fulfillment.

Harold Gordon came to the Bright Manufacturing Company in response to a newspaper advertisement. The personnel manager told him that Bright was a "growing company in
which a good man could go far" and arranged an appointment with Mr. Gallant, the president, who made final hiring decisions. The following are largely Gordon's observations in the months that followed this first contact with the Bright Manufacturing Company.

Gordon was impressed by Gallant's pronounced affectations: he had a habit of staring fixedly at the person with whom he was conversing, all the while "taking great puffs on his pipe." A middle-aged man, he was a former collegiate athlete who liked to refer to his subordinates as his team, and himself as the quarterback. "I'll try you on the production staff first," said Gallant. "You report to Mr. Barton, the production control manager at 8:30 Monday morning."

"I'm your new assistant," Gordon told Barton after he had looked him up on Monday morning. Barton's face was blank and his handshake limp. Gordon had the impression that this was the man's first knowledge that an assistant had been hired. He gave the new man a week to look over the shop, observing conditions and asking questions. When the week was up, Gordon discussed several ideas and suggestions with his new boss. "We're not ready for that sort of thing" was the only reply.

In the weeks that followed, Gordon had the feeling that he was doing nothing and getting nowhere in his
desire to be helpful to the company. He prepared a list of recommendations that he thought would improve the company's production control system and submitted copies simultaneously to Mr. Barton and Mr. Gallant. A week later he was called to the president's office. "I want to thank you for the list of recommendations that you submitted; they're a great deal similar to those of a consulting firm we had in two years ago," said Gallant. "However, I want you to know that we're not primarily interested in this sort of thing at this time. We want you to concentrate for the time being on problems within your own assignment." Gordon endeavored to point out that the problems of production control could never be solved until the framework in which the system operated could be given a general overhaul. However, his arguments were to no avail; Gallant thanked him for his suggestions and terminated the interview with the statement, "This is the type of thinking that we like to see an employee doing; but you mustn't let it interfere with your work."

Gordon made every effort to concentrate on the problems of production control. His suggestions to Barton were met with answers such as the following:

"We're not ready for that."

"We can't get control of production with the plant manager shoving his friend's orders in ahead of the others."
"Gallant can't do anything without having a hell of an argument with Mercier (the chairman of the Board)."

One day he submitted a production control card to Barton. It was his opinion that this device would put the system on a more planned basis. When several weeks had passed with no reply from his superior, Gordon asked him what he thought of the card. Barton replied that he had not had time to examine it. Gordon asked for the material back and arranged an appointment with Mr. Gallant.

Before the interview, Gordon had decided to take the situation in hand and either "get somewhere or get out." He pointed out to the president that he had been able to accomplish nothing since coming to the company, and that his position could readily be abolished with a saving to the firm. He asked to be made administrative assistant with power to make revisions and inaugurate procedures, justifying this recommendation with a statement about his background, his ability and his desire to be helpful to the company. Gallant acknowledged Gordon's abilities and his potentialities; he hoped that he would stay with the company. However, he made it clear that it was not possible for him to do what Gordon had suggested. At this point, the young man concluded that he was getting nowhere. He tendered his resignation, which was accepted with regrets.
It is not the purpose of this interpretation to question the wisdom of Gordon's decision to resign. There is ample evidence to support the wisdom of his action. Gordon is related to the purposes of this study only because he exhibits to a marked degree a condition that afflicts most executives: our superiors do not fill the expectations of the ideal boss to the degree that we should like, with the result that we strike out against this circumstance, not to the degree that Gordon did, but in our own manner. Gordon is to be admired for taking arms against his sea of troubles; but the question should be raised as to the validity of the data upon which he acted. Was the quality of his expectations realistic? In terms of his long-range development as an executive, did his best interests lie in the refinement of the quality of his upward relationships in terms of the rather difficult situation at the Bright Company? Was he setting off on an impossible odyssey in search of a boss who would fill the rather severe relationship expectations which he would impose?

In preparing men for administrative competency, there is a need for the development of realistic expectations apropos superiors. There is a little bit of the quality that blinded Gordon in most managers. It is probably rooted deeply in those infantile experiences during
which parents are viewed with a mixture of affection, hostility, and anxiety. (Gordon demonstrates each of these relationships in the situation cited.) This quality clouds and somewhat determines work relationships with superiors. Bosses, however, aren't parents. Expectations of securing parent-type relationships with superiors are rather impossible of fulfillment, since superiors, being people, are subject to the same pre-occupations and relationship blindspots as their subordinates.

Assistance to the manager in the development of reasonable expectations in the superior relationship presents another area for concern on the part of those involved in the development of managers.

