

DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES
March 2023

No. 2023-01

On subsequent studies of Mary Parker Follett

Hayashi, Toru

Faculty of Economics
Nagasaki University
Nagasaki, Japan

Abstract:

This paper tries to interrelate Follett's subsequent studies by intervening the "two-factor theory" by Herzberg. First is Weick's "model of group development" and "two-factor theory": one attempt is to overlay "two-factor theory" (motivators as Mo and hygiene factors as Hy, with high and low as H and L, respectively). Second, Barnard's "method of incentives" and "two-factor theory": If "personal and non-material opportunities" and "ideal benefactions" among the four specific inducements are transferred to general incentives, two remain: "material inducements" and "desirable physical conditions." As a result, specific inducements correspond to hygiene factors and general incentives correspond to motivators. Third, the contrast between Follett's "dealing with differences" and Barnard's "method of persuasion." Domination" corresponds to "coercion," "compromise" corresponds to "rationalization of opportunity," "voluntary obedience" corresponds to "inculcation of motives," and "integration" corresponds to "creativity of moral codes. Furthermore, although "creativity of moral codes" is not in the category of "method of persuasion," it is positioned as a higher-order "method of persuasion" in this study.

Introduction

Both Barnard and Weick are considered subsequent studies to Follett. However, it is not always sufficiently clear what exactly is being succeeded. When two equal entities face differences, they are usually adjusted by the market mechanism. In this study, we will

compare Follett's and Barnard's ideas on dealing with differences, including parallel and hierarchical relationships in a hierarchy.

The root of the differences lies in the purposes or value assumptions of each subject¹. In general, the purpose at the individual level can be paraphrased as “how and where to live.” The process of formation and transformation of these purposes depends on a double interaction with the social environment (the external world)² as a means, i.e., realization (enactment) as subjective sense-making toward the external world. Weick's (1979) "theory of organizing" describes and explains this cyclical process as a “model of group development.” Theoretically speaking, it is a repetition of choices to affirm (maintain) or deny (break through) the status quo so that they differ from each other in structure and process (Kishida, 2019).

The structure of this paper is as follows. First, by juxtaposing the "two-factor theory" by Herzberg (Herzberg, 1966), we attempt to provide a theoretical complement to the “model of group development.” Second, through a comparison with the "two-factor theory," we will clarify the problems inherent in Barnard's (1938) “classification of incentives.” Third, we will attempt to contrast "integration" by Follett (1924, 1949) and "method of persuasion" by Barnard (1938).

Criticism of the incentives antecedent view

¹ In Barnard's style, it involves moral codes, and in the Carnegie School (e.g., Simon, 1945; March and Simon, 1958; Cyert and March, 1963), it involves value premise. As will be discussed below, if the value premise is decomposed into two factors (Herzberg, 1966), it seems to be possible to explain the organizing process in a consistent manner.

² Including the counterparty with whom to collaborate.

According to Follett³, there are three ways⁴ to resolve differences: domination, compromise, and integration. Domination works in the short term but is not successful in the long term. Compromise involves giving up some of each other's desires. In both domination and compromise, one of the parties is unsatisfied⁵, whereas in integration, both parties are fully satisfied (Follett, 1949, pp. 127-128).

However, Mouri⁶ points out that differences and conflicts can be expected depending on the "judgment or interpretation" of the "circumstances" on which "integration" is premised. In this regard, Weick, who paid attention to "judgment or interpretation," based on retrospective sensemaking, visualized how the "process of organizing" develops and is repeated under the double interaction of the parties involved. However, a prescription for "integration" is not necessarily intended. Yuhara (2016a, p. 69) also points out various factors (obstacles to integration) that support the fact that "integration" is not easy.

³ Follett's organizational theory, which focused on dynamic processes rather than static structures, later influenced Barnard, Weick, and others (Mitsui, 2012, p. 276; Sugita, 2012, p. 20, 2021, p. 32). Weick points out the similarity between Weick's original concept of "sense-making" and Follett's view of organization as "relating" (Weick, 1995, pp. 32-34).

⁴ The four methods of settling differences were modified from four to three: voluntary submission, domination, compromise, and integration (Follett, 1924).

