

The International Behavioural and Social Sciences Library

MID-CAREER DEVELOPMENT



Classics from the Tavistock Press

The International Behavioural and Social Sciences Library

MID-CAREER DEVELOPMENT



TAVISTOCK

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

In 13 Volumes

- I Efficiency and Effort
 W Baldamus
- II Interdependence and Uncertainty
 Edited by Charles Crichton
- III Form and Content in Industrial Democracy
 F E Emery and Einar Thorsrud
- IV The Dynamics of a Changing Technology
 Peter J Fensham and Douglas Hooper
- V Communications in the Building Industry
 Gurth Higgin and Neil Jessop
- VI The Game of Budget Control
 G H Hofstede
- VII The Changing Culture of a Factory
 Elliott Jaques
- VIII Measurement of Responsibility
 Elliott Jaques
- IX Mid-Career Development
 Robert N Rapoport
- X The Enterprise and its Environment
 A K Rice
- XI Managers
 Kenn Rogers
- XII New Ways in Management Training
 Cyril Sofer and Geoffrey Hutton
- XIII The Enterprise in Transition
 H van der Haas

MID-CAREER DEVELOPMENT

Research Perspectives on a Developmental Community for Senior Administrators

ROBERT N RAPOPORT
WITH CONTRIBUTIONS BY
M B BRODIE AND E A LIFE



First published in 1970 by
Tavistock Publications Limited

Reprinted in 2001 by
Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN

Transferred to Digital Printing 2007

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group

© 1970 The Administrative Staff College, Henley-On-Thames

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilized in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

The publishers have made every effort to contact authors/copyright holders of the works reprinted in the *International Behavioural and Social Sciences Library*. This has not been possible in every case, however, and we would welcome correspondence from those individuals/companies we have been unable to trace.

These reprints are taken from original copies of each book. In many cases the condition of these originals is not perfect. The publisher has gone to great lengths to ensure the quality of these reprints, but wishes to point out that certain characteristics of the original copies will, of necessity, be apparent in reprints thereof.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A CIP catalogue record for this book
is available from the British Library

Mid-Career Development
ISBN 0-415-26444-8
Industrial Relations: 13 Volumes
ISBN 0-415-26510-X
The International Behavioural and Social Sciences Library
112 Volumes
ISBN 0-415-25670-4

Mid-Career Development

RESEARCH PERSPECTIVES ON A DEVELOPMENTAL
COMMUNITY FOR SENIOR ADMINISTRATORS

ROBERT N. RAPOPORT

with contributions by

M. B. BRODIE *and* E. A. LIFE



TAVISTOCK PUBLICATIONS

London • New York • Sydney • Toronto • Wellington

First published in Great Britain in 1970
By Tavistock Publications Limited
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN
ISBN 422 73500 0
© *The Administrative Staff College, Henley-on-Thames, 1970*

Distributed in the USA by Barnes & Noble Inc.

Contents

Foreword by Lord Fulton	<i>page</i>	vii
Acknowledgements		ix
Introduction		xi

PART ONE · THE CONTEXT OF MANAGEMENT TRAINING

1 General Management: a Perspective	3
M. B. BRODIE	
2 Training for Management: a Historical View	16
E. A. LIFE	
3 The Administrative Staff College: its Curriculum and Orientation	38
E. A. LIFE	

PART TWO · EXPERIENCES OF HENLEY

4 The Concept of a Developmental Community: The Research Challenge	55
5 Client Orientations to the College: Nominators and Prospective Members	69
6 The Henley Experience: Retrospective Accounts by Members, 1960-1966	90
7 The Post Henley Career, 1960-1967	110

PART THREE · MANAGERS AND THEIR CAREERS

8 Types of Managerial Development Pattern	133
9 The Metamorphic Development Pattern	152
10 The Incremental Development Pattern	173
11 The Tangential Development Pattern	188

vi CONTENTS

PART FOUR · FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS

12 Henley and the Future: Adapting a Developmental Community	205
13 Reflections on the Research: the Manager, the Enterprise, and Society	230