WHEN THE BOSS MAKES A MISTAKE

There comes a time in the manager's career when he must accept and adjust to most of his superior's methods of operation or set about to affect a change in the point of view from which the operation proceeds. The disposition of this issue has larger implications: it determines the role which the subordinate chooses to play and the type of service with which he wishes to be identified. In many ways, it shapes the subordinate's business career, for each of the alternate roles, which we shall define later, may be perfected only through the practice acquired in
individual episodes, and around each role grows a pattern of expectations which may not be lightly upset. Such a determination faced Henry Gaffney a short time after he had been employed as personnel manager at the Duo-Fax Company. Henry Gaffney had known Thomas Young, the president of the company, for some time prior to his employment. While going to college, he had worked several summers at the plant; after the war, Gaffney had worked with another local concern, maintaining the while a speaking acquaintanceship with Young, who had a great deal of confidence in the young man's ability.

Thomas Young founded the Duo-Fax Company with a partner thirty years earlier. At 59, he was attempting to divest himself of some of the administrative routine in which he had been involved so that he might concentrate primarily on matters of company policy. He had also purchased a farm in Vermont and was looking forward to spending more time away from the plant. When he engaged Gaffney's services, he authorized the new manager to make a thorough survey of conditions in the plant and to propose whatever measures, personnel-wise, seemed indicated.

Gaffney undertook a large scale interviewing program, discussing company affairs at great length with the various department managers and foremen, in fact with any plant official who was willing to talk with him. Most of the
men seemed eager to talk; some called of their own accord to see when their interview was to be scheduled. As the picture which he was being given came into focus, Gaffney found that most of the men were enthusiastic about their work with the company; they considered business prospects to be bright. It was their opinion, however, that Young and other top management people were too pre-occupied with their particular interests to attend to the recommendations of subordinates and to accord them the follow-up that they would have liked. The plant manager, for instance, was an expert in working on the intricate machinery used in the production of the company's products. He never tired of tinkering with it, testing, adjusting, and experimenting with new set-ups. Both he and Young refused to become involved in the interpersonal friction that developed in the shop. Their attitude was, "Sit tight; things will blow over. Meanwhile, we'll let the boys work it out for themselves." Even this condition was not without its bright side, however; for it gave the foremen a certain amount of freedom and self-direction that they might not otherwise have had. An informal organization for initiating change and solving problems developed among them and filled the vacuum which top management disinterest had created. Generally, it was a happy group.
One continuing conflict did stand out, however, against this background of relative bliss. (In fact, Gaffney wondered if much of the conflict and hostility which generated elsewhere might not have been mis-directed at this situation as a convenient issue.) It was the intense friction between the maintenance foreman, Lou Montgomery, and the other foremen. Some years back, Lou joined the Duo-Fax Company as a one-man maintenance crew. Shortly after his employment, he encountered some misunderstanding as to which of several tasks he should tackle first. He went to Young and said, "Tom, tell me who my boss is. I don't care who I work for, but I want to know what individual I take instructions from." Young indicated that Montgomery should work directly under him, a relationship that was continued during the rapid growth of both the company and the maintenance function in the years following World War II. During these years, Montgomery managed to maintain both adequate maintenance service and effective relations with the production foremen; it was not until after the incident described below that the trouble developed.

Three years before the time of Gaffney's interview, Young had called Lou into his office and shut the door. "Lou," he said. "Can you keep a secret?" "Sure, Tom," replied Montgomery. "What is it?"
Lou, I haven't even broached this to the board of directors yet and, if word were to get out, I'd be in all sorts of trouble. I've felt that we needed a larger plant for some time, and I think that I've finally found the new building. I'm sure that I can sell the idea to the board, and I'm convinced that within a year we'll be operating at our new location.

Now, here's the reason I'm letting you in on the secret: I don't want a penny spent on maintenance work at this plant unless it's absolutely necessary to keep production going; patch things together with bailing wire if you have to; just make ends meet for a couple of months, will you do that, Lou?

And remember! Not a word of this to anyone. Not even Jack Sullivan (the plant manager) knows about it.

Lou Montgomery described the difficulties he encountered in executing his instructions as follows:

You can imagine the spot I was on; within a few weeks, the foremen were convinced that I was a tight-fisted, unreasonable b——. They could only conclude that I was following short-sighted maintenance policies that were running the company and its equipment into the ground and keeping them from getting the type of service that they needed to do a job. I couldn't spill the beans; and, of course, the plant manager was in the dark and couldn't argue the point even if he had wanted to.

