

Relations industrielles Industrial Relations



Hawthorne Revisited: Management and the Worker, its Critics, and Developments in Human Relations in Industry, by Henry A. Landsberger, 132 pp. Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.

Émile Gosselin

Volume 14, numéro 2, avril 1959

URI : <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1022329ar>

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.7202/1022329ar>

[Aller au sommaire du numéro](#)

Éditeur(s)

Département des relations industrielles de l'Université Laval

ISSN

0034-379X (imprimé)

1703-8138 (numérique)

[Découvrir la revue](#)

Citer ce compte rendu

Gosselin, É. (1959). Compte rendu de [*Hawthorne Revisited: Management and the Worker, its Critics, and Developments in Human Relations in Industry*, by Henry A. Landsberger, 132 pp. Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.] *Relations industrielles / Industrial Relations*, 14(2), 306–308.
<https://doi.org/10.7202/1022329ar>

Tous droits réservés © Département des relations industrielles de l'Université Laval, 1959

Ce document est protégé par la loi sur le droit d'auteur. L'utilisation des services d'Érudit (y compris la reproduction) est assujettie à sa politique d'utilisation que vous pouvez consulter en ligne.

<https://apropos.erudit.org/fr/usagers/politique-dutilisation/>

Érudit

Cet article est diffusé et préservé par Érudit.

Érudit est un consortium interuniversitaire sans but lucratif composé de l'Université de Montréal, l'Université Laval et l'Université du Québec à Montréal. Il a pour mission la promotion et la valorisation de la recherche.

<https://www.erudit.org/fr/>

ment leur conception du syndicat, comme organisation, dans une série de onze propositions qui ont trait à la raison d'être du syndicat, sa structure, et le contexte social dans lequel il évolue. Suivent ensuite une étude anthropologique des quatre syndicats locaux et une description de la méthodologie utilisée au cours de l'analyse. Cinq chapitres sont consacrés à la recherche proprement dite: la signification de la participation; participation et appartenance à des groupements extra-syndicaux; participation et caractéristiques particulières des membres; organisation de la structure de contrôle; ordre et uniformité; habileté des leaders et participation. Enfin, après avoir résumé leurs observations et tiré une brève conclusion, les auteurs terminent leur travail par une abondante bibliographie et une série d'annexes dans lesquels on trouve le texte du questionnaire utilisé ainsi que des notes explicatives sur leur procédé statistique.

Cet ouvrage est remarquable par sa clarté et sa rigueur scientifique. Les auteurs prennent bien soin de limiter la valeur des généralisations que l'on peut tirer de leur recherche. Celles-ci n'ont une validité que pour des unités syndicales locales correspondant à leur échantillonnage.

Cependant il semble bien clair que la démocratie syndicale est la résultante de plusieurs facteurs dont les plus importants se situent en dehors du syndicat. Celui-ci, en effet n'existe pas en vase clos, mais au milieu de plusieurs organisations: l'entreprise dont les employés sont aussi membres de l'union locale, régionale, nationale, les groupements volontaires et civiques, les municipalités, etc. Toutes ces organisations créent un contexte qui peut sur le plan local favoriser ou empêcher la démocratie syndicale dans sa structure et son fonctionnement. L'entreprise, l'Etat, tous ceux qui accordent une importance à la démocratie syndicale, devraient s'interroger sur le degré de contribution qu'ils apportent à créer un contexte dans lequel la démocratie peut se développer. L'originalité de cet ouvrage est d'avoir proposé des graphiques de contrôle comme moyen de représenter et de mesurer le fonctionnement interne d'une organisation.

GÉRARD DION

Hawthorne Revisited: Management and the Worker, its Critics, and Developments in Human Relations in Industry, by Henry A. Landsberger, 132 pp. Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.

Most courses in industrial sociology, human relations, or personnel include references to the Hawthorne Studies. However the author, Professor Landsberger of Cornell University feels that many students, if not some of the critics of the *Human relations school*, by concentrating on only parts of the book, *Management and the Worker*, do not have a balanced view of the book itself. Roethlisberger, Dickson and their associates have touched on a great variety of topics and used many methods. Reading *Management and the Worker* carefully, one realizes « that everyone of the Hawthorne studies grew out of the inconclusiveness of the one preceding it ».

Management and the Worker has been under a steady barrage almost since it appeared in print, but there has been very little response by those under attack. This state of affairs « makes peace negotiations impossible, and makes a continuation of the war pleasant since the hazards of counterattack by the besieged are apparently negligible ». The author devotes himself to a searching reassessment of *Management and the Workers*. To set the record straight, he describes in some detail the sequence of experiments conducted by the Hawthorne group. He is not offering a « digest » but detailing a chain of interlocking experiments, one leading to the next. The purpose is not alone to dispel the « illusion of familiarity » (of which many critics may not be totally absolved). The author wants to look into the criticisms leveled against *Management and the Worker* in order to explore the relationships that may exist between the « Studies » and subsequent developments in the field of human relations in industry.

The author analyses some of the most recurring charges being made by economists or sociologists, or by both groups, against the human relations group, the most far-reaching one being « that of inadequate conceptualization of the major problems in industrial relations ». The group appears to be su-

perficial in its selection of concepts and phenomena to be analyzed. It fails, so say the critics, to take unions into account, does not pay attention to methods of accommodating industrial conflict, such as collective bargaining and lets workers being manipulated for management's ends. Furthermore, «there is no view of the larger institutional frame work of our economic system within which these relationships arise and have their meaning». Some critics ascribe such a state of affair to a failure «to use an appropriate sociological method or theory» if the Mayo School ever had any.

