

Relations industrielles / Industrial Relations



The Dark Side of Management: A Secret History of Management Theory, By Gerald Hanlon (2016) Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxfordshire: Routledge, 240 pages. ISBN: 978-1-138-80190-5

Jeffrey Muldoon

Volume 75, numéro 1, hiver 2020

URI : <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1068724ar>

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.7202/1068724ar>

[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

Muldoon, J. (2020). Compte rendu de [*The Dark Side of Management: A Secret History of Management Theory*, By Gerald Hanlon (2016) Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxfordshire: Routledge, 240 pages. ISBN: 978-1-138-80190-5]. *Relations industrielles / Industrial Relations*, 75(1), 181–183. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1068724ar>

Tous droits réservés © Département des relations industrielles de l'Université Laval, 2020

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/>

é
rudit

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/>

This handbook provides a balanced overview of employee turnover. The volume includes review and empirical research chapters examining turnover and related topics from micro and macro perspectives with research, managerial and policy implications. While this wide scope of the handbook prevents the readers from developing an in-depth understanding of specific turnover issues, this is likely not the goal of this volume. I believe providing an overview of the issue at the expense of covering specific turnover topics rather superficially can be appropriate given the interdisciplinary and multilevel nature of turnover research. Nevertheless, I think the handbook is missing two key elements. First, all empirical studies of the book employ quantitative methodologies. I believe a qualitative chapter could add value to this handbook by providing an interesting perspective to employee turnover. Second, turnover intention is a strong indicator of turnover behaviour. While there are a few chapters that discuss turnover intention, a theoretical chapter devoted to the relationship between turnover intention and turnover behaviour would enhance the handbook's contribution to the literature.

I would recommend this handbook to researchers, policymakers and practitioners who are interested in employee turnover issues. I believe the book is a valuable read to those who would like a well-rounded introduction to employee turnover from an interdisciplinary and international perspective. Canadian readers should be aware that the handbook does not include any studies in the Canadian context. The readers of *R/IR* who are interested in a thorough investigation of specific turnover issues can benefit more from other resources.

Firat K. Sayin

Assistant Professor
Sobey School of Business
Saint Mary's University
Halifax, Nova Scotia

The Dark Side of Management: A Secret History of Management Theory

By Gerald Hanlon (2016) Milton Park,
Abingdon, Oxfordshire: Routledge,
240 pages. ISBN: 978-1-138-80190-5.

The emergence of management has been a perplexing development worldwide for intellectuals, labour leaders, politicians, and the worker. No group has produced as much or generated as much hatred and fear as the manager. Marxian and Critical theorists deprecate managers; mainstream business thinkers praise them. Gerard Hanlon entered into the debate regarding the "dark side" of management and analyzes the impact that management has on the worker. Unlike other management historians, Hanlon does take the worker's views and values seriously, citing labour and management historians alike. Likewise, Hanlon takes the agency of labour to accept, collaborate, and resist management as an important consideration in understanding the process and evolution of management. I believe that these contributions are important and noteworthy. I believe a work of management history that takes into consideration historians, such as Herbert Gutman and David Montgomery, would produce a management history of greater nuance. I also believe that there is great importance to link management to social democracy and liberalism as a hedge against capital.

However, Hanlon fails at this nuance, revealing a lack of understanding of management, economics and history. Mostly, it is difficult to take any book on management history that does not have a single citation of Daniel Wren, Arthur Bedeian, or Ronald Greenwood. If those scholars are too conservative, Hanlon also fails to cite Milorad Novicevic, Albert Mills, John Hassard and Michael Rowlinson. Even though he cites the work of Chris Nyland, Hanlon misses the connection that Nyland made between Taylorism and liberalism.

Furthermore, Hanlon writes an entire book on 19th and 20th century America but does not have a single reference to Richard Hofstadter, Gordon Wood, Daniel Walker Howe, Elizabeth Cohen, James Patterson, David Kennedy, Nelson Lichtenstein, Steven Fraser, Alan Brinkley or James McPherson. These are not obscure historians. These admissions damage the historical interpretations of the book.

I will provide some examples. There are several major problems with Hanlon's understanding of Mayo, both factual and interpretational. I use his issues with Mayo as a fulcrum due to my own work on Hawthorne. Contra Hanlon, Mayo's fear was not the industrial worker or even democracy, but a mass grouping driven to hatred by a demagogue promising an impossible future featuring ever more social control and hatred of the other, which could include various ethnic groups, races, classes or religious groups. Furthermore, Mayo's chapter on the Rabble Hypothesis is a rejection of economic thought and one that would have been rejected by Hayek, Becker and Lucas, as well as other economists who stressed price as the primary method of coordination. The "Rabble Hypothesis" is not a phrase that originated with Mayo, but David Ricardo. Ricardo's argument is that nobody cares about society other than the way it affects their own needs, something that modern economists agree with. Mayo's purpose was very different.