When the move was finally made public, relations got even worse. My duties
required that I spend much of my time at the new plant getting things ready for occupancy; that meant the foremen weren't getting anywhere near normal maintenance service. Tom Young assigned us one of the company's new station wagons for commuting between the two locations; the fellows tagged us "the Red Cross ladies." When we moved into the new plant, the bad blood continued. Tom Young never saw fit to tell the full story and, by this time, I don't think it would have done any good, had he decided to do so. Some of the foremen won't have anything to do with the maintenance department; if they have anything to do, they try to do it themselves; they use petty cash to buy maintenance supplies at the local hardware store. When they have to call us in, it's just a case of bickering and griping and name-calling; one of the foremen even grabbed me by my shirt-front and tried to push me against a wall. They keep saying things that aren't true; and, I must admit, that after I take just so much, I strike right back at them.

Frankly, I've about concluded that it's a hopeless situation. I can see no hope of a solution.

Gaffney realized that the conditions that had been described to him were, in fact, an indictment of Tom Young's leadership. He wondered if he should attempt to pass on his findings to Young; and if so, how he might make the telling a learning experience that would result in more perceptive behavior on the general manager's part.

Gaffney's predicament is not an unfamiliar one.
He was a new member of the organization team. Perhaps he had heard somewhere the comment, "Sit tight and don't pass judgment until you have established yourself." A frank report to the general manager, including reference to Young's own part in bringing about the problem, was not without risks. On the other hand, the stand which he would take on the current issue would largely determine the nature of the subordinate role that he was to play under Young; and, in turn, his relationships with the other managers and supervisors in the organization.

Larger implications are involved in the disposition of such issues as that Gaffney faced, coming as they do in the first few months at the new assignment--during those fleeting moments, come all too soon, when the relationships patterns begin to form. The issue is never a clean-cut one; its outlines are clouded by the setting in which it arises and by the hundred and one management dictums proposed by those who make a business of such things as to how the subordinate should act in such circumstances. At the risk of being inconsistent, we shall add another: the candor level is in part determined by the subordinate; this determination in large measure shapes the relationship.
GETTING ALONG WITH THE BOYS

Increasing specialization by managers in executing the functions of the business, has brought with it a parallel need for increased skill on the part of the manager in relating effectively to other executives at his own level. In the disposition of vertical relationship blocks, the status differential is always available as a last resort. Among peers, this instrument is not available; and the sub-surface tensions may continue, sometimes for years, with the consequent costs to the organization in terms of dissipated time and energy. The cases that follow indicate the nature of such failures.

The Strang Company was operated by two young men who purchased the business ten years before; Edward Cameron concentrated on sales and distribution while the second partner, Thomas Woods, devoted himself to production in the plant. As the business prospered, subordinate managers were hired to make it possible for the partners to focus their attention on matters of company policy. After this reorganization, differences developed between the two men that are illustrated by their split on how the current slump in the company's profit picture might be overcome.

A short time before the current disagreement, the
Strang Company had been forced to manufacture and market a new type of product that was gaining consumer acceptance in the firm's market. The partners felt they had no alternative other than to add this product to their line if they wished to maintain their competitive picture in the area. While this action resulted in an increase in over-all sales volume in the months that followed, there was a gradual decline in the company's net profit position as compared to prior years. It had been known that raw material costs of the new product would be considerably higher, but it had been hoped that additional sales volume would improve the company's profit picture. The hoped-for rate of increase in sales volume never materialized.

The two partners disagreed violently on the remedy for the condition. Cameron, the former sales supervisor, was in favor of investing in expensive, special-purpose machinery in order to bring about a cost improvement in the firm's production methods and procedures; Woods was completely opposed to such a purchase. He blamed the situation on the sales department's failure to secure adequate distribution for the new product and neglect of the established, high-margin items in the company's line in favor of the new, low-margin product. This displacement of high-margin by low-margin product sales, Woods held to be the cause of the company's depressed
profit picture. He was also of the opinion that the present volume was not sufficient to warrant the additional expenditure for machinery. Cameron, a naturally optimistic person, felt that it was only a matter of time before business would pick up sufficiently to justify the expenditure. Neither man would budge from his position. The following is indicative of the rift in point of view:

CAMERON: Damn it, Tom; what better way to show everyone that we're a growing, dynamic outfit than to invest in this new equipment? If we don't have confidence in our own future, who will?

WOODS: You've picked a terribly expensive way to show confidence. The machines would be idle half the day.

CAMERON: I would rather have them idle half the day than to continue with things the way they are going.

WOODS: I can see no point in going overboard. Someone around here has to be realistic.

