McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y:

Implications for Christian Business Education

Todd Steen
Department of Economics, Management and Accounting
Hope College
P.O. Box 9000
Holland, MI 49422-9000
616-395-7582
steen@hope.edu

Steve VanderVeen
Department of Economics, Management and Accounting
Hope College
P.O. Box 9000
Holland, MI 49422-9000
616-395-7574
vanderveen@hope.edu

Date: September 28, 2004

Paper to be presented at the Annual Meetings of the Christian Business Faculty Association, San Antonio, Texas, October 29, 2004

McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y:
Implications for Christian Business Education

Introduction

Professors of management attempt to teach students theories of management. But what can theories of management contribute to the teaching of students? What, in particular, can we learn about the teaching of students from the theories advocated by such management "giants" as Frederick Taylor (1911), Peter Drucker (1954, 1993), Douglas McGregor (1960), and more recently, Jeffrey Pfeffer (1992) and Daniel Goleman (1995, Goleman, Boyatzis, and McKee, 2002)? In addition, as Christians teaching theories of management, how can we assess these theories from a Christian perspective?

In this paper we first consider whether managing people in the workplace is similar to teaching students in the classroom. Then we discuss what various theorists of management may have to contribute to the practice of teaching. Third, we consider the assumptions management theories make about people. Finally, we offer implications for teaching from a Christian perspective.

Is Teaching Managing?

On the face of it, management and education may seem to have little in common. Upon further examination, however, there can actually be a close relation, depending on the assumptions one makes about the workers to be managed or the students to be educated. First, what is teaching? That is, what do teachers do? Teachers, in short, **develop** students. For instance, teachers use content to "develop learning skills."

> These learning skills are not only or mostly basic study skills, even though these are needed; they are the sophisticated skills necessary to sustain learning across a career and a lifetime" (Weimer, 2005, p. xviii, see also Sayers, 1947).

Teachers, therefore, teach students how to think as well as what to think (see Kolb, 1984, p. 4).

How, then, do teachers do this? According to Chickering and Gamsom (1987) there are seven principles of effective teaching. Effective teaching:

1. Encourages instruction/student contact
2. Encourages cooperation among students
3. Encourages active learning
4. Gives prompt feedback
5. Emphasizes time on task
6. Communicates high expectations
7. Respects diverse talents and ways of learning

In other words, effective teaching requires making learning suitable for students to learn.

Managers are also in the development business. Peter Drucker, for instance, states that management's first function is economic performance because management's first job is managing a business (Drucker, 1954, p. 11). Management's second function is managing managers, which means management must make "a productive enterprise out of human and material resources." This implies that the enterprise must be a "genuine whole: greater than – or at least different from – the sum of its parts, with its output larger than the sum of its inputs," realizing that people alone can "**grow and develop**" (emphasis ours) (Drucker, 1954, p. 12). Finally, managers must manage the worker and work.

> This implies organization of work so as to make it most suitable for human beings, and organization of people so as to make them work most productively and effectively (Drucker, 1954, p. 14).

To accomplish the functions of managing a business, managing managers, and managing workers and work, managers (1) set objectives, (2) organize the activities, decisions, and relations needed, (3) motivate and communicate, (4) measure, and (5) **develop people** (emphasis ours) (Drucker, 1954, pp. 343-345). Managers, too, want to teach people how to think as well as what to think.

Therefore, because both teachers and managers develop people, an important part of teaching can be thought of as managing. Teachers are managers of students, then, to the extent that they organize learning to make it suitable for students and organize students in such a way that they learn productively and effectively. Although teaching, like management, is both an art and a science (consider Parker Palmer's idea that teaching is a "mystery" – Palmer, 1990), management theories can give us insight into how we are currently teaching, and how we should structure our teaching. In the following section, we examine a variety of management theorists and note the insights that they can provide for the educational process. We will discover that how we make learning suitable for students and how we organize students depends in large part on our assumptions about students.

Significant Management (and Teaching) Perspectives

Frederick Taylor. Taylor attempted to organize work to make it suitable for workers and organize workers to make them more efficient. Taylor's Scientific Management has been defined as "the application of scientific methods to the problem of obtaining maximum efficiency in industrial work and the like" (Kanigel, 1997, p. 7). Taylor is said to have

> bequeathed a clockwork world of tasks timed to the hundredth of a minute, of standardized factories, machines, women, and men. He helped instill in us the fierce, holy obsession with time, order, productivity, and efficiency that marks our age (Kanigel, 1997, p. 7).

