

	ECONOMIC APPROACH	INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCE APPROACH	HUMAN RELATIONS APPROACH
What is it?	<p>This approach was pioneered by Frederick Taylor in <i>Principles of Scientific Management</i> (1911) and it</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Rejected ‘rules of thumb’ in favour of ‘one best way’ ○ Emphasized value of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ efficiency, ○ standardization and uniformity, ○ discipline and hierarchy (command and control) ○ Classic case study at Bethlehem Steel Plant (where the workers were told to do everything the same, when previously there were more effective teams than others) → they instead 	<p>Hugo Munsterberg (1913) <i>Psychology and Industrial Efficiency</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Attempted to put some psychology into ‘the one best way’ by developing science to identify the ‘one best person’. ○ Suggested this rested on <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) precise analysis of task (b) development of aptitude tests <p><i>Develop or recruit employees that fit the job (have the traits that suit it)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ General electric switchboard study: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What’s task? ○ What’s ability? ○ Key operator skills: memory, attention to 	<p>Pioneered by Elton Mayo</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Based on study at the Hawthorne works of western electrical company ○ Mayo set out to implement Taylorist regime — changing pay, rest periods, lighting etc. ○ Created 2 groups and manipulated conditions for one who were separated in testing room. ○ Manipulations had unexpected effects for both groups ○ Why? Women said that they felt cared about when they were changing around the work environment to make it optimal ○ In desperation, asked workers ○ They identified six factors: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. working in a small group 2. receiving close supervision 3. increased earnings 4. working in a novel situation 5. being curious about the study 6. being the focus of attention

	<p>took a standardized approach</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Implementation of Taylorist principles increased production from 13 tpm/pd to 48 	<p>detail, precision, speed, intelligence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Tested by: test of digit recall, cross out letters in a newspaper column, sorting cards, draw patterns quickly and recalling lists of logically paired words ○ <i>These tests identified known best operatives</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Researchers had broken down anonymity and made workers feel as though they mattered ○ This created cohesiveness and was a basis for group norms ○ Norms had explicit and implicit impact on 'chisellers' and 'rate-busters' — transforming individual differences into group similarities
What are some problems with it?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This approach is process focused and not people focused ○ Leaves little space for creativity as workers were told what to do and how to do it 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Enormously influential however, not easy to identify task requirements for high-level jobs (e.g. lecturer) as the tasks were not broken down etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Human relations approach limited by lack of theoretical specification. ○ Nevertheless, provides springboard for the social identity approach

LEADERSHIP AS SOCIAL IDENTITY MANAGEMENT: THE 4 KEY ELEMENTS

<i>Being one of us</i>	<i>Doing it for us</i>	<i>Crafting/creating a sense of us</i>	<i>Making us matter</i>
'leaders are ingroup prototypes'	'leaders are ingroup champions'	'leaders are identity entrepreneurs'	'leaders are identity impresarios'

<p>Leaders are more effective (more likely to be influential) the more they are perceived to represent a social identity that we share.</p> <p>They need to be seen as ‘one of us’ (not ‘one of them’) and as embodying ‘who we are’ and ‘what we want to be’.</p> <p>Evidence: meta-analysis by Steffens et al, 2017 → 118 independent samples, 235 effect sizes, $N = 29,871$ effect size: $r = .38$ 95%CIs [.34, .43]</p>	<p>Leaders are more effective (more likely to engender followership) the more they are seen to stand up for a social identity that we share.</p> <p>In part this is because this is a basis for them to be seen as authentic.</p> <p><i>Authentic leadership shows support for followers: we don’t follow people unless we believe they’re taking us forward</i></p> <p><i>Not about being true to themselves but about how they’re being true to the group</i></p>	<p><i>The leaders who work most effectively, never say ‘I’. And that’s not because they have trained themselves not to say ‘I’. They don’t think ‘I’. They think ‘team’. They understand their job to be to make the team function....</i></p> <p><i>There is an identification with the task and with the group.</i> (Drucker, 1992)</p>	<p><i>The key social achievement of Paul’s community-forming actions consisted in the bringing together of many people into one body, the construction of a new form of solidarity ...transcending former distinctions</i> (Horrell, 2006).</p> <p>Successful leaders work hard to create identity-embedding structure (e.g., activities, festivals, rituals, buildings).</p> <p>These ensure that the rhetoric of ‘us’ is translated into group members’ lived experience and material reality.</p>
---	---	---	--