CAMERON: Realistic! Hell! Only the other day I was reading an article in FORTUNE magazine; companies are doing this sort of thing every day. Labor-saving devices are the only way that industry can meet the rising costs of wages and fringe benefits. You ought to get your nose into some of those books and bring your thinking up to date.

Subsequent to this meeting, the two men confided separately in a mutual friend:
CAMERON: I certainly can't understand Tom's business outlook. When I suggest he do some reading to bring himself up to date and to broaden his vision, he replies, "I'm already too broad." He'll never agree with me on this machinery; his pride won't let him. And it's frustrating as hell when I know that I'm right.

WOODS: I don't know how I'm going to be able to keep Ed in check; when he gets a pet idea, he won't let go of it no matter what proof you show him. Instead of wasting time talking about impossible purchases, we should be looking for ways to increase sales. Ed's a stubborn fool.

How does such a relationship block end? In further interviewing at this company subsequent to the gathering of the facts related above, it was discovered that managers subordinate to the two partners were severely restricted by this continuing conflict; many of their recommendations were held up indefinitely due to inability on the part of the principal executives to agree. On many matters, the subordinates contrived ways of bypassing the partners; even, on occasion, pitting one against the other in order to gain whatever the purposes of the business seemed to require. Here is a classic relationship block that threatens the very existence of the business: no superior authority exists to which the parties may take recourse; the source of relief must be found within the individuals themselves as the result
of improved powers of observation and interpretation.

The same type of continuing conflict at a somewhat lower level is evidenced in the statements of two officials of a small slaughter house. Jack is the credit manager; Harvey the sales manager. They have been working under these tensions for almost thirteen years.

**Summary of How Jack Feels:** What the hell is wrong with that damn Harvey? The cooler's practically full of beef. That crooked b_____ couldn't sell a beef legally. I tell you he is going to ruin this company. I know he's pulling "shananigans." He won't sell those beef; he holds them until they get old and then sells them cheaper to the customers, plus a little extra cash to himself on the side. Furthermore, he's getting all the truckdrivers in on his shady deals; I happen to know that the company pays those drivers overtime while they run to the booze shop to buy him a bottle of booze. Anybody can sell beef the way those knotheads do. I tell you, we've got to fire that damn Harvey and get a good, honest head salesman.

**Summary of How Harvey Feels:** That damn, dirty Jack is the guy that is screwing me up. He's the type of guy that would be scared to hang his underpants on the line at night for fear someone would take them. I know damn good and well that he is chasing away prospective customers, and even some of my old customers are leaving. If that damn ugly buzzard doesn't stop interfering with my customers, I'm going to kick the supreme hell out of him. I had five new customers lined up last month. He okayed sales to one of them, said the others were too great a risk. And if any of my customers get even one week overdue, he calls them up or writes them a letter demanding immediate payment or else we can't sell them any more. My customers don't like Jack's attitude and
they say, if something isn't done about him, they are going to take their business elsewhere. I say Jack should either be put in his place or fired; he's nothing but a crumby trouble-maker.

The relationship failures between Cameron and Woods and between Jack and Harvey are not passing rifts. They have been in effect for years. Jack and Harvey, principal officials in a small company, have not communicated normally with one another for almost thirteen years; there is no reason to believe that they will be able to do so in the next thirteen. In both the cases cited, the tension has continued just below the crisis level; any out and out show-down struggle seems to have been avoided, possibly in deference to the balance of power, equally shared by the two parties. But the continuing friction saps the vitality and stunts the growth of the organization that fosters it. If there is one type of managerial breakdown that seems to withstand the mellowing influences of time, it is horizontal conflict. For these reasons, peer relationship failures, while less threatening to the individual manager, can be more damaging to the purposes of the firm.

ALLEGIANCE TO THE TEAM

There is much in common between the continuing struggle described above between individual peers and
the conflict between groups at the management level. A distinguishing feature seems to be the fact that intergroup struggle is more impersonal and less threatening to the managers involved. Increasing specialization plays its part, especially in the larger organization, in the competition on the part of management groups to secure acceptance for their departmental concepts and points of view. There are times, moreover, when the competition is not directed at the job or task but focuses instead upon the problems of group maintenance. The result may be defensive action against another group which might appear to be threatening its integrity. When this happens, individual managers seem to be caught up in a tide of events not of their own making. Such was the case with George Kelly, a fabrication foreman employed by one of the nation's leading electrical manufacturers.