Peter Drucker claims that Taylor laid the foundation for automation because Taylor sought "patterns of stability and predictability behind the seeming flux of phenomena" (Drucker, 1954, p. 19). Taylor was always looking for the "one best way," the "best process." In other words, Taylor thought through the concepts of automation so that the actual machines of automation could be applied. Even though Taylor is often associated with the mechanization of labor, he saw "knowledge, not muscle power, as the prime productive resource" (Kanigel, 1997, p. 9). His contribution was ultimately "a state of mind, applicable to every aspect of life" (Kanigel, 1997, p. 12), even to teaching.

The specific problem Taylor was trying to solve with Scientific Management was the problem of efficiency. Taylor believed the workers were generally not as productive as they could be, and therefore companies and even countries were wasting a most valuable resource. There were several reasons for this lack of productivity. First, Taylor believed that workers were afraid to work harder and more productively because they thought doing so would throw fellow laborers out of work. Second, Taylor believed there existed defective systems of management which make it "necessary for each workman to soldier, or work slowly, in order that he may protect his own best interests" (Taylor, 1911, p. 4). If workers were being paid based on a per unit basis and they worked hard, thereby increasing their productivity and wages, management would raise its expectations of what a worker could produce and then lower the per unit wage paid. Third, Taylor believed workers utilized old "rule-of-thumb" methods as opposed to new scientific methods of work.

All of these beliefs can have an analogy within the educational process. In the classroom, students may feel pressure not to do the best work they can in case they might "break the curve." Students may also have similar concerns about performing too well on assignments and may "soldier" – a term Taylor used to describe the tendency of workers to "take it easy" due either to their natural desire not to work or the social pressure against working too hard. In addition, students come to college with "rule-of-thumb" methods in that they come with their own habits and ideas about learning which may not be efficient.

Taylor's method of solving this problem was to implement a four-step process. First, managers (or expert consultants) were to develop a science for each individual element of the work; that is, every movement. Second, managers were to "scientifically select and then train, teach, and develop the workman, whereas in the past he chose his own work and trained himself as best he could" (Taylor, 1911, p. 15). Third, managers were to cooperate with the workers to insure "all of the work was being done according to the principles of the science which has been developed" (Taylor, 1911, p. 15). Fourth, managers were to equally divide the work and the responsibility for doing the work, which meant in essence that managers would do all the planning and workers would do all the physical labor, as if managers were programming machines. Workers could not plan according to the principles of Scientific Management because they lacked the knowledge and mathematical skills needed (Kanigel, 1997, p. 517) and they were apparently, in Taylor's words, too stupid to train themselves (Taylor, 1911, p. 31).

Therefore, to get workers to work, Taylor depended on extrinsic motivation. He believed workers were motivated mainly by economic needs: work was "simply an

exchange of labor and skill in exchange for pay" (Kanigel, 1997, p. 460). Taylor would increase the workers' pay dramatically, but only if they did exactly as he said. While he promoted democracy in the sense that he wanted workers to make suggestions concerning manufacturing efficiency, Taylor relied on a dictatorial style of management (see Kanigel, 1997, p. 547).

The general feeling among the workers once Scientific Management was implemented was predictable. In addition to losing the only source of power – their expertise (Hardy, 1990, p. 136) – workers lost their sense of dignity (Kanigel, 1997, p. 466). Workers' jobs were being "dumbed-down" because Taylor assumed they were "dumb." Taking people's dignity and power had the effect of a self-fulfilling prophecy: workers didn't want to work, at least under Taylor's system.

Interestingly, Taylor argued that shop management was like teaching. He believed that teachers wouldn't allow college students to study subjects "unaided" and by themselves (Taylor, 1911, p. 66). Ironically, although academics tend to criticize Taylor's principles and techniques, they often implement many of his ideas for both good and ill. For instance, teachers implement Taylor's ideas when teachers emphasize efficient "use of class time" and when the focus of teachers is on "getting through the material." They apply Taylor's principles when teachers reduce expectations of students or inflate grades in order to motivate students to study harder; or when they consider themselves the source of classroom knowledge. In fact, too much lecturing, inflated grades, excessive focus on grades, and easy assignments might be considered negative symptoms of Taylorism. In some cases, from a systems perspective (see Senge, 1990), the application of Taylorism could actually make learning less suitable for students. For

example, the result of lowering expectations for students' preparedness is less student preparedness. Less student preparedness can result in more lecturing and even a dictatorial approach to teaching, which would further reduce the ability and motivation for students to learn.