APPENDICES

I List of Variables from the Questionnaire 'Career Patterns and Henley'	248
II A Note on the McQuitty Hierarchical Linkage Analysis	263
III List of Variables in Thirteen Key Clusters, and Weights assigned them	265
References	271
Name Index	280
Subject Index	283

Foreword

Lord Fulton

The influence of education in the United Kingdom, taken as a whole, is to encourage academic virtues. This makes problems for a country whose need for managerial skill is increasing with the growing complexity of its social, economic, and industrial organization. Therefore it becomes urgently necessary to identify this kind of talent and by the right training and career development to make the most of it wherever it is to be found.

The authors of this study are modest—perhaps unduly modest—in their claims. But if we are to accept their own assessment of their work as pioneering new territory for others to cultivate more intensively in the future, we must surely whole-heartedly applaud the originality of the method chosen by which the staff of the Administrative Staff College at Henley and the Tavistock research workers enmeshed themselves in a cooperative task which gave its special character to the whole enterprise.

The result shows that not only have they contributed significantly to the re-assessment by the College at Henley of its role and scope for the future, but they have also thrown light on much that has hitherto been unknown about the principles of career development. It is to be hoped that their work will be widely read.

This page intentionally left blank

Acknowledgements

Many people have been involved in this research in different capacities, and the author wishes to record his thanks both to those named individually and to those whose identities may not be divulged. Eric Trist was instrumental in launching the study, and his support was greatly appreciated at various stages throughout its course. During the pilot stages, interviews were conducted by Andrew Life, Stephanie White, and Michael Foster, as well as the principal author. Karen Seashore and Rosemary Fison helped with parts of the data analysis. Barrie Irving and Linden Hilgen-dorf gave advice and help with the quantitative analysis. Harold Bridger helped with Chapter 12 specifically, and contributed many ideas generally. Elliott Mittler helped with some of the programming work and computer analysis, as did the staff of Survey Analysis Ltd.

At the Administrative Staff College the help of the Principal, Mr Martin-Bates, and the staff, particularly Morris Brodie, Andrew Life, Ben Aston, and Katherine Elliott, has been indispensable. The 600 or so members who participated in the research must remain anonymous, but they and their firms are gratefully acknowledged as collaborators in this work.

The task of typing the manuscript was very capably shared by the secretarial staff of the Tavistock Institute and of the Administrative Staff College, particularly Elizabeth Burrett, Angeline Agran, Pamela Rant, Susan Vlasto, Linda Francis, and Bunty Hayes.

The collaboration and assistance of the above-named people have been invaluable, and I am more than grateful. None of them should, of course, be held accountable for deficiencies in the end-product, responsibility for which remains with the principal author.

October 1969

R.N.R.

This page intentionally left blank

Introduction

This is the report of an exploratory study set within a deliberately broad frame of reference. Too often studies of careers and managerial development, of organizations and the use made of those who work for them, of training institutions and the role they should fill, have been undertaken with little reference to one another. In this study each has a significant place, and, to the extent that an evaluation has been attempted, it has been the sort which has brought these elements into perspective with one another, in an attempt to provide a new look at familiar problems.

Different readers will find different parts of the book of interest. Only the more social-science-orientated managers and the more 'applied' social scientists are likely to find enough in all parts of the book to hold their attention. Less research-minded managers and the less 'applied' social scientists may perhaps find certain parts tedious, if not irritating.

The core of the study is contained in Part Two. Part One – on the background of management and of training institutions and particularly Henley – is included to give the reader sufficient background to the issues being investigated, the context within which they arise and the specific institution in which the training experiences reported were taking place. It can be skimmed by those already informed on these matters and by the more academically-minded social scientists, for this part of the book is concerned with interests more specific to the men of action in the world of management and administration. Similarly, the more technical elements of conceptualization and cluster analysis in Part Two may be skimmed without too much loss by managers wanting to get to the crux of the managerial typology presented in Chapter 8. It is hoped that both administrators and social scientists will find Part Three of interest, though perhaps in different ways.