The Standard Electronics Company was in search of the campaign that would help it to regain its share of the market for the electrical unit that constituted one of its newest and most promising lines. Standard was the first in the field with this product and, at one time, sold eighty per cent of the market. This percentage was being reduced by competing firms that had been introducing product innovations that had been attracting the interest of the trade. The current position of the product sales
division was that the company had to come up with a lighter, more compact unit in order to meet this threat.

Plans for such a unit were developed by George Kelly, foreman of fabrication at the plant. Kelly had been chief technician in the plant's engineering division prior to moving to his current position; this experience convinced him that his plan was technically sound. He brought the plan to Al Simms, production manager at the plant. Al shared his enthusiasm and promised to submit the plan to a meeting of the plant staff scheduled for the next morning.

The meeting was attended by production executives, the general manager, sales managers and representatives of the engineering department including Tom Call, under whose direction Kelly had previously worked. After the meeting, Call stopped at Kelly's desk and the following conversation took place:

CALL: I liked your unit, George, but it was badly presented and almost broke up the meeting.

KELLY: What am I supposed to do if I have an idea? Forget about it?

CALL: If you have an idea, it should be turned over to your factory engineer; he'll see that it's transmitted to me. If the idea is good, we'll develop it. How else can I train my engineers to do their jobs?

KELLY: I don't like to cause friction,
Tom; but I've turned over suggestions to your boys before. And that's the last I've heard of them.

CALL: We can't be expected to get to everything.

KELLY: That new packaging idea that we submitted was one that you didn't get to, and I'll bet it's cost the company a quarter of a million dollars. You people rejected it in favor of one of your own that was never put into operation. Simms means to avoid that type of mistake in the future; he hasn't gotten what he's wanted from you people so this time he's going to bring pressure to bear.

CALL: George, we don't get everything we want from supervision either. Getting one of your boys to make a simple methods change is like pulling teeth. One thing I can say: I keep my gang out of supervision problems.

KELLY: And I might add that you don't always succeed. Nothing has come up in that line, however, that I couldn't handle.

CALL: Your boss tried to put us on the spot this morning, George; but it didn't work. Why can't you guys stick to supervision and let us engineer the jobs. This business of showing people in a bad light can work both ways.

KELLY: I'm sorry if my plan caused animosity; however, if it does the company any good, I guess it was worth it.

CALL: We don't hold anything against
you or your idea. It was the way that it was presented. If you people would respect channels, it would help me straighten out my problems and we would have people doing the things that they're supposed to be doing. Why didn't you tip us off on this plan in advance?

KELLY: I'd like to help you out, Tom; but our group works more closely than yours, and I've made a point of clearing things with Simms. And, what the hell difference does it make anyway? It'll all come out in the wash, and the important thing is to get us out of this sales slump.

CALL: That's right; but let's hope that Simms can stand getting wet behind the ears when his turn comes. Look, I've got to get going; let's keep this conversation under our hats, O.K., George?

KELLY: Sure thing; see you, Tom.

A few minutes later, Simms returned from the meeting room and engaged in a "post-mortem" of the meeting with Kelly. He reported that the production people and the sales people had been enthusiastic about the plan. The engineers, on the other hand, had cited many reasons why the proposed unit could not be successfully produced and had promised to submit a sample incorporating their own ideas at the committee's next meeting. Simms decided to have a model of Kelly's unit constructed; the engineers went to work on theirs. Both groups planned to introduce
working models at the next staff meeting.

To some observers, the behavior described above would appear desirable—it provokes competition, challenge and group spirit. One management consultant proposes to stimulate it; "cross-pressuring" is the term that he uses to describe the technique. Kelly prizes his relationships with Call and his other former colleagues in the engineering department; he is also motivated by a sense of loyalty to his present group and its leader and to the present campaign by which it is seeking to fulfill the purpose of the company and to retaliate for the failure of the engineers to act upon suggestions previously made. The question arises, in the present instance, as to whether Kelly's objective should be the improvement of relationships, or are there other, overriding considerations in this instance? In the answer to this questions lies the basis for the next guidepost to which reference is made: the strengthening of relationships is not the exclusive basis for executive action.

THE MANAGER AND THE CHANGING SCENE

The senior executive with long service with a single company will eventually find the doors of alternate opportunity closing behind him. He has surrendered something of his job flexibility and his personal mobility in
acquiring his senior status. He has also become vulnerable to the organizational shifts that the evolving purposes of his organization demand. Because he contributed to the improved circumstances of the organization, he acquired status; this status, however, makes him even more a target for, and sometimes a victim of, the very tempo of change that he helped create. The success of the organization, to which he contributed, creates new circumstances and directions to which he, in turn, must adjust. Such appeared to be the type of situation in which Jack McArdle, general manager of the Yako River Shipyard, found himself at the age of fifty-seven.