But Taylor's ideas can also be implemented in a positive manner. For instance, scheduling breaks (or at least a change in pedagogical style) during class time, giving clear instructions on doable assignments, having a well-organized syllabus, ensuring the proper lighting and temperature, and utilizing a variety of media can all be beneficial in terms of making learning more suitable for students.

In addition, Taylor's ideas can be implemented to better organize students for learning. For instance, certain seat configurations can be more appropriate depending on the teaching tactic. Even changing the seat assignments can be helpful. More significantly, how students are distributed across a major (that is, course sequencing) can have a huge impact on learning. The point is that technical efficiency and the principles of Scientific Management can be applied for good or for ill. How much they are applied may depend upon our assumptions about students. Taylor, unfortunately, expected little of his workers. He was more successful at teaching them what to think than how to think.

<u>Peter Drucker</u>. Drucker claimed that Scientific Management may be "the most powerful as well as the most lasting contribution America has made to Western thought since the Federalist papers." He made this claim because he thought Scientific Management was "simplicity itself" and looked at work "systematically" (Drucker, 1954, p. 280). But Drucker also felt that Scientific Management had "blind spots." One blind

spot was that Scientific Management confuses "a principle of analysis with a principle of action" (Drucker, 1954, p. 282). In other words,

> It is perfectly true that we have to analyze the work into its constituent motions. It is true that we can best improve work by improving the way the individual operations are performed. But it is simply not true that the closer the work comes to confining itself to the individual motion or operation, the better the human being will perform it (Drucker, 1954, p. 283).

Workers are people, not machines. Workers, unlike machines, have the ability "to coordinate, to integrate, to judge and to imagine" (Drucker, 1954, p. 263).

Drucker was more interested in teaching people how to think than what to think, for teaching them only what to think robbed them of their humanity. This can be contrasted to what Drucker referred to as a second blind spot of Scientific Management: "the divorce of planning from doing." While planning can be separate from doing, planning and doing do not have to be done by two different people. In fact, Drucker says that there "is no work that can be performed effectively unless it contains elements of both" (Drucker, 1954, p. 284). Drucker emphasized that when workers are engaged only in doing, they acquire "experience and habit rather than knowledge and understanding" (Drucker, 1954, p. 285). In fact, Drucker emphasized the development of the whole person. To take advantage of the special properties of the human resource, work must "encourage the growth of the individual." Thus work "must always challenge the worker" (Drucker, 1954, p. 266).

Because workers are a human resource, Drucker was opposed not only to economic needs manipulation (such as those practiced by Taylor) but also psychological needs manipulation (such as those practiced by Pfeffer and Goleman – see below). Drucker labeled this use of science to get workers to do what managers wanted them to

do “enlightened psychological despotism” (Drucker, 1974, p. 243). In its place, Drucker advocated “Management by Objective and Self-Control” (MBO) for managers. MBO assumed that “there are at least a substantial number of people in the work force who want to achieve” (Drucker, 1974, p. 245; see also Hardy, 1990, p. 163). It is the task of management, then, “not to motivate people to work, but to make it possible for them to achieve at work” (Hardy, 1990, p. 163). This means that managers must be allowed to participate in the setting of their own objectives and they should be allowed to control themselves. To make sure that the managers’ and the business’ objectives are consistent, Drucker recommends utilizing a “manager’s letter.”

> In this letter to his superior, each manager first defines the objectives of his superior’s job and of his own job as he sees them. He then sets down the performance standards which he believes are being applied to him. Next, he lists the things he must do himself to attain these goals – and the things within his own unit he considers major obstacles. He lists the things his superior and the company do to help him and the things that hamper him. Finally, he outlines what he proposes to do during the next year to reach his goals (Drucker, 1954, p. 129).

In terms of managing workers and work, Drucker believed that peak performance would result from “careful placement, high standards of performance, providing the worker with the information needed to control [herself or] himself, and with opportunities for participation that will give [her or] him managerial vision” (Drucker, 1954, p. 304).

Drucker’s insights into the worker and work provide insight for the classroom. First, instead of “dumbing down” work, work must always be challenging. One way to make work challenging is to provide students the opportunity to plan as well as to do their own work. If the instructor does all the planning, students acquire only experience and habit: they learn at almost an inhuman level. However, if students are able to plan

how they will learn, they will gain knowledge and understanding and the chances are better that they will grow and develop as human beings.