The chapters of Part Four represent an attempt to report how the study has already had an impact on the institution studied and how it might have further influence in the future.

The study itself is thus set clearly in a larger stream of events and processes, as part of a specific developmental evolution within the institution where the work took place.

A given form of career training is good or bad only in relation to the kinds of men who experience it, the use which enterprises make of those who are trained, the options open to the men and how they actually use them. This study has come out with findings which, though not entirely new, have emerged from a distinctive research approach. One hopes that the findings will enable each individual manager and each enterprise to make comparisons of sufficient interest to have justified the effort – for it took a very great deal of effort, as such explorations tend to, to arrive at the plateau represented by this book. There is a tremendous amount still to be done and said on the main topics of the study. Indeed, one of the principal aims of the study so far has been to suggest future directions that will be more purposeful and deliberate than the exploratory probes that serve as the foundations for the present report.

The very limitations of the study in time, resources, and approach may stir some to build further upon it. The perspectives of the administrators questioned ought surely to be supplemented by the perspectives of others – of their chiefs, colleagues, and subordinates and of their wives. The effects of one kind of training experience for men in middle life should surely be compared, under controlled conditions of research design, with the effects of alternatives. The exploratory interview guides and questionnaires ought to give way to more rigorous instruments, to verify and extend the patterns suggested by this first scanning of the problems of the study.

Like many of its genre, this study raises more questions than it lays to rest. For example, having established some basic types of career-development pattern, what can be learned about their 'natural histories', their interactions and transformations, as administrators encounter different career experiences? In what ways are career patterns of a given type adaptive within one setting, or in one stage in an organization's development, but not in another? Within the training institution studied changes have been taking place and more will occur, some of them attributable to the work done on this project; in which directions and on what priorities should further research be undertaken to meet its evolving needs?

INTRODUCTION xiii

This is not a last-word study, but an attempt to open up new ground by cutting across the boundaries that conventionally separate action from research. It is hoped that all readers will, in different ways, be able to make capital of it.

R. N. RAPOPORT

This page intentionally left blank

PART ONE

The Context of Management Training

This page intentionally left blank

Chapter 1 . General Management

A PERSPECTIVE

M. B. Brodie

Generalship is a concept that is used a great deal in practice even though it lacks its theory.

It is most familiar in the context of supreme military command, a notion which emerged in times gone by as a result of the delegation of military responsibility by the monarch. It occurs in the vocabulary of religious organization. A 'general superior' is the supreme head of a religious order in the Catholic Church, who governs in accordance with the constitution of the order and the laws of the Church and has authority over all members of the order.

The same essential idea is to be found in the notion of general management. Enterprises frequently have 'General Managers'. The attributes of generalship and the qualities of the generalist reflect the top-level nature of this role and the power and responsibility which correspond to it, for providing leadership, for looking to the broader-ranging and external issues as well as to those within the enterprise, and in particular for developing policies which integrate the activities of the enterprise and reconcile conflicting interests.

How general management is understood in practice can perhaps be illustrated by examples from the private sector of five firms invited by the British Institute of Management to present and explain their 'General Management Practice'. (The first of these presentations was in January 1966, and short papers were prepared for each.)

The Metal Box Company put the emphasis on company organization and structure, forecasting, and budgeting. F. Perkins Ltd built their presentation around the themes of planning, control, and communication. Joseph Lucas Ltd concentrated on structure and overall management, and their production and personnel policies. Sterling Winthrop Group Ltd, a subsidiary of a United

4 THE CONTEXT OF MANAGEMENT TRAINING

States firm, put the whole emphasis on policies for growth, on the problems of developing their business in Europe, and on personnel policies. Renold Ltd reviewed their finance, manufacturing, selling, and personnel policies, their group structure, the overseas subsidiaries, and how they saw their future.

Although there is this diversity of approach, in each instance general management is identified with the wider issues of organization and policy, with the way each main area of the business is related to the enterprise as a whole and with prospects and plans.