The Yako River Shipyard grew from modest beginnings as a small boiler and machine repair shop which Thomas White set up after emigrating to this country from Scotland. In the old country he had served his apprenticeship in various shops along the River Clyde. When Jack McArdle's ship put into White's shipyard for repairs, the two men became acquainted as the result of a heated altercation over the details of work that was being done on the main engine of the ship, and more particularly, over the costs that White had established on the work. White was so impressed with McArdle's knowledge of machinery and also because they both came from the same part of Scotland, that he offered the man a position at the shipyard.
White's operation was built on the line type of organization. McArdle was strictly the boss in the department that was assigned to him, and his men knew it. All work assignments, together with the technical assistance in setting up and executing the work, emanated directly from him. The men liked McArdle; even though he had the reputation of being a little tight-fisted when a collection was being taken up in the plant, he was known as a square-shooter who stuck up for his men when they were right and made short shrift with the troublemakers, sometimes, in the early days, using his own fists when the occasion demanded it. He was respected for his skill and knowledge of the work.

During World War II, and in the years that followed, there had been a marked change in the ship-repairing industry and in the operations at the Yako River Shipyard. Unionism had come to the yard, but relations had generally been satisfactory and little trouble had been experienced. The top wages that the company paid had attracted a good type of worker and added to the firm's reputation of being a place where superior people were employed and high-quality work turned out. Some specialization had been introduced: advances in the fields of marine engineering, electronics and allied fields necessitated special skills which were obtained by sub-contracting some of the work.
and hiring a few specialized workers for the rest; but the work was always coordinated by McArdle, who was by this time superintendent of the yard, and it was never allowed to interfere with the traditional authority of the foremen in their respective shops.

When Thomas White passed on, the terms of his will specified that the business be sold to the Fulbright and Wheeler Corporation, a national shipbuilding concern, with the provision that Jack McArdle be granted one-fourth ownership in the Yako River subsidiary and be retained as general manager.

The Fulbright and Wheeler management had their new acquisition surveyed by organizational and management experts who recommended that operations of the subsidiary company be integrated with those of the parent organization. This was to be done in order to permit a change in the character of work to be undertaken at the Yako River Yard. In order to even out the slack period between job orders, some of the construction work to be completed at the larger yards was to be assembled at Yako and then transported to other locations where shipbuilding was in progress. To coordinate the recommended integration, staff assistants representing such home office departments as purchasing, personnel, planning and control were assigned to work with McArdle.
As the re-oriented organization enveloped the yard, the general manager became increasingly disturbed. He felt that he was no longer running the plant. The multiplication of staff positions had added to the overhead, delays developed in the procurement and supply of parts and materials; furthermore, costs were figured using a system of coded numbers which made it difficult for McArdle to know if the operation was running at a profit. To make matters worse in McArdle's eyes, the yard was placed under an organization-wide union agreement that provided two weeks' sick leave with pay; and, as the men came to accept this leave as their due, the yard was plagued with absenteeism over which the general manager felt he had no control.

McArdle's displeasure came to a head with his discovery that work priorities that he had established had been upset by pressures brought to bear on the foremen by various staff specialists seeking to expedite work in which they were interested. He completely lost patience with the set-up and sought an appointment with the vice president in charge of plant management. After this official had listened attentively to McArdle's complaints, he asked for the general manager's recommendations. McArdle expressed the opinion that the Yako River plant should be restored to the old method of
operation, as a separate entity, to stand or fall on its own feet. He stated that he knew how to run the plant at a profit and would enjoy being permitted to do so. As things were, he felt that the plant was working for the cost accounting system, instead of the system working the plant. He felt that it would be more effective for him to do his own purchasing rather than to go through the routine of requisition and delay that the purchasing department had set up. He was particularly bitter about the labor arrangements which he felt had been more effectively administered on a local basis. In view of recent developments, it was his opinion that the young men who had been sent to him by the home office as staff specialists were now telling him how to run the shop. He was deeply disturbed by the whole development and was considering the sale of his stock and the passing in of his resignation.

McArdle's is the almost tragic story of the older executive who finds his whole career slipping away from him for reasons over which he seems to have little control. The efforts and sacrifices of a lifetime of service to the firm are in danger of being overturned, and the only action that comes to his mind is a rather pointless delaying one, directed at attempting to halt or turn back the relentless march of events. His traditional
frames of reference are not adequate for the inspection and interpretation of an issue of such immensity. The insights and perception that would make it possible for him to interpret properly the social processes involved and his own part in these processes are lacking. Information on a situation's relationship factors is data without which a manager is prevented from making adequate decisions. McArdle had all of the "facts" except the most important ones. Which leads to the further point that access to relationship data is particularly helpful when the manager is required to change his functional role.