⁵ The dissatisfaction and satisfaction of desire in Follett seem to be captured in a synthesized one-factor continuum compared to the two factors; since the two factors are incommensurable with each other, synthesizing them makes no sense.

⁶ According to Mouri (Follett, 1949, Commentary, pp. 211-214, in Japanese translation edition), differences and divisions are to be expected in the judgment or interpretation of "circumstances." However, the way to solve this problem is also "integration" in accordance with the "law of circumstances." It is a healthy humanization that concrete human beings give meaning and value to individual human relationships in the overall situation.

However, they seem to be enumerated from a particular rationalistic perspective, as if seeking a kind of Pareto-optimal solution. A "rationalistic interpretation" also denies the multiplicity or equivocality of "circumstances." Rather, the essence of "integration" is to "fully satisfy both parties," i.e., to be agreeable⁷ to them.

As one of the prescriptions for "integration," Barnard offers the following "method of incentives" and "method of persuasion."

"If an organization is unable to afford incentives adequate to the personal contributions it requires it will perish unless it can by persuasion so change the desires of enough men that the incentives it can offer will be adequate. Method of persuasion includes, (a) the creation of coercive conditions, (b) the rationalization of opportunity, and (c) the inculcation of motives." (Barnard, 1938, p. 149)

In short, because there are limits to the appropriate incentives that can be offered, managers are compelled to motivate would-be contributors through persuasion. In this study, such a prescription will be referred to as the "incentives antecedent view." However, the "method of incentives" is not coherent. Regarding the conditions for the existence of formal organizations, Yuhara contrasts them as follows. On the one hand, effectiveness is external, impersonal, and objective; efficiency is internal, personal, and subjective (Yuhara, 2015, p. 62); on the other hand, the "method of incentives" is objective and the "method of persuasion" is subjective. Nevertheless, Yuhara does not elaborate on the

⁷ It can be paraphrased as the satisfactory solution advocated by the Carnegie school. However, even though the production and participation decisions in organizational equilibrium theory (Simon, et al., 1950; March and Simon, 1958) are essentially different, both can be paraphrased as the same "satisfaction." This seems to be due to the value premise unresolved.

former, i.e., specific inducements and general incentives (Yuhara, 2015, p. 63).

According to Yuhara's positioning, the specific inducements (material inducements, personal and non-material opportunities, desirable physical conditions, and ideal benefactions) and the general incentives (associational attractiveness, adaptations to habitual methods and attitudes, the opportunity of enlarged participation, and the condition of communion) are all external, impersonal, and objective. But are both "personal and non-material opportunities" and "ideal benefactions" external, impersonal, or objective? No. They are not. In fact, Yuhara's correspondence between objective and subjective concepts of effectiveness and efficiency, in accordance with Barnard, is not a mistake. It should also be logically coherent to map the "method of incentives" to the "method of persuasion." However, such a correspondence would lead to the contradiction mentioned above. Why? The reason is that the criteria for the two categories of specific inducements/general incentives are inappropriate.

In this study, one attempt is to reclassify them in response to hygiene/motivation factors (Herzberg, 1966) instead of specific/general. In this way, the contradiction into which Barnard fell seems to be curable (Table 1) and can theoretically complement the group development model (Figure 1).

| two-factor | | method of incentives | |
|-----------------|------------------------------------|--|----------------------|
| hygiene factors | company policy and administration | material inducements | specific inducements |
| | supervision-technical | personal non-material opportunities (1) | |
| | salary | desirable physical conditions | |
| | interpersonal relations-supervisor | ideal benefactions (2) | |
| | working conditions | | |
| motivators | achievement | associational attractiveness | general incentives |
| | recognition | adaptation of conditions to habitual methods and attitudes | |
| | work itself | the opportunity to enlarged participation | |
| | responsibility | the condition of communion | |
| | advancement | | |

Source: Herzberg (1966) and Barnard (1938)

Note: (1) Personal non-material opportunities and (2) ideal benefactions seem to conform to not hygiene factors but motivators.

| incommensurable | | non-material/noneconomical inducements (motivators) | | |
|--|------|---|---|--------------------|
| | | Low | | High |
| material/economical inducements (hygiene factors) | Low | no organizing | → | center of gravity |
| | | diverse ends | | common means |
| | | ↑ | | ↓ (※) |
| | High | unstable/market transaction | ← | center of rigidity |
| diverse means | | common ends | | |

Figure 1 Integration between two-factor and group development model

Source: Composed by author based on Herzberg (1966) and Weick (1979)

Note: (※) Gratification-produced pathology (Maslow, 1970, pp. 71-72).