In the Civil Service, though pre-eminence has attached to those in positions of generalist responsibility, the concept of the generalist is now under attack, and debate has been enlivened by the appearance of the Fulton Committee Report (Fulton, 1968). The first of the half dozen main inadequacies the Committee detected in the Civil Service was 'the philosophy of the amateur (or "generalist" or "all-rounder")' (Fulton, 1968, paragraph 15), which they saw as running counter to the need for Civil Servants to be skilled managers. The Committee wrestled with the usually contrasted notions of the specialist and the administrator, to establish the proper relationship between specialists and administrators and to clarify how the career of an individual may shift him from one role to the other. An administrator in his early years had to specialize in a particular area, but 'modern administration requires men to have breadth as well as depth' (Fulton, 1968, paragraph 42), and specialisms had not to be too narrowly conceived. What was now required from all administrators was a 'fuller professionalism'. In what respects the fuller professionals differ from the generalists is not very clear from the Report, a point that illustrates the difficulty faced by the Committee in unravelling complex issues with the aid of a vocabulary lacking in precision.

As to the concept of the generalist itself, views are divided. Following the appointment of the Fulton Committee, the Institution of Professional Civil Servants commissioned an independent comparative study of the role and career expectations of the professional *vis-à-vis* the administrator. Various authors, all university teachers, were asked to look at France, Germany, Sweden, Australia, and the US, as well as Britain. Reviewing the main findings, the editor singled out one major lesson: '... nowhere does one find anything like a theory justifying the separation, either of persons or of functions, into generalists and specialists, admin-

istrators and advisers' (Ridley, 1968, pp. 10-11). In the comparison, Britain was the odd man out. None of the other countries had anything like the British administrative class or a recruitment policy for the higher Civil Servant on a non-vocational basis.

One critic (Hobsbawm, 1968), taking part in a series of broadcast talks following the publication of the Fulton Report, contended that it was quite wrong to equate the notion of 'the amateur' with the generalist all-round administrator. He argued that the report confused two quite separate things: specialist expertise, on the one hand, and 'a sufficient familiarity . . . with a subject to make reasonable judgements about it', on the other. Confusion on this obscures 'a crucial point that what is required today is more and better "generalists" and "all-rounders" in administration, and not more specialists' and the tendency has been in this direction in all forms of decision-making and policy-making. Another (Lord Helsby, 1968), accepting the need for a 'basic professionalism in the business of government combined with imagination and sound judgement', was not entirely convinced by the stress which the Fulton Committee placed on the specialist techniques. He was also impressed by the trouble to which large business concerns went to produce men with general administrative ability.

What are the more general areas of responsibility in running an enterprise? A leading American scholar (Cole, 1965) suggested half a dozen spheres of action which, to a greater or lesser degree, must be the concern of those responsible for the exercise of power. These are: determination of objectives and their modification as conditions require; development and maintenance of an organization; securing adequate financial resources; acquiring efficient technological equipment and keeping it up to date; establishing a market and devising new products; maintaining good relations with public authorities and with society at large.

At the Administrative Staff College, it is held to be important that those who are to occupy posts at general management level should learn

- '(a) to see their role in their enterprise in relation to its main objectives and in its total environment,
- (b) to understand the implications for their enterprise of government policies and of the changing domestic and international situation,
- (c) to evaluate their own experience and attitudes against

6 THE CONTEXT OF MANAGEMENT TRAINING

- those of people of similar standing and ability working in other enterprises and in other countries,
- (d) to assess new knowledge, thought, techniques and methods and their application in management,
 - (e) to develop the skills of obtaining decisions from a group of people of diverse expertise, experience and temperament,
 - (f) to assess wisely and quickly what is important in unfamiliar areas and situations,
 - (g) to appreciate the particular responsibilities and problems of top management.'

General management is thus crucially a total-enterprise activity, a matter of making overall policy and putting it into practice, based on the view taken by those in top management of the place of the enterprise in the environment and the particular direction it should take. However, the very fact that this is a generalized activity can obscure the part of the individual more senior manager in all this.