Second, teachers could allow students to participate in learning according to Management by Objectives and Self-Control. Through the use of a "student's letter" they could reflect on the objectives of the instructor and the learning institution and think of how their own objectives relate. They can also help the instructor by disclosing what it is the instructor does to hamper them from meeting their learning objectives as well as what the instructor does to help them. (If students are working in teams, they can write a student's letter to their team leader and their team leader can acquire some "managerial vision.") They could then write their own learning "contract" by stating what they will do themselves to meet their learning objectives. Allowing students to develop such a "contract" could increase their participation in learning and their commitment to learning.

Third, teachers could focus on placing students not only so that they more efficiently learn (Taylor's focus), but also so that they would more effectively grow. Teachers could place students on projects or internships not because of certain skills and abilities they have today, but in terms growing certain gifts for the future. For instance, students could be put on teams and assigned a significant task. Each team could choose a chairperson to ensure that planning, organizing, leading, and controlling (the classical functions of management) take place so that the task gets completed according to guidelines determined by their professor. In this way both the chair and the team are given the opportunity to grow and develop as responsible workers and managers.

Jeffrey Pfeffer. In many ways, Pfeffer's (1992) ideas of power seem more reflective of Taylor than of Drucker, even though he focuses more on effective leadership

than efficient management. This is because Pfeffer seems to advocate a form of "enlightened psychological despotism" by promoting the techniques of "the social psychology of interpersonal influence" to "effectively get things done" (Pfeffer, 1992, pp. 187ff). One technique Pfeffer advocates is framing, which makes things look reasonable or ridiculous, depending on the context. Framing can also be used as a pricing tactic to influence the buyer's reference point (see Monroe, 1990, pp. 78ff.). For example, by listing a relatively low sales price next to an inflated "everyday" price, sales prices can appear to be greater bargains than they really are. Alternatively, raising the price of the lowest-priced product in a product line may influence people to buy the higher priced items.

In addition to framing, another social psychological technique of influence is scarcity: how things look "depends on how scarce they are" because it is "difficult to value things objectively. However, if many others want it, then we assume it probably has value" (Pfeffer, 1992, p. 201). Scarcity relies on the theory of psychological reactance. The term reactance comes from the fact that "when increasing scarcity . . . interferes with our prior access to some item, we will react against the interference by wanting and trying to possess the item more than we did before" (Pfeffer, 1992, p. 201; see also Cialdini, 1988, p, 232).

A third technique for influence is social proof. This is a technique many of us used on our parents when we said "everyone else is doing it!" A fourth technique for influence is liking and ingratiation. We prefer to say "Yes" to people we like, and people we like tend to be those who show they are similar to us, who look physically attractive to us, who compliment and flatter us, and who bring us good news.

Teachers might implement Pfeffer's ideas in a number of ways. First, they might be able to make students more pliable by implementing ingratiating techniques such as remembering names and being complimentary. Second, professors could use Pfeffer's ideas to motivate students by telling them that the skills they are learning are important because successful alumni say so (social proof) or that these skills are desirable because they are very rare (scarcity). They might also be able to motivate some students to perform exceptionally well by limiting the number of "A" grades available (scarcity); teachers can also make an ambitious syllabus look palatable by eliminating some assignments (framing). Using Pfeffer's ideas to motivate students is a way to organize work and the use of these techniques would seem to depend on assumptions professors make about students' desire to learn.

Daniel Goleman. Goleman is best known for his seminal book *Emotional Intelligence* (1995). In a follow-up book, *Primal Leadership* (Goleman et al, 2002), the authors argue that people will perform better if their leader creates resonance – "a reservoir of positivity that frees the best in people. At its root, then, the primal job of leadership is emotional" (Goleman et al., 2002, p. ix). Drucker might consider Goleman's work to be "enlightened neurological despotism" because it is using breakthroughs in research on brain neurology to influence people. These breakthroughs show

> why leaders' moods and actions have enormous impact on those they lead, and shed fresh light on the power of emotionally intelligent leadership to inspire, arouse passion and enthusiasm, and keep people motivated and committed (Goleman et al, 2002, pp. ix, x).

For instance, the “open-loop” design of the limbic system means that other people can change our very physiology – and so our emotions” (Goleman et al., p. 7). For example,

> Scientists have captured this attunement of emotions in the laboratory by measuring the physiology – such as heart rate – of two people as they have a good conversation. As the conversation begins, their bodies each operate at different rhythms. But by the end of a simple fifteen-minute conversation, their physiological profiles look remarkably similar – a phenomenon called mirroring (Goleman et al., p. 7).

