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Homicides Related to Drug Trafficking—

Homicides as a result of business disputes in the distribution of illegal drugs appears as a new subtype of homicide in the United States, report authors Heffernan, Martin, and Romano. In this exploratory study of 50 homicides in one police precinct in New York City noted for its high level of drug dealing, 42 percent were found to be "drug-related." When compared with non-drug-related homicides in the same precinct, the "drug-related" more often involved firearms and younger, male victims.

Management Theory Z: Implications for Correctional Survival Management—Increased work load and decreased budgets are realities facing correctional management during the remainder of the 1980's, asserts Dr. William G. Archambault of Louisiana State University at Baton Rouge. This means that fewer employees must be motivated to produce more and higher quality services. Faced with a similar dilemma, American business and industry have "discovered" Theory Z management and have demonstrated its pragmatic value. This article analyzes the utility of Theory Z in correctional organizations and outlines the steps necessary to implement this approach.

Making Criminals Pay: A Plan for Restitution by Sentencing Commissioners—Attorney Frederick R. Kellogg writes that the recent controversy over the insanity defense has focused public doubt over the criminal justice system. He highlights the need not for further tinkering but for wholesale reform. This recent proposal would classify offenses according to harm and enforce restitution in every case. It would sweep away the entire uncoordinated panoply of postconviction proceedings and replace them with a well-staffed sentencing commission of experienced trial judges whose assignment would be to assess the harm done by the offender and collect judgment to repay the victim and the state.
Management Theory Z: Implications for Correctional Survival Management

By WILLIAM G. ARCHAMBEAULT, PH.D.
Louisiana State University at Baton Rouge

In the present era of economic recession, budget cuts, reduced manpower, residual Proposition 13 fever among the taxpaying public, and the continued prospect of operating at or near capacity, American corrections must learn to manage limited resources more efficiently if it is to survive. American business is already starting to develop its own survival management model based on the study of Japanese management techniques which may provide American corrections with a framework for developing its own survival management model.

Slightly more than four decades ago, Mitsubishi Heavy Industries, Ltd., of Japan reforged American scrap metal and discarded aeronautical technology into the light weight, efficient, and now famous fighter plane, the Zero. Today, Japanese business and industry have reforged American management technology into another kind of light and efficient Z-fighter—Management Theory Z. Experts credit this Z with making it possible for Japanese industry to outpace and business to outsell American counterparts.

Management Theory Z is currently being exported back to the United States as an approach which offers to save the American business, industry, and economy. Major U.S. corporations—including GM, Rockwell International, Eli Lilly, among others—are investing hundreds of thousands of dollars researching and training management in Z theory. Ironically, top Japanese
executives candidly admit that they simply adopted American management technology to their own cultural and social values.2 Thenceforth, the Z-Theory is the ability to motivate workers—both Japanese and American—to achieve higher levels of productivity and to encourage employee personal commitment to the organization, as compared to more bureaucratic types of organizations. Z-theory organizations tend to be more flexible in adjusting to changing economic and business conditions, more cost-effective, require fewer numbers of employees to accomplish given targets, and have a more employee-oriented management style, rather than on the quality of the American worker.3

This article examines some of the basic tenets of Theory Z and their application to correctional management.

Understanding Management Theory Z and its Origins

In general, Theory Z is an organizational development (OD) model for restructuring, and managing an organization more efficiently; it is an American abstract framework and term which has recently been applied to the study of Japanese business organizations. Theory Z focuses on the importance of the social and cultural dimensions of the work environment and the use of these in establishing an environment which encourages worker personal commitment. The roots of Theory Z are founded in contemporary organizational management theory, although there appears to be some debate over who first employed the term. William Ouchi is credited with having "coined the term Theory Z" as a result of his extensive study of Japanese industry,4 although the author cares to carefully avoid making such claims in his own writings. In fact, reference to Theory Z and a statement of its basic assumptions appeared in a 1974 article by Lawrence Foss.5 Wrote Foss, "Theory Z stresses relations between the social and cultural dimensions of work and the individual life... through the medium of the social field... within the organization.6 Foss' central hypothesis was that effective organizational management had to be based on three dimensions: (1) concern for productivity which is also associated with McGregor's X theory of management; (2) concern for people (workers) which is associated with McGregor's Theory Y and (3) concern for the organization as a total social system which became the Z dimension. An effective and efficient organization must balance all three dimensions.

Both Ouchi and Foss were influenced by works of Herzberg, Likert, and other similar management theories in attempting to integrate such concepts as "spacehip world" and "cowboy management." Further, Foss' rationale included the notion that modern workers, born into an era of American economic affluency, could only be motivated by appealing to their sense of self-esteem and self-actualization. Foss' work on Z seems to have lost little impact on management theory or practice because it was too abstract and ideally stated.

Ouchi's management Theory Z, however, was founded on more conservative and easy to understand ideas which not only provided an abstract framework for explaining why Japanese corporations were so successful, but also provided a practical blueprint for reorganizing American businesses. The current management approach under Theory Z among American business and industry is that it produced positive results, in the United States as well as in Japan.7

Regardless of Theory Z's origins, it is an idea whose time has come. Theory may have some clear application to the problems of American correctional management.

Adapting Theory Z to American Correctional Management

The central task facing all correctional management today is that of making more efficient use of available resources. Employees, who are required to produce a greater volume and variety of services. Management Theory Z provides a framework for accomplishing these goals.