How a manager and his enterprise interact and how they both relate to society at large are important questions. Traditional literature in this field too often treated considerations of personality in isolation, and exposés of personality requirements for management were notoriously superficial. No doubt, in part, this was due to the influence of ideas about highly individualistic, often idiosyncratic, behaviour which was supposed to characterize men of leadership and action, and, indeed, some have behaved very idiosyncratically indeed. But one unfortunate effect was to couch explanations of enterprise, success, and failure primarily in personality terms.

However, in most situations, this is now seen to be by no means the whole, or even the greater part, of the explanation, which has to be sought in a more careful analysis of the relationships between personality, behaviour, and the social context. Correctives have been gaining ground. 'Field theory' in psychology and recent developments in systems theory have helped to shift the emphasis to the study of relationships and interactions between individuals and the groups to which they belong, and between groups within enterprises and those outside it. Analysis of both individual behaviour and enterprise performance has, as a consequence, been put onto a sounder basis.

A crucial conceptual element in this has been the notion of

'role'. It links what is socially required or expected of people holding given posts with the motivations and modes of behaviour of the individuals who occupy them, and has served to clarify the nature of the problems facing those in positions of responsibility. In a complex society, an individual will hold many different roles. He has to reconcile his more personal wishes, ideas, and ways of behaving with what is expected of him in his various roles, and as a manager he must do this without sacrificing a readiness to behave in ways different from those so far socially approved or sanctioned, where he deems this appropriate. Complexity is in the very nature of policy-level situations. Tensions and conflicts characterize them, and it is the responsibility of those who fill these roles to achieve a workable and satisfactory resolution of them.

Those who occupy the higher-level positions have the particular responsibility of dealing with matters which cut across functions, departments, and sectional concerns. Much of their work is thus at the boundaries of the various 'sub-systems'. A. T. M. Wilson, referring to what he calls 'the integrative need of the executive', draws attention to the problems confronting the professional executive in his endeavours to make sense of complex situations and confusing data, and his need for a framework so that he can have an overall view of his world: 'It may on occasion force him to add up or to multiply things which cannot be added or multiplied; and it is certain to contain imperfections, inconsistencies and evasions' (Wilson, 1967). He further points to the problem which arises because this integrative task conflicts with the pluralist assumptions, concepts, and hypotheses of the wide range of people – internal specialists and outsiders – with whom he must work.

The notion of role comes in very importantly in a unique study by a professional philosopher of the moral problems which arise within large organizations. Dorothy Emmet severely criticizes the separation between sociology and ethics, and argues that moralists would do well to look at sociological studies, using the notion of role to provide the link between factual descriptions of social situations and moral pronouncements on what ought to be done in them. In a thought-provoking development of her argument, she talks about the ethics of role, the problems of a lack of clear coincidence between responsibility and actual power, and 'the morality of institutional action where the relations between

8 THE CONTEXT OF MANAGEMENT TRAINING

personal kinds of responsibility and the impersonal kinds come to a head' (Emmet, 1966, p. 201).

It is in the creation of a new role or in changing the image of an existing one that she sees the attributes of exceptional individuals. This reflection evokes Lloyd Warner's description of managers as 'cultural mediators of the present as it moves from the past into the future, people who have to handle a structured past and yet make decisions which take them into an unstructured future, a requirement which is inevitably accompanied with conflict, tension, and ambiguity'. He asks what characteristics of personality are then necessary. Most important would be autonomy, the ability to make a decision on one's own, and to act freely, creatively, and independently. Such people must also have the ability to quickly structure what they see; they should be 'capable of putting together the changing parts of their society and the flow of events within their economic life to form them into a world of meaning and significance for action' (Warner, 1960, p. 120). As a corollary, managers must have a proper understanding of the culture within which they work and a sensitivity to the problems of cultural change. Cochran (1965) illustrates this very vividly. He puts forward a number of propositions relevant to economic growth to compare USA and Latin-American culture. He suggests, for example, that Latin-American values give more priority to family interests than to economy and profit maximization. Social and personal emotional interests are more important than business obligations. Nepotism may be favoured at the expense of continuity of able top management, and so on. He makes it clear that though these qualities may be hindrances to material progress they are not necessarily inimical to what Latin Americans would call the good life. There is a growing recognition of the importance of these basic cultural considerations and it is because they are so important that, in Cochran's judgement, a new period may be starting in which, after a generation of increased specialization, the need will be for generalists.