Laughter is a tool which can facilitate mirroring, **or** even accelerate it. The result of laughter, as well as emotional signals such as smiles, is sometimes a “positive emotional hijack.” A good laugh

> sends a reassuring message: We’re on the same wavelength, we get along. It signals trust, comfort, and a shared sense of the world; as a rhythm in a conversation, laughing signals that all is well for the moment (Goleman et al., 2002, p. 11).

In the work environment, even the sound of laughter “signals that people’s hearts and minds are engaged” (Goleman et al., 2002, p. 11).

Goleman and his colleagues theorize that there are resonance-building leadership styles and resonance-destroying styles (Goleman et al, 2002, pp. 53ff). For instance, the “affiliative” style helps create a positive environment because in this style leaders try to befriend followers. The “coaching” style also builds resonance because leaders and followers share life goals and the leader helps frame the followers’ work in relation to these life goals. The leaders also give followers the flexibility to pursue these goals. This “democratic” style aids a positive environment because in it leaders ask followers for their advice and opinions and then attempt to incorporate them in major decisions. The “visionary” style motivates people by reframing work in the context of a grand organizational purpose. In contrast, authoritarian or military style leaders tend to destroy

resonance. Although effective in emergencies, such a leadership style generally pushes talent away. "Pacesetting" styles, or leading by challenging people or by exemplifying a strong work ethic, can get results when people are already motivated, but can also leave them without a sense of direction.

Goleman's insights have the following implications for the classroom. In order to build trust, comfort, and even arouse passion and enthusiasm, teachers should find ways of laughing with students. In fact, a shared laugh might refocus the class and put the teacher and the students on the same "wavelength." In order to maintain an atmosphere of resonance in order to free the best in students, instructors could utilize the resonance-building leadership styles. They could ask for input and use this input in the design of assignments, for instance. They could befriend students by attending sports events and conversing with students before and after class about non-academic topics. In addition, instructors could work individually with students to determine what their life goals are and to structure assignments in accordance with those goals, and they could constantly remind students of a grand vision. In a Christian college, that vision might be to pursue shalom or to prepare for kingdom work.

Earlier in this paper, we argued that because both teachers and managers develop people, teaching can be thought of as managing. Teachers are managers of students to the extent that they organize learning to make it suitable for students and organize students in such a way that they learn productively and effectively. We also need to develop students as suggested by the various definitions of teaching. In doing so, do we synthesize the best from the different management theories? What should be our

approach? How does a Christian perspective inform our choice of teaching technique? To this discussion we turn to next.

Theory X and Theory Y: Douglas McGregor

To begin to introduce a Christian perspective, we turn to one more significant management theorist. Douglas McGregor, in his work *The Human Side of Enterprise*, introduced an important theory of management that he entitled "management by integration." A key idea in his theory was the identification of what he called Theory X and Theory Y. McGregor asserted that many traditional managers organize their workplace based on Theory X. Theory X assumes that "the average human being has an inherent dislike of work and will avoid it if he can (McGregor, 1960, p. 33)." As a result, "managerial control must be asserted through hierarchical authority and the imposition of executive will. Workers must be motivated by extrinsic rewards, so that they will do what they would rather not do (i.e., work) (Hardy, 1990, p. 156)." In contrast, McGregor proposes what he calls Theory Y, the idea that work can fulfill some higher level needs for workers (such as the need for "self-actualization") and therefore provide value to workers beyond just extrinsic rewards. Workers' needs therefore must be integrated into the job design process so that work itself can provide intrinsic rewards.

In addition to Theory X and Theory Y, McGregor made another important contribution to management. He suggested that managers and management theorists stop and ask about the assumptions they are making about people. They must ask questions such as (see Maslow, 1999, p. 15):

Do you believe that people are trustworthy?

Do you believe that people seek responsibility and accountability?

Do you believe that people seek meaning in their work?

Do you believe that people naturally want to learn?

Do you believe that people don't resist change but they resist being changed?

Do you believe people prefer work to being idle?