Much of the criticisms against the Mayo School have not been directed at the empirical studies, «but at those books which are expressions of the school's ideology». To prevent *Management and the Worker* from being condemned through guilt by association, the author does not pretend to defend the writings of the Mayo school as a whole. He subjects the book to a «critique confined initially to it alone».

Management and the Worker is not a dogmatic book and, on the whole, does not generalize much beyond the immediate findings. At some points, the authors may show their own leanings but they are careful to present the readers with data which are contrary to it and not only those supporting the authors' viewpoints. The book warns of the difficulties to be encountered in such studies and by itself constitutes good breaks for those who might be prone to generalize too much on the basis of such studies. The author notes that the critics have sometimes been guilty of factual errors and errors in interpretation «which may have furthered their arguments, but which have certainly not materially aided scientific progress».

Management and the Worker has been charged of withholding attention from union. Critics sometimes jump to the conclusion that the authors are pro-management. In the first place there were no union in the Hawthorne plant when the studies were conducted. Secondly, between 1927 and 1932 trade unionism was at a low ebb, throughout the country. Interviewed workers referred very little to trade union subject

matters for the simple reason that they felt very little affected. But the study group does not deliver a clean bill of health to management. On the contrary it describes a state of affairs which is quite unsatisfactory for employees and a large group of supervisors alike. Furthermore, the interviewing program was not introduced in order to manipulate the workers, though the workers felt relieved in many cases, such benefit appearing to the authors as one of the «most unexpected results of the program».

Professor Landsberger discusses many other points in *Management and the Worker* which have been subject to criticisms. The concept of *sentiments* should not be interpreted to mean «irrational reactions» because the two terms are explicitly not used interchangeably by the authors. The book comes under heavy fire when it emphasizes such sentiments as the striving for status and prestige above the desire for power, control, and economic status. The book is certainly open to attack on this score, since the authors were fully aware of the impact of economic deprivation upon the analyzed workers. If they selected status instead of another variable, it was because it constituted «a neglected aspect» of the relation between a worker and his job. A study of that particular aspect was meant to «add» to the body of literature and was not considered as an alternative. The authors explored a variety of hitherto unknown, unrecorded facets of the relations in industry but did not mean to give a character of finality to their own findings.

The Mayo School is criticized for its failure to recognize the true causes of industrial unrest. The author distinguishes between the fact of conflict, its forms, its descriptions, its causes. Since there was no union at Hawthorne, the authors recognized the fact of conflict, but described it in terms of tensions between informal groups. Professor Landsberger notes that the authors «committed a well-high incredible sin of omission by not recognizing in 1939» that the rise of formal unionism was due to the same set of conditions which they had observed some eight years earlier. Such a conclusion would then have been fully in line with their earlier findings. But the authors had

found that workers form groups in order to resist changes and divide informal means to protect the groups. The problem cannot be solved by just merely training first-line supervisors, by building up nice personalities. When the book uses the word « social system », it is not with a view of expounding a theory of non conflicting interest and of necessarily cooperative interdependence. The word means that the factory is a whole with parts, each of them bearing a relation of interdependence to every other part.

The authors of *Management and the Workers* are charged of ignoring the the extra-plant factors, economic and socio-political, « within which behavioral patterns and relationships are structured... » and this is where the critics score most heavily. The authors relate technology to its effects on the status and prestige scale in the factory but have little, if nothing to say, about technology and the extra-plant environment and their effects on management and management's decisions in all fields. It would have been logical for the authors to climb the factory walls and engage into an extra-plant social investigation. They would have benefitted from a better knowledge of the communities and sub-groups from which the workers were recruited and would certainly have grasped the influence of the plant itself in those areas.

In a final section, the authors discuss some problems in defining the Human Relations approach. He refutes the imputation of some characteristics which are supposedly unique to the school, and he seems to direct the critics' guns toward other schools which enjoy an astonishing freedom from attack, though they seem to be good examples for the study of those very characteristics... « The immunity enjoyed... may result from the restricted reading of the critics... » Describing and explaining the more or less immediate impact which the Hawthorne studies have had, the author devotes the balance of the book to show that the recent developments in the field of human relations in industry have a direct and a real link with *Management and the Worker*.

Hawthorne Revisited gives the impression that *Management and the*

workers had a very large number of critics and few outspoken defenders. Our own feeling is that the subject is discussed too much in terms of school vs school or discipline vs discipline. Those who have been perhaps the most violent critics of the « ideology » have learned much from the studies in terms of approach and methodology. Some of the criticisms are certainly unjustified but on the whole they don't appear as criticisms directed uniquely as *Management and the workers*, or at the initiatives undertaken by the Research group. They rather point to some inescapable flaws in the total design, to the necessary limitations in any project of an exploratory nature. They also constitute a strong warning to searchers that it is a very difficult position for a scientist, and often a misleading one, to assume at various times the **role of the doctrinaire** without giving proper warning to the reader that the remedies proffered do not strictly derive from a rigorous study of all the variables involved in the situation, but from a vision, however realistic, of the society of to-morrow.

EMILE GOSSELEN

Executives for Government: Central Issues of Federal Personnel Administration, by Paul T. Davis and Ross Pollock, Washington D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1957, 186 pp. \$1.50.

Good government does not mean only the establishment of sound policies through elected representatives. It means helping the Executive to accomplish its fundamental and crucial tasks in the crucial tasks in the legislative and the administrative fields. In order to fulfill those objectives the reform of the Civil Service has become one of the major subject matter in the field of public administration since the beginning of the 20th century. England, Germany, France, Canada and the United States have made a particular effort in order to obtain, develop and retain executives for the central government.

The book under review « *Executives for Government* », draws its experience from the United States and addresses