**SUMMARY**

The manager may be considered as being at the center of a web of relationships woven from the myriads of interpersonal experiences that constitute the milieu of his activity. In this chapter we considered the upward and horizontal strands of rapport by which he attaches himself to the people with whom he works. In the consideration of the cases which we have cited, these appear to be some of the principal influences at work:

1. The manager is typically more sensitive to his upward rather than to his peer and subordinate relationships. This intense pre-occupation, extending up and down the management ladder, results in unfulfilled
subordinate expectations. Tom Young's concentration on problems at his own level had contributed to and sustained unresolved relationship failures at lower levels of the Duofax Company. The personnel manager's problem was to redirect Young's attention to the consequences of his limited social vision.

(2) **Relationships with superiors tend to be clouded** by unrealistic expectations. These expectations are eventually refined in the normal maturation processes; but, particularly for the younger manager, they generate unfortunate disturbances and slow down the growth and development of the executive. Harold Gordon's impatience with his superiors at the Bright Manufacturing Company is a case in point. Gordon's action grew from his unrealistic expectations and from higher management's inability to fulfill or to refine them.

(3) **The candor level, in part determined by the subordinate, in large measure shapes his upward relationship.** The subordinate's disposition of early issues between his boss and himself contributes to the pattern of mutual expectations and determines the role that he is to play and the service that he is to provide to his superior. Out of Henry Gaffney's mental struggles to determine what action should follow his discovery of information critical of his general manager will grow a relationship based upon
candor or the reverse.

(4) Peer relationship failures, while less threatening to the individual manager, can be more damaging to the purpose of the organization. Such failures are not subject, as a last recourse, to disposition by use of the status differential. The conflict between Cameron and Woods in the Strang Company, and between Jack and Harvey in the slaughterhouse situation, continued with no sign of resolution to sap the strength and vitality of their organizations. Since such disturbances continue frequently just below the crisis level, and because the power balance eliminates a remedial break-through, the solutions to such difficulties, it would appear, must be found in the improved insights of the parties themselves.

(5) The strengthening of relationships is not the exclusive basis for executive action. It would seem that problems arise in the administrative scene when the managers concerned should accord priority to other motives. Kelly, the foreman in the Standard Electronics case, was conscious of and motivated by the relationships factors involved in his production group's conflict with the engineering department. However, this motivation had to be set aside in the interest of larger purposes. To attempt to base all decisions on relationship factors is to fail to consider management problems in the larger
and more realistic context.

(6) However, information on the relationship factors involved is necessary to adequate administrative decision. Without it, decisions are reached on incomplete data. McArdle, general manager at the Yako River Shipyards, had considered all of the elements of his problem except the most important one - his own relationship to a shifting social balance; his interpretation and consequent actions were, therefore, based upon incomplete information. Whether the relationships elements in the total problem become the basis of action or not, they do constitute a part of the data upon which a thorough evaluation should be based. As such, the manager should be equipped to avail himself of such information.

(7) Access to such relationship data is particularly helpful when the manager is required to change his functional role. Social insight under such circumstances opens up meaningful sources of information, and methods of interpreting events, upon which he may wish to base his decisions. The nature of organizational process is such that revised functional assignments will be frequently imposed upon him for reasons, situationally derived, to which adjustment is almost inevitable.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to review the human relations problems of a cross section of industrial managers, to make note of any uniformities which were found to reside in these problems and to attempt to make a classification of these problems and uniformities.

THE PROBLEMS OF THE NEW MANAGER

It early became apparent that the administrative skill of the new manager was sorely tested by virtue of circumstances that his promotion itself created and also because these circumstances confronted him at a time when his poise, skill and information were apt to be at a low point. The problem was compounded by factors both situationally derived and by those growing out of the new manager's own perceptions.

(1) Situationally derived pressures. Some of the relationship pressures which the new manager must administer grow out of the change of regime and appear to be almost apart from any attitude or behavior that the manager himself brings to the setting. These include the latent hostility and reservation with which the members of the
group may perceive the change, the tendency to idealize the "good old days" and to rally around the "old lieutenants" who may have been considered by the group to have been the legitimate heirs and "next in line" for the position which has been given to the new manager. A different type of pressure growing out of the new manager's situation is the one exerted by top management's expectations, either real or imagined. The manager, feeling himself to be under obligation to management as the result of his promotion, sets out to show early, tangible results, sometimes with disastrous consequences.