We wish to do the same: we wish to ask "What assumptions are we making about our students?" In theory, we will become better teachers if we make more accurate assumptions because assumptions drive both teaching theory and practice. If, for example, we assume that our students don't want to learn, then we may focus more on teaching what to know rather than on teaching how to know. To get students to know something, we will likely spend more energy motivating them using extrinsic methods than intrinsic ones (cf. Herzberg, 1968, pp. 117-135), and implementing tactics attributable more to theorists such as Taylor, Pfeffer, and Goleman than to Drucker and McGregor. As teachers, then, we might spend more time on such things as scheduling breaks during class time, changing the order of assignments, giving clear instructions, better organizing the syllabus, manipulating the lighting, adjusting the temperature, moving the seats, and changing the timing and color of handouts.

On the other hand, if we assume our students want to learn, then we may focus more on teaching students how to know than on teaching what to know, and we may spend less time motivating students extrinsically because we will assume students want to learn. Therefore, given the assumption that students want to learn, it makes more sense to use the implied teaching tactics of Drucker and McGregor. As teachers, then, we might challenge students by providing them with the opportunity to plan and do their own

work, or we might encourage students to write their own learning "contract" by stating what they will do themselves to meet their learning objectives. In addition, we might expect that students aren't in class just for a grade or a diploma but in order to meet higher level needs, such as the need to find one's calling (see Hardy, 1990, pp. 80-121 for a Christian view; see Maslow, 1999, pp. 1-16 for a secular view), or the work one was created to do (see Ephesians 2:10).

Therefore, thinking about the assumptions we make about our students is important. But how should a Christian think about students when it comes to student motivation? What, in other words, should a Christian think about Theories X and Y? What should we assume about our students? Do most of our students want to achieve or are most of them unmotivated? Should we hold to Theory X assumptions or Theory Y assumptions? To answer the question about which assumptions we should hold, we must introduce a model that has assumptions of its own.

Management Theory in Christian Perspective

Our model, like any model, is influenced by assumptions. The assumptions underlying our model are influenced by a particular tradition arising out of a specific worldview. The particular tradition we are part of is the Reformed-Calvinist tradition of the larger Protestant Reformation. This philosophy argues that in Scripture God reveals himself through the "basic motifs of creation-fall-redemption-consummation" (Spykman, 1992, p. 10). Taken together, these motifs assume that

> in creation God covenanted his kingdom into existence. After the fall, God renewed the covenant with a view toward the coming of the kingdom. The ultimate goal is the restoration of all creation in the renewed earth. Thus, the original covenant stands forever as the abiding foundation and norm for life in

> God's world. Similarly, in the beginning God created his kingdom – "the heavens and the earth," the realm over which he rules. Mankind, then, as servants of the King, rebelled; but God came back, renewing his kingdom in a proleptic way through Israel, and then reestablished it decisively with the coming of King Jesus. The kingdom, therefore, now stands as a settled reality securely anchored in God's past acts of salvation as an abiding, present, coming reality, and as an assured hope based on the promise of a future fully restored reality (Spykman, 1992, p. 11).

These motifs of creation-fall-redemption-consummation should have a formative impact on our assumptions concerning students. What follows is a brief summary of each, including implications for humankind.

Creation

God's work in creation sets the context for all that we experience and all the tasks that we undertake. In addition to creating the world with particular structures and functions, God also created us in his image, and he proclaimed this creation very good. The Canons of Dort (Third and Fourth Points, Article 1) state the "the whole man was holy." According to Spykman, "we learn what imaging God means best by looking to the Word incarnate in Jesus Christ, who became like us in all things, who came to do the will of the Father, and who through his Spirit lends an eschatological perspective to all who seek to be faithful imagers of God" (Spykman, 1992, p. 226, 227). We must never forget that all humans bear this mark of God's image somewhere in them.

Sin and Evil

Although the origin of sin remains a mystery, we know that the impact of sin is far reaching and severe. Our work, which was part of God's good creation, now came under the curse of sin (see Genesis 3:14-19). Both humankind and culture are completely

permeated by sin, a condition that Calvinists call "total depravity." According to the Canons of Dort (Third and Fourth Points, Article 1), the fall brought upon humans "blindness, terrible darkness, futility, and distortion of judgment in his mind; perversity, defiance, and hardness in his heart and will; and finally impurity in all his emotions." At the same time, however, the Canons of Dort (Third and Fourth Points, Article 4) claim that there remained in humans a "certain light of nature, . . . by virtue of which [they retain] some notions about God, natural things, and the difference between what is moral and immoral, and demonstrate a certain eagerness of virtue and for good outward behavior." In other words, although the impact of sin is universal, it does not destroy the underlying goodness of God's creation and the image of God that was placed in humankind. Yet our efforts are completely misdirected and require the renewing grace of God. The sinful condition of humankind is an important reality that Christian teachers have to acknowledge as they structure the educational process, not only for how students behave, but also for our motives and behavior as teachers.