The growing significance of managers in society is a development which goes beyond ideological boundaries. Consider the example of Poland. Bauman, drawing on investigations carried out by the Sociological Research Bureau of the Higher School of Social Sciences in Warsaw, found that there had been

'a remarkable shift from predominantly ideological to mainly technical and managerial preoccupations; the party meetings come gradu-

ally to resemble consultative assemblies; the content of individual and collective tasks confided to people in their capacity as party members is, in much greater proportion than before, connected directly with the purely industrial life of the factory . . . Political merit and ideological virtues are no longer a sufficient qualification for the performance of party functions: one must possess vocational education and professional skill to deal with technical and administrative problems at a table with specialists of the highest rank' (Bauman, 1964, p. 214).

A study of the USSR illustrates this further. Managers have acquired a significant and recognized place in Soviet society. Their influence during the last decade or so of Stalin's rule grew. In this period, top managers gained a greater say in policy-making and enlarged the degree of autonomy of their enterprises. Indeed, one writer saw Kosygin's appointment as premier in 1964 as indicating ' . . . a willingness to accord the leaders of the industrial establishment high symbolic status and a pledge of continued receptivity to managerial demands' (Azrael, 1966, p. 149).

This having been said, the question arises of the involvement of managers in politics and of how far they may constitute an independent force for political change. Azrael sees little likelihood in the USSR of the managerial elite producing political dissidents. One of the main reasons for this is the managerial recruitment and training process. By origins, selection, and education, Soviet managers, it seems, are unlikely to question the dominance of those whose primary aim is political, and he considers the argument sufficiently strong to justify a quotation from Thorstein Veblen as a preamble to his conclusion:

'By settled habit the technicians, engineers and industrial experts are a harmless and docile sort, well fed on the whole and somewhat placidly content with the "full dinner pail", which the . . . Vested Interests habitually allow them' (Azrael, 1966, p. 173).

This may leave unanswered the interesting question as to what might happen if the managerial elite actively sought to exert political power. Some interpretations of events in Eastern Europe suggest that this might be happening.

Fears of technocracy have often been voiced. Is there a danger that technical experts and managers, through their influence on organization, will form a new ruling class? Such a threat, as applied to France, is discounted by Crozier (1964), one of the

most perceptive writers in this field, for an interesting reason. He contends that this fear derives from a misunderstanding of the nature of technical and scientific progress. The success of the experts and the managers is constantly self-defeating. As they rationalize processes, others are then able to take them over, and the power which comes from their expertise disappears. 'When progress accelerates, the power of the expert is diminished and managerial power becomes more and more a political and judicial power rather than a technical one' (Crozier, 1964, p. 300), which takes us back to social and political analysis.

For a fuller explanation of such findings we need to know more about the nature of the work senior managers do and the way others expect them to carry it out, though these are matters on which we must conjecture, since most studies by social scientists have taken very limited facets of managerial action and attitudes as their focus, not the complex areas of high-level policy-making.

The problem is further complicated because one facet of the work of those taking the critical decisions in enterprises has usually been related to the more elusive and individualistic qualities which in the nineteenth century were attributed to the entrepreneur. Has the era of the entrepreneur passed, or are the general managers of today what the entrepreneurs were in the nineteenth century?

One view would have it that entrepreneurship is a very different thing from management, almost antithetical to it. The entrepreneur as the bold thrusting individual with a zest for innovation, dominating the enterprise he owns, is contrasted with the career-manager, a bureaucrat concerned with stability rather than change, with little or no financial stake in the business. This view remains powerful and persistent. It helps to explain why in Britain there is an Institute of Directors with a philosophy that differentiates direction from management or why in Germany companies have a board of directors responsible for policy and a separate managerial board for operating the business (Shonfield, 1965).