Now, if we superimpose the "two-factor theory" (motivational factor as Mo and hygiene factor as Hy, and high and low as H and L, respectively), we obtain the following. Clockwise, first, a path starting from "diverse ends" (MoL, HyL) to "common means" (MoH, HyL) (organizing based on double interaction); second, a transformation of "common means" to "common ends" (MoH, HyH) (inversion of ends and means); third, a transformation of "common ends" to "diverse means" (MoL, HyH) (rigidity of relationship); last, an opportunity to move from "diverse means" to "diverse ends"

(renewal in search of new organizing).

Barnard also lists three "methods of persuasion": the creation of coercive conditions, the rationalization of opportunity, and inculcation of motives. Of the three, "coercion" corresponds to Follett's "domination." Thus, the "persuasion" option leading to "integration" is "rationalization of opportunity" or "inculcation of motives." In any case, if the condition of "without violating any codes" is satisfied, the result is "sufficient satisfaction for both parties."

Let us look at Barnard's theory of efficiency with "sufficient satisfaction" as a clue. It says that persuasion is necessary because the incentives are finite (incentives antecedent view) as a means of raising the motivation to contribute. If material and economic incentives are plentiful and offered without discipline, it can lead to what Maslow (1970) calls "gratification-produced pathology"⁸ (Figure 1). Moreover, since there is no opportunity for organization (common means), differences are adjusted in the counterclockwise direction in Figure 1, i.e., in the market (various means). However, from the viewpoint of "creation of moral codes," which Barnard positions as the essence of leadership, such an argument (incentives antecedent view) does not seem to be appropriate. In this regard, Yuhara introduces an interesting logic.

In contrast to Barnard's discussion of the balance between "individual codes" and "organizational codes" based on coordination by managers, the rejection of dualistic thinking of Nishida Kitaro takes as a given the coordinating function of managers. The essence of management responsibility, or leadership in Barnard's view, is the function of creating moral codes through the "conviction" that "individual codes" and "organizational

⁸ Herzberg (1966, p. 174) says, "the worshipping of Adam can lead to the loss of Abraham, and this is the unhealthy aspect."

codes" coincide, and that efficiency and effectiveness are combined and harmonized in the face of various intersecting and conflicting codes of conduct (Yuhara, 2016b, pp. 108-109).

| Table 2 coping with differences (Follett, 1924) and method of persuasion (Barnard, 1938) | |
|---|--|
| coping with differences | method of persuasion |
| domination | the creation of coercive conditions |
| compromise | the rationalization of opportunity |
| voluntary submission | the inculcation of motives |
| integration | the creativeness of moral codes |

Source: Follett (1924) and Barnard (1938)

What is the "conviction" that leads to the creative function of moral codes? Assuming a hierarchical structure, it is nothing but coordination among the different functional departments, i.e., general management (Fayol, 1916). In fact, "coordination" in the name of general management is carried out under the manager's vision and time perspective⁹ through a combination of incentives and persuasion, whether simultaneously or sequentially. In fact, however, there are cases in which either incentives only or persuasion only is sufficient. If persuasion is sufficient, incentives are unnecessary. Incentives are not always preceded by a response to differences.

For example, "rationalization of opportunities" may suffice. It is, in essence, a comprehensive understanding of the position and meaning of the part in charge in relation to the whole. The multi-skilled (or versatile) workers and QC circle activities in the

⁹ Barnard, in his creation of a moral code, explains the need for resourcefulness, energy, imagination, and general ability (Barnard, 1938, p. 272), and it would seem that these are also necessary in the combination of incentives and persuasion.