Redemption

Through the death of Jesus Christ on the cross, God reconciles his children and his creation to Himself. Sin does not have the final word; its impact can be overcome. We can see signs everywhere of God's redeeming work, and we know that the "creation waits in eager expectation for the sons of God to be revealed (Rom 8:19ff NIV)," and that "the creation itself will be liberated from its bondage to decay and brought into the glorious freedom of the children of God." According to the Canons of Dort (Third and Fourth Points, Article 16):

> As a result [of God's saving grace in Jesus Christ], a ready and sincere obedience begins to prevail where once the rebellion and resistance of the flesh were completely dominant. It is in this that the true and spiritual restoration and freedom of our will consists.

For our present purposes it is important to note that before Christ ascended into heaven he gave his disciples the "Great Commission," which in effect is a renewal of the cultural mandate.

> In the beginning already our Creator conferred on us a "mission unlimited." Traditional theology has a name for it: the "cultural mandate." It involves a cluster of God-given tasks, including marriage, family nurture, daily labor, governance, learning, and worship. By our willful disobedience we reneged on this original "great commission." . . . In [his] parting message Christ takes the "great commission," enunciated by his Father at the dawn of creation, and restates it in the language of redemption of the New Testament era (Spykman, 1992, p. 472, 473).

We should be encouraged by the fact that even though we "reneged" on the original cultural mandate, God renewed it; we should also be encouraged by the fact that the war has been decided and the most decisive battle already won. Our lives as Christian teachers and students reside in the light of Jesus' redeeming sacrifice on the cross, which gives us great hope as to what can be accomplished in the classroom.

The Consummation

The Bible instructs us to look forward to a new heaven and a new earth (2 Peter 3:13), the home of righteousness that will be ushered in when the Lord returns. This "'end time' history carries the biblical story line of creation, fall, and redemption forward, drawing all its diverse elements together into a breathtaking array of culminating acts" (Spykman, 1992, p, 515). The Lord's Prayer makes the connection between our life with God in heaven and our current existence here on earth: "Thy

Kingdom come, thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven." We believe that thinking about how both management and teaching will be done when Christ returns can be instructive in thinking about those activities today (see, for example, Steen and VanderVeen, 2003; Steen, VanderVeen, and Voskuil, forthcoming, 2005).

Implications for Teaching Management

How then do we organize learning for students and organize students for learning? Do students generally want to learn or don't they? McGregor claims that how we answer these questions relates to our worldview. Parker Palmer acknowledges that not all students will respond to "Theory Y" methods of education. "If good teaching depends on drawing students and their stories into the conversation called truth, then good teachers must deal with the fact that many students prefer to sit silently on the sidelines" (Palmer, 1990). His response to this situation, however, rests firmly on Theory Y assumptions.

> If we are to treat their condition, we need an accurate diagnosis. It is inaccurate, though common, to attribute most student speechlessness to laziness or stupidity—and that diagnosis usually leads to teaching that is more punitive than provocative. Instead, I suggest, the silence of many students is the result of disempowerment that leads to privatization. Students are often marginal to the society by virtue of their youth, their lack of a productive role, their dependency on the academy for legitimization. . . The remedy is clear: establish settings where silenced voices can be heard into speech by people committed to serious listening (Palmer, 1990).

As we teach management, we often point out the flaws of the Theory X approach. Taylor's Scientific Management can often serve as a "straw man" for us to knock over using the insights from Theory Y approaches. At the same time, we may be using teaching methods and techniques that rest on the same assumptions as Theory X. However, we can not forget the influence of sin in our lives as well as those of students.

As Christians we are painfully aware of how pervasive the impact of sin is, and we should bear no illusion concerning the limits of the goodness of humankind. Therefore, both Theory X and Theory Y assumptions apply to the teaching of students, and because these assumptions apply, some of the implied tactics do as well. Because we live in a fallen world, it is true that some of our students don't want to learn, and it is possible that all of our students don't want to learn some of the time. Even though Drucker may be correct in branding the theories of Pfeffer and Goleman as "enlightened psychological despotism" and Taylor's theory as "blind," if we truly desire to "cause students to learn," we cannot overlook the contributions these theorists may have for effective teaching. We will have to determine which of the implied tactics of these theorists are more ethical and which are not so that even in our teaching we can do God's will on earth as it is done in heaven.