The role of the individualist entrepreneur, mostly seen in retrospect, may have become exaggerated, and, with contemporary discussion of management more often journalistic than scholarly, judgement is difficult. Comparing American and British technology in the nineteenth century, Habakkuk (1962) inclined to the conclusion that men were bold and expansionist primarily because circumstances were conducive. It was favourable market

conditions which brought out the capacity of businessmen, not the other way round. It was because there was a high rate of growth in the American economy that entrepreneurial talent seemed abundant. Where similarly favourable conditions obtained in Britain, there too were the men to exploit them. When an economy is expanding slowly, entrepreneurs are scarce. Habakkuk does not underestimate the social inhibitions in Britain that discouraged able men from going into business. In a society in which the ownership of land, the army, and the growing professions were all more highly esteemed than business, and where making profits was, in the eyes of many, a sordid affair, young men of ability were bound to find little attraction in business. Organizational ability as a factor in enterprise success got scant recognition or attention.

The inadequacies of too over-simplified a view of such issues are increasingly recognized. Economic theory, in particular in its preoccupation with risk-taking and profit maximization, had neglected questions of enterprise policy-making and organization and the complex relationships between them and the more definable financial and economic dimensions of an enterprise. Marris (1966) goes a long way to correct this. He puts the emphasis on the distinctive contribution of managers as organizers, and is ready to describe the capacity for large-scale organization developed by managers working together as virtually a new factor of production. As a result of this evolution, he argues, it is now more realistic to see the investor as buying a share in the organization of an enterprise than in its physical assets. Managerial teamwork has taken over from entrepreneurial individualism.

No less challenging to a common view of managers as lacking in entrepreneurial attitudes and skills is the judgement of the economic historian Postan that, in the twenty years following the end of the war in 1945, the managerial class in all Western countries 'brought to the conduct of enterprises a greater degree of rationality and professional expertise and a greater proneness to innovate than those characteristic of owner-managed enterprises also taken as a whole' (Postan, 1967).

Postan is talking here in a general way about the managerial class. In terms of social structure, are they a separate class or even, as some would have, a new ruling class? Again, only a tentative answer is possible, since as yet there are few studies which contribute towards the much-needed political science of management.

12 THE CONTEXT OF MANAGEMENT TRAINING

However, for analysis of present-day society it may be more useful to think in terms of elites, or high-status groups. Modern industrial society is sometimes depicted as one which has moved away from a class system in the Marxist sense to an elitist pattern, where personal ability and talent displace more hereditary and arbitrary ways of attaining power and prominence.

However, the concept of the class system provided an explanation of economic and political power, whereas the elite view leaves much more uncertain the question of whether political power goes with elite status. Bottomore puts the managers of industry along with intellectuals and high government officials as the three elites often singled out as having taken over the functions of earlier ruling classes. He is prepared to acknowledge that managers are an important functional group, but in his view neither they nor the other two groups '... can be seriously regarded as contenders for the place of the governing elite' (Bottomore, 1964, p. 83). Managers have not been moved by a strong sense of solidarity with one another to combine as a cohesive, independent, and powerfully organized group in society. Within society the importance of an elite with the skills of enterprise organization and leadership may be accepted, but there is no reason to attribute any special political power to its members and, as yet, the managers themselves have provided no real basis or pressure for this.

One might come to a different assessment if those who go into management were drawn from the whole of society, if promotion to the top were entirely dependent on ability, and if those who moved to the top formed a distinct and independent social group, but that is not how things seem to be. In those societies which have been studied, capitalist or socialist, it appears that managers usually come from families of men who themselves are managers, professionals, and so on. Middle-class origins predominate. That would seem to have been so in the past as well as today. A recent investigation of a sample of managers in North-West England only confirms this (Clark, 1966). Where achievement is rewarded with promotion, this may only go so far. One writer would contend that, 'The managerial ladder helps men to step up, but it rarely extends from the bottom to the Board Room' (Guttsman, 1963, p. 355). Evidently, as managers make headway in their careers, they are more likely to fit in with the prevailing social system and merge with the establishment than keep distinct from it.