Likewise, "Spontaneous Cooperation" is not a phrase that just appears in his incomplete 1949 book, but it also appears in the 1945 version. Furthermore, it is borrowed from Chester Barnard, and does form parts of Mayo's 1933 writings. Furthermore, Mayo argues that workers are irrational because they are not guided by economic incentives and some of their decisions are non-logical in orientation. Mayo was not a social scientist in the modern sense, but more of a philosopher, whose work bridged several fields. There is considerable evidence

to suggest that behavioural economics, a field Mayo would have agreed with and supported, expresses merit in indicating that people are irrational. In addition, individuals view their economic gains through a social prism, a fact supported in the justice literature. Finally, contra to Hanlon, Mayo was not the first to attempt to change the mind of the worker. That could be laid at the feet of Taylor who stressed a mental revolution.

The book abounds several historical errors and a lack of understanding of even introductory textbook economics and sociology. Here are some examples: John Marshall was already Supreme Justice when the Dartmouth case was adjudicated. This case was important because it created the sanctity of the contract allowing for trust, without such economic exchange would cease to exist and corporation would be in the hands of the government. This ruling was only dissented to by Gabriel Duvall, who may have been the most inconsequential justice in history. Herbert Hoover, Walter Lippman and F.A. Hayek would have found little to agree with. The term neoliberalism is not defined and listing Hoover, Lippman and Hayek as neoliberals ignores the real differences between them. For American liberals, the embrace of Keynes was at the expense of economic planning. Value is not produced by craft, cost, or effort but marginal productivity, contrary to labour value theories. Management is not a parasite, but a coordinator of labour. Specialization is not a position of power, but an economic fact.

Here is the irony. There will always be elites. The idea that elites will disappear, and everyone will be equal is a fantastic idea. When Mayo wrote about traditional societies, he was talking about Kings and Chiefs, hardly an equalitarian past. Mayo and Taylor were highly critical of both management and labour, but they blamed management more. They wanted to make the existing elite better. They wanted to

make cooperation between management and labour the concern of their work to reduce competition and hatred. I could see why people who lived and wrote between 1856 to 1949 would fear war. The characteristic of a top historian is empathy—the ability to understand the viewpoint of those people in which we disagree. One just wishes that Hanlon combined his insight of worker resistance with a more empathetic view of management. However, despite its limitations, Hanlon's work is worth a read. It could inspire scholars to examine the labour issue from both the perspective of labour and management history. Both approaches have much to offer each other. I believe Hanlon's work can begin the process of bridge forming.

Jeffrey Muldoon

Associate Professor
School of Business
Emporia State University
Emporia, Kansas, USA

The Talent Revolution: Longevity and the Future of Work

By Lisa Taylor and Fern Lebo (2019) Toronto/ Buffalo/London: University of Toronto Press, 228 pages. ISBN 978-1-48750-082-5.

In an era where organizations are facing big issues related with demographic questions, it is interesting to read a book which advocates for the aging workforce, as the current technological revolution leads organizations to put the emphasis on millennials and to frequently forget boomers.

In three parts and thirteen chapters, the authors support the idea of demographics longevity as “the single greatest opportunity on which smart organizations can capitalize” and boomers, called “a mature workforce” as revolutionaries building a rich and underused resource of talents for organizations.

The first part, based on studies and theoretical frameworks, makes a sort of “zoom out” to place the debate in the big picture and to go behind common preconceptions

and stereotypes. Big picture means that we currently are facing a social revolution with huge consequences on work inside and outside organizations.

The point is to replace today's demographic change as part of a long, revolutionary cycle, not to minimize but to put in perspective the notion of “revolution” and to explain that workplaces have experienced revolutions before and probably will after! However, understanding what is at stake in this revolution may deliver an early competitive advantage. In this context, the whole world of work is dramatically changing with employers and employees facing the same issues, which are: demographics, career ownership, freelance economy, the rise of platforms and the impact of AI and robotics. The authors argue that what is coming first, as driver, and explaining the dynamic of all the others drivers, is demographics, because longevity does have an impact on the workforce by setting new norms and expectations.

The social revolution is taking place in the fourth wave of the industrial revolution called “a tsunami” and described as “driven by technology, fueled by competition and characterized by massive changes in the workplace”. For the authors, if we are considering this point just as a change in our working environment, we will be aiming towards what we want. Quite the reverse, we need to be aware that it's not less than a paradigm shift and act accordingly which means: thinking about managing a “talent revolution” and not a technological or a demographic one.

The early stage of the talent revolution, as it is for each revolution, is characterized by instability, chaotic situations, precarious employment and it affects all workers of all ages. Focusing on demographics diverts from the real issues and challenges.

This is why we need to capture things that we know for sure and which are that, according to the authors, organizations