Toyota Production System, which is said to have overcome the weaknesses of the Ford system with its single-skilled workers, are examples of this (Abo et al., 1991). If the meaning of assigned work is understood "autonomously (Ji-dou-ka in Japanese)," this itself becomes "rationalization of opportunity" or "inculcation of motives." Neither of these is directly related to material or economic incentives such as wage conditions. What is relevant is the "confidence" that the other party will understand. If, as a result, the "individual codes" and the "organizational codes" coincide, and efficiency and effectiveness are combined and harmonized, then this seems to be an example of "integration." As far as the incentives antecedent view is concerned, it is not necessarily appropriate to position Barnard's study as a successive study to Follett's "integration."

Conclusion

In this paper, first, we attempted to complement the theoretical model of group development by juxtaposing the two-factor theory. Second, we clarified the problems inherent in Barnard's categorization and method of incentives, criticized the incentives antecedent view, and reclassified it in terms of the two-factor theory. Third, I attempted to contrast Follett's "integration" and Barnard's "method of persuasion."

References

- Abo, T., Itagaki, H., Ueyama, K., Kawamura, T., and Kumon, H. (1991), *The Japanese Production System in the U.S.A.: 'Application' and 'Adaptation' in Local Factories*, Toyo Keizai Inc (in Japanese).
- Barnard, Chester I. (1938) *The Functions of the Executive*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press .

- Cyert, Richard M. and March, James G. (with contributions by Clarkson, G. P. E., et al.)
(1963) *A Behavioral Theory of the Firm*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Fayol, Henri (1916) *Administration Industrielle et Générale: Prévoyance, Organisation, Commandement, Co-ordination, Controle*, Paris: Dunod.
- Follett, Mary P. (1924) *Creative Experience*, New York: Peter Smith.
- Follett, Mary P. (1949) *Freedom & Co-ordination: Lecture in Business Organization*, London, UK: Management Publications Trust.
- Herzberg, Frederick (1966) *Work and the Nature of Man*, Cleveland, OH: World Publishing.
- Kishida, Tamiki (2019) *The Generation and Development of Organization Studies*, Yuhikaku (in Japanese).
- March, James and Simon, Herbert A. (1993) *Organizations*, 2nd ed., Blackwell (Originally in 1958).
- Maslow, Abraham H. (1970) *Motivation and Personality*, 2nd.ed. (Originally in 1954), New York: Harper and Row.
- Mitsui, Izumi (2012) "Dynamic organizational views," in The Society for the History of Business Administration (ed.), *Encyclopedia of the History of Business Administration* (2nd ed.), Bunshindo, p. 276 (in Japanese).
- Mouri, Shigetaka (1963) "Commentary," in Japanese edition (translated by Saito, Morio), Follett, Mary P., *Freedom & Co-ordination: Lecture in Business Organization*, Daiyamondosha, pp. 173-248.
- Simon, Herbert A. (1997) *Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-making Processes in Administrative Organization*, 4th ed. New York: Free Press (Originally in 1945).

- Simon, Herbert A., Smithburg, Donald W., and Thompson, Victor A. (1950) *Public Administration*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf .
- Sugita, H. (2012), "Follett's life and her times," in Mitsui, Izumi (ed.), *Follett*, Bunshindo, pp. 1-24, chapter 1 (in Japanese).
- Sugita, Hiroshi (2021) *Follett's Hermeneutic Management Thought*, Bunshindo (in panese).
- Weick, Karl E. (1979) *The Social Psychology of Organizing*, 2nd ed. Reading, MA: Wesley.
- Weick, Karl E. (1995) *Sensemaking in Organizations*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Yuhara, Tomoaki (2015), "The characteristics of duality and adjustment in Barnard's Theory: Based on the essays of Koestler and Kitaro Nishida," in *Miyazaki Sangyo Keiei Daigaku Ronshu*, Vol. 25, No. 1, pp. 59-76 (in Japanese).
- Yuhara, Tomoaki (2016a), "A study on Follett's integration theory: Based on Graham's theory," in *Miyazaki Sangyo Keiei Daigaku Ronshu*, Vol. 26, No. 1, pp. 65-74 (in Japanese).
- Yuhara, Tomoaki (2016b), "The creation of moral rules in Barnard's organization theory: Based on the denial of dualism in Kitaro Nishida's," in *Konan Keiei Ronshu*, Vol. 57, No. 1, pp. 87-110 (in Japanese).