Conclusion

In this paper we compare teaching to managing, suggesting that the theories of management that we teach can contribute to the teaching of students; we also examine a variety of management theorists and note some of the insights that they can provide for teaching and learning. In essence, our paper is about "walking the talk" in the classroom. It implies that teachers of management are more accountable for the way they teach because of the subject they teach. Management theorists have something to teach us about teaching. On the other hand, as Christians teaching management, we have to ask whether the assumptions underlying the theories of management we teach are themselves ethical. We argue in this paper that according to the Reformed notions of creation, fall,

redemption, and consummation, applying both Theory X and Theory Y assumptions to our students is appropriate. This is because humankind was created as working beings in the image of God, making Theory Y assumptions applicable. At the same time, with the fall of humanity work was cursed and as a result, many workers find it difficult to find the intrinsic rewards of work and respond only to extrinsic rewards, making Theory X assumptions applicable. But with the redeeming work of Jesus Christ in the world, there is again the possibility that humankind can attain at least partially the intended meaning of work as given by God in creation. However, at least one challenging question remains: Are the tactics implied by management theorists appropriate? Are some of these tactics more ethical than others?

As college professors who teach management or management students, we probably spend much more time reading about management than the art and craft of teaching. As we think more about teaching, management theory can offer important insights. In addition, as Christian professors, we are

> called to discern the norms of God's creational Word for our life in his world, illumined and directed by his Word in Scripture, under the regal authority of his Word incarnate, so that thus we may learn to "lead every thought captive in obedience to Christ" (Spykman, 1992, p. 84).

This means we must continually analyze the contributions of management theories for both the managing of workers and for the teaching of students. It means we must also analyze the tactics of these theories as well as their underlying assumptions. Any use of management theory for either management or education that does not take into account the reality of God's creative and redemptive work, as well as the influence of sin on creation, may fall short in its both its practical and moral application.

Works Cited:

Chickering, Alfred and Zelda Gamson (1987), "Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education," http://www.library.umass.edu/instruction/tips/teaching.html.

Cialdini, Robert (1988), *Influence: Science and Practice*, 2nd edition, Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Drucker, Peter (1993, original 1946), *The Concept of the Corporation*, New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publisher.

Drucker, Peter (1974), *Management: Tasks, Responsibilities, Practices*, New York: Harper and Row.

Drucker, Peter (1954), *The Practice of Management*, New York: HarperBusiness.

Goleman, Daniel (1995), *Emotional Intelligence*, New York: Bantam Books.

Goleman, Daniel, Richard Boyatzis, and Annie McKee (2002), *Primal Leadership*, Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Hardy, Lee (1990), *The Fabric of this World*, Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing.

Herzberg, Frederick (1968), "One More Time, How Do You Motivate Employees?" *Harvard Business Review*, January-February, pp. 117-135.

Kanigel, Robert (1997), *The One Best Way: Frederick Winslow Taylor and the Enigma of Efficiency*, New York: Penguin Books.

Kolb, David A. (1984), *Experiential Learning: Experience as a Source of Learning and Development*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Maslow, Abraham (1999), *Maslow on Management*

McGregor, Douglas (1960), *The Human Side of Enterprise*, New York: McGraw-Hill.

Monroe, Kent (1990), *Pricing: Making Profitable Decisions*, New York: McGraw-Hill.

Palmer, Parker (1990), "Good Teaching: A Matter of Living the Mystery," *Change*, Jan/Feb 1990, pp. 11-16.

Pfeffer, Jeffrey (1992), *Managing with Power*, Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Sayers, Dorothy (1947), *The Lost Tools of Learning*, New York: National Review. (For access, go to www.gbt.org/text/sayers.html.)

Senge, Peter (1990), *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization*, New York: Currency/Doubleday.

Spykman, Gordon (1992), *Reformational Theology: A New Paradigm for Doing Dogmatics*, Grand Rapids, MI: William. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Steen, Todd and Steve VanderVeen (2003), "Will There Be Marketing in Heaven?," *Perspectives*, November, 2003, pp. 6-11.

Steen, Todd, Steve VanderVeen, and Julie Voskuil, "Finance: On Earth As It Is In Heaven?," *Managerial Finance*, forthcoming, 2005.

Taylor, Frederick (1998, original 1911), *The Principles of Scientific Management*, Mineola, NY: Dover Publications.

Weimer, Maryellen (2005), *Learner-Centered Teaching*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.