(2) Pressures derived from the new manager's behavior. As the new manager responds to the conditions that he encounters and to the other psychological needs that he brings into his new position with him, his intuitive non-logical behavior may generate additional pressures that confound the relationship problems which he must administer. In the cases that were reviewed, the following types of new manager behavior and its unfortunate consequence were observed: the introduction of strategic replacements, sometimes under the guise of technological experts, but actually as a source of psychological support; the overturn of the indulgency pattern, the delicately-structured modicum of self-direction which the predecessor had permitted and the members of the group
enjoyed; and the establishment of close supervision in an attempt to secure the control necessary to fulfill top management's expectations and to assure subordinate obedience.

While these intuitive responses might tide the new manager over, the question of alternate administrative responses based upon more adequate perception was raised.

THE MANAGER'S ADMINISTRATION OF SUBORDINATE RELATIONSHIPS PROBLEMS

After the new manager has established himself, the work group's attention returns to the disturbances growing out of the continuing process of its own development and maintenance. Out of this absorption grow a different set of pressures to which the manager may respond in one of a number of ways.

(1) Situationally derived pressures. The cases cited illustrate the degree to which production may be sidetracked by the group's attempts to maintain its integrity and standards. In responding directly to this pressure, the manager may find himself acting counter to a popular management myth holding that the expression of feelings by employees is out of place in the work situation. If he responds in terms of this myth, his administrative behavior is restricted.
(2) **Pressures derived from the manager's behavior.**

In spite of the fact that production is blocked by a force particularly emotional in its content, the management myth precludes appropriate response. The alternate behavior, acceptable if not highly effective, is the attempt to reason subordinates out of relationship difficulties. Success in meeting emotion with logic is, it would appear, restricted.

It was indicated that these responses to subordinate relationship problems, either refusing to acknowledge them as legitimate management concerns or attempting to meet them with reason alone, did not serve the purpose of restoring group equilibrium or re-establishing productivity. The question of an alternative administrative response that would permit the manager to meet such pressures at the psychological and sociological level was raised.

**THE MANAGER'S RELATIONSHIPS WITH SUPERIORS**

The manager's own experience as a member of the management group would seem to provide a laboratory in which he might test and refine his approaches for subsequent use in relating to his subordinate group. It would appear that the experience is rarely put to such use. It seems to be common practice to deny the unity of sociological experience at all levels of business.
society. The assumption seems to be that somehow different conditions prevail at the level just below one's own.

(1) **Situationally derived pressures.** The status-protecting functions of the human mind accord legitimacy to interpersonal feelings and their administration at the manager's own level, but deny this legitimacy at the subordinate level. Since the manager's boss is also a subordinate, and subject to the same "upward look," there results a sequence of unrequited expectations.

(2) **Pressures derived from the manager's behavior.** The situation described above, plus the search for a "parent-figure" which was found in evidence to some degree, contributes towards the imposition of unrealistic expectations upon the superior. He must fit the impossible particulars to which Roethlisberger referred, "Are you not the leader? Don't you know the answers? Should you not set the perfect example? Don't you know what is right on all occasions? Say, what the hell is going on here? Get wise to yourself, buddy!!" (17, p. 154)

Such expectations can result in the hopeless search for a situation in which the expectations will be met or uneasy toleration of barely acceptable circumstances. An alternative response would depend upon the acquisition of insight into the nature and source of such unrealistic expectations and the substitution of more mature perception.
This study has not told the management trainer what to do or how to go about doing it. It has, however, set up a classification of one set of circumstances which the trainer might wish to take into account in going about his task. It would appear that ways must be found to accord the manager skill in interpreting and diagnosing the relationship situations that he encounters. He must have practice in looking at concrete situations effectively with provision made for his own involvement and the management myths that cloud his vision. He needs skill and practice in relating effectively to disturbed subordinates and in accepting and administering with precision the difficulties which they present. He must acquire the type of insight that will permit him to develop reasonable relationships with superiors.

This study has thrown some light upon managerial shortcomings and inadequacies in dealing with human relations problems. By implication, it has indicated some of the skills which the competent human relations practitioner should have. The discussion has been brought only to the threshold beyond which specific methodology is required in developing in managers the social skills required to administer their own relationships needs and those of their
subordinates. The difficult work lies ahead. The question that has been considered was what the manager should be and what he should not be. Largely unresolved in the field of human relations, it would seem, is how the manager should become these things, and what happens to managers who try to behave in the manner which has been indicated.