Even in those countries of Western Europe where syndicalism

has had more of an impact than in Britain, and where executives have sought to combine and exert themselves as a public force (Brodie, 1965), the policies followed have tended to keep them detached from the main trade union movement and their position nationally seems not very influential.

One of the greatest concerns today is the fear of social control by the large powerful economic institutions of society. The more extreme critics would have it that 'Contemporary industrial society tends to be totalitarian' (Marcuse, 1964). C. Wright Mills (1956), in his well-known book, carried the argument further than most in contending that in the USA the means of power are now concentrated in the hands of three elite groups: the military, the politicians, and the heads of corporations. This thesis, in the way it is stated, may be more demanding than the evidence and analysis can yet sustain, but there are issues here of government-industry relationships and the public responsibilities of top managers in the Private Sector which are a long way from being resolved.

Some would contend that businessmen working in the Private Sector should be single-minded in their aims and not be diverted from seeking maximum profits by wider considerations of public responsibility. This argument rests on a theory and logic of society which are too artificial to be sound, even if the advice were not unwise on other grounds. Whether one approves of the situation or not, the facts are otherwise. Business and government interaction and interdependence have gone a long way. The relationship, in the USA, is impressively close; in the eighteen years of government from 1949 to 1967 businessmen accepted almost 180 appointments at the level of assistant secretary or higher. To take the Defense Department and the military services, the Treasury, the Commerce Department, and the Post Office, under Truman one-third of the total number of appointments went to businessmen, under Eisenhower two-thirds, under Kennedy and Johnson about one-quarter. They 'have held important policy-making posts in the four postwar administrations, regardless of the party in power' (Schechter, 1968). To suggest that businessmen at work should act as if they were not also citizens is also to ignore the fundamental point that it is society which provides the context for the exercise of their freedom and initiative.

No enterprise is an island or a law unto itself. Policies must be related to what is going on in the world at large. It is for such

14 THE CONTEXT OF MANAGEMENT TRAINING

reasons, some would argue, that for those holding high responsibilities, and who have reached out in their careers beyond the limits of a particular specialism, an understanding of the social, cultural, political, economic, and technological environment takes priority. Hence the comments of Crozier, Cochran, Hobsbawm, and others that the importance of the generalist is growing, not diminishing.

Managers are said to be important in society; some would say of crucial importance. They are often regarded as the prime force for economic progress, or as the main hindrance to it. Internationally, it seems that there may be some movement towards a sharing of managerial values and attitudes. Yet, in a professional sense, they do not constitute a very cohesive group. The characteristics which unify them have not yet been defined with precision, and they do not seem to be much influenced by the integrating forces which shape and govern the established professions. As a group, they are neither well organized nor particularly vocal in society. We do not know much about how they see themselves; and others see them in a variety of ways. No doubt, part of the difficulty is that management itself is a loose notion. It enters frequently into popular parlance, yet it is one which social scientists and analysts would like to endow with rigour and intellectual consistency, though so far without success.

The situation may be frustrating. It is not surprising. We are dealing with something which is bound up intimately with the workings of society, with any society that is organizationally complex. Management is a social phenomenon evolving in response to human needs and initiative and not a theoretical construct, the application of which has been carefully engineered. The practice of management came before the theorizers, and the study of management raises in an acute and exciting way the interaction between practice and theory. The best early thinkers in management were themselves practising managers reflecting on their experience.

The present study of Henley managers aims to contribute something to the understanding of general managership, perhaps more to the process of becoming a general manager than the state of being one. As one wit remarked, to be a top manager is easy; getting to be one is the problem.

The findings seem to support the idea that the attitudes and requirements of generalship are shared very broadly across sectors