

chologists and professors. The program has just completed its first flight and therefore substantial appraisal is not yet available to this writer.

Measurement

As a matter of fact, little trend toward scientific measurement or any kind of objective evaluation has as yet appeared in all of this manager education process. Within the last year or two, occasional and strident but low volume voices have been raised asking whether "in fact all of this educational endeavor produces more educated and more competent managers?"

One rejoinder is that we never know that about any education except for simple skills; "why stress measuring this kind of education?" The writer knows two companies that have made a rather intensive though limited effort up to a certain point to get some kind of a check on the effect of their educational program as seen by the participants themselves and by those accustomed to work around them back on the job.

The results of such efforts are not conclusive but are suggestive. Some evidence is seen of greater interest in planning of operations and in motivation of subordinates, and greater willingness to suspend judgment and to argue over issues patiently and objectively. Broadened horizons and slightly more standardized vocabularies on management matters seem to result.

The margins of difference between the "educated" and the "uneducated" apparently is not very substantial, the length of time is recent, and the technical difficulties in the way of any kind of scientific measurement seem at present well nigh insuperable, at least with the budgets available for the task.

In any event, it is obvious that those who pay the bill are happy to continue to do so on an even more expanded basis, and the testimony of "the victim" usually rings with sincerity, enthusiasm, and very respectable words as he describes what he got from his experience. This favorable testimonial in behalf of the "patent medicine" is not universal, but so nearly so as to indicate that for some time yet the trend lines of expansion and diversification found in this study may well continue.

It is to be devoutly hoped that the tendency to *varied* methodology of instruction will further spread and diversify since it is obvious that there exists no authoritative *pedagogical* literature to guide those who plan education programs for forty year old adults of twenty years' business experience seeking to "expand their horizons," "retread their minds," or "supplement their skills."

Another devout wish which can hardly be called the expansion of any existing trend is for more *attention* and *budget* put back of the effort to find at least more *objective evaluations* if not more quantitative measures. Quite apart from the matter of whether the general *over-all results* are in question as to *their value*, some such measurement studies must be available if *disputes about method* and *subject matter* are ever to be settled on anything besides popularity, imitation, prejudice, and "empire building."

In summary, the American corporation with typical American belief in salvation by education has, since 1950, supported a unique and impressive educational revolution which is still in explosive acceleration. Since policies, climates, and budgets are usually set from the top, we may expect to see styles in "foreman training" increasingly set by results of "executive education." Corporate leaders early found it congenial to progress by "training the workers," then the foremen, then middle and functional management.

They are increasingly approaching the example set by General Foods which in the Forties gave a new management development program first to their board members, and then moved down through the organization.

As educational programs have progressed from worker to

foreman up the levels, there has been the standard plaintive cry "I sure wish my boss would take this course." General Electric's pattern of focusing the curriculum around the major emphases of current and company-wide administrative problems and opening the course to top level officers opens up an intriguing vista—administration by education.

- 1 L. A. Allen, L. A. Allen Associates
- 2 N. Barish, New York University
- 3 H. R. Bowen, Grinnell College
- 4 L. R. Boulware, General Electric Company
- 5 E. C. Bursk, *Harvard Business Review*
- 6 T. H. Carroll, Ford Foundation
- 7 G. B. Carson, Ohio State University
- 8 T. E. Clemmons, International Business Machines Corporation
- 9 D. E. David, Ford Foundation
- 10 C. R. Dechert, Purdue University
- 11 F. F. Drucker, New York University
- 12 J. E. Ellsworth, The Ensign-Bickford Company
- 13 A. H. Forster, Armstrong Cork Company
- 14 J. H. Forrester, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
- 15 L. Gulick, Institute of Public Administration
- 16 G. F. Habach, Worthington Corporation
- 17 J. R. Hawkinson, Northwestern University
- 18 M. L. Hurni, General Electric Company
- 19 E. H. MacNiece, Permacel
- 20 A. Matz, University of Pennsylvania
- 21 H. B. Maynard, H. B. Maynard Company
- 22 D. E. McFarland, Michigan State University
- 23 C. A. Myers, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
- 24 S. Ramo, Thompson Ramo Wooldridge Company
- 25 A. W. Rathe, New York University
- 26 J. P. Richmond, Mount Dora, Fla.
- 27 E. Shell, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
- 28 H. F. Smiddy, General Electric Company
- 29 W. R. Spiegel, University of Texas
- 30 R. Villers, Rautenstrauch & Villers
- 31 L. F. Urwick, Urwick House
- 32 G. B. Warren, General Electric Company
- 33 G. H. Welsh, University of Texas

DISCUSSION

G. D. Lobingier⁴

This is an extremely well done report on the growth of management training and education, tracing the development of such programs from their beginning to the present. The shift in sophistication of content, from "how-to" techniques in the early stages to the present concern with broader subject matter, is to me as dramatic, if not more so, as the quantitative growth in the number of programs.

In the early part of the paper, I would have liked to have had some further discussion by the author, in his historical analysis of supervisory training (as distinguished from management training), of the reasons for the criticisms he noted which crept into evaluations of supervisory training. Were the reasons "absence of radical innovation in method or content," or was there some lack of understanding the basic principles of work situations which caused a disenchantment with courses which supervisors attend? The author's opinion would be most valuable.

Although on a minor point the author speculates very briefly on a possible "filtering-down" process from management education to supervisory training, my own point of view is one of reservation about any prospective effectiveness. What may be needed in such cases is not a direct application of novel practices but one which takes into account the levels of background, responsibility, and sophistication of the two groups—supervisory versus management.

The section of the paper discussing trends is most enlightening; the author has quite properly focused attention on these and underlined their importance to the direction management educa-

⁴ Director, Educational Department, Westinghouse Electric Corporation, East Pittsburgh, Pa.

tion is taking. Included is the point strongly made of the lack of meaningful objective evaluation to the manager education process. Nothing of significance seems to be coming from the occasional efforts to evaluate; the efforts none the less are certainly indicative of the questioning, perhaps vague dissatisfaction, but confusion existing in the field. It occurs to me that the author has pointed out a curious contradictory phenomenon of "management education" unsystematically seeking a way to systematic management.

Finally, the paper points up the necessity for real effort on the part of industry to look hard, deep, and long at the quality and level of personnel to be trained or educated in the programs, to clear up the arguments pro and con for fundamentals versus techniques in content and methods, and to probe for basic principles and objectives of management education. Perhaps all three of these topics are more properly the subjects for an additional paper. I would have welcomed and valued, however, the views of Mr. Bradshaw, who is qualified to present them.