

cycle for each rank and file employee is to be clearly specified, and that he should be closely supervised to be sure that he adheres to the task as specified. Implicit, if not explicit, in this theory is the concept that rank and file employees cannot be trusted to do a full day's work, that such employees will abuse any freedom given them by ceasing to work or by engaging in wasteful activity."

The behavioral scientists today in their research and development of management theory cast a great deal of doubt on this basic classical management theory, and some modern management theorists, after establishing this model for classical management theory that fits their purposes, then proceed to illustrate the virtues of their theories in a comparative manner. They use comparative concepts such as this: They talk about classical management theory versus the participative management theory here, of cooperation, namely, your psychologists, sociologists, and anthropologists.

They have many good points. I just hate to see them make their points by casting doubt or aspersions on what worked so well at one particular time. They will talk about job-centered management versus employee-centered management, or autocratic management behavior versus supportive management behavior, or management-set norms versus the shared norms in productivity. They set it up to an either or an or situation.

Now, when such comparisons are made, it seems only logical that the following considerations should be applied to any suggested theory of management, and in dealing with management or management theory this is a very important approach.

First, management theory should always be viewed in the proper time perspective. What worked in 1900 probably will not work as well today as what we are doing. But, likewise, what we find today in management theory that works well