Theory Z, like all human systems in business and industry, must be modified in order to be adapted to any correctional organization. Adaptation must take into account the public, tax supported, and politically controlled nature of correctional organizations, as well as the reality that correctional goals are vague and measures of productivity are often unmeasurable and unquantifiable. All are problems which have historically plagued correctional management's evaluation of management efforts. On the other hand, the "human resources" nature of corrections and the particular degree of personal commitment to corrections work already held by corrections employees may well offset these problems. For the immediate future, American correctional management will be deprived of the option of employing increased economic incentives as rewards for correctional workers. Hence, more effective use of alternative incentives must be utilized.

To increase worker productivity, Theory Z directs that three essential management conditions must be achieved. First, management must increase the level of trust between worker and manager. Second, management must develop a holistic concern for the worker's welfare. Thirdly, management must develop an effective system of shared decisionmaking. These will be discussed below.

Developing Trust—Trust between management and worker is the essential, but missing, element which makes an American organization different from a Japanese one (as it is stated with the current management of American organizations. Trust is cultivated by management in a variety of ways. The most basic of these is that the worker is expected to make the example of good work habits for their employees, be flexible and demonstrate performance to perform different duties as needed by the organization, and share the burdens of increased workloads, salary cuts, or other unpleasant consequences of depressed economic conditions.

For correctional management, this means that, if parole officers are required to increase their caseloads, then supervisors must be willing to do the same. If correctional officers are expected to rotate among a variety of different posts or duty assignments, then managers must also be expected to police themselves and openly show disapproval of anyone abusing management's trust. Correctional management has more resources at its disposal to aid in developing a holistic approach toward workers than does business. Correctional workers—correctional officer, social worker, or probation officer—need some degree of what they are doing is important and that they are doing a good job. Hence, correctional workers by the nature of their work environment are especially receptive to a holistic approach in managing them. The nature of correctional work brings employees into daily contact with offenders who negatively reinforce the self-perception of "doing a good job." Hence, the need for positive reinforcement is especially strong. Trained management supervisors can provide the worker with rewards which money incentives cannot buy, which benefit both the worker and management, and which cost the worker's trust and personal commitment.

Developing Shared Decisionmaking—Historically, correctional management and administration have been founded on Weberian and Fayollean concepts of organization which tend to reject the notions of
shared decisionmaking in favor of centralized authoritarian decisionmaking. This is particularly true of custody institutions and state bureaucratic administrative organizations. Prior attempts towards forming management have not been generally successful in corrections.

However, the successful implementation of Theory Z requires that management must be willing to share decisionmaking with employees and increase the level of worker-manager interactions. Allowing workers to share in decisionmaking which directly affects them does not abrogate management's authority or prerogatives. Nor does it mean that employees have a voice in all decisionmaking or have the right to act contrary to management directives.

It does mean, however, that in all matters which directly affect the welfare of employees, they are assured of having input. For example, suppose a local correctional institution, operating to capacity, suffers budget cuts which will make it necessary to reduce personnel costs by some specified amount, say 7 percent. Suppose that the alternatives facing management are either to reduce the total number of presently filled positions by 7 percent or to spread the reduction among employees by having each employee work one day every other week, but not get paid for that day. The outcome of such a decision would likely require that management consult more closely with the affected employees, if they are allowed to participate in the decision and are presented with the fiscal evidence which justifies the necessity of such a serious action.

Shared decisionmaking, however, requires that management be involved in the group decisionmaking, thereby also requires a breakdown of unnecessary bureaucratic impersonality and social distance between worker and manager. In most American correctional organizations, especially in metropolitan areas, will respond to the reality of shared decisionmaking.

The following steps in implementation may occur in a different order than presented. However, all must be eventually satisfied if the management approach is to have any success.

Step 1: Read About Theory Z. - Ouchi notes that the first step to implementing Theory Z is to get managers to read and understand the works of the late management theorist, Tomichi Ouchi. In order to become familiar with the ideas and limitations of this approach to the end, additional references are provided at the end of the article.

Step 2: Get Top Management Involved. - The second step involves selling top management on the potential benefits of Theory Z. To have any chance of success, top management must be convinced and committed to the idea of implementing Theory Z on an organization-wide basis.

Step 3: Establish Union and Employee Leadership. - From the earliest stages of implementation, management should try to involve unions and employee representatives in the implementation of Theory Z. Traditional union diehards may initially be resistant to this nontraditional approach.

Step 4: Train Supervisors and Managers at All Levels. - The Theory Z approach to management can be successful only if it is implemented on an organization-wide basis. All supervisors and managers, not just a few first supervisors or mid-level managers, must be trained in the Z approach. Most correctional supervisors and managers will need extensive training in leading group shared decisionmaking, since many will initially be resistant to this nontraditional approach.

Step 5: Involve Unions and Employee Representation. - Policies written with sufficient discretion that supervisors and managers can adequately address the holistic concerns of workers. Are policies written in a way which fosters manager-worker interaction, trust, and teamwork? Obviously, where the answer to any of these questions is no, corrective action is required.

Step 6: Implement From the Top Down. - Planned implementation is necessary. To be successful, Theory Z must first be implemented in systematic phases from the top levels of the organization down through the various levels of the organization. Z organizations depend heavily on positive management leadership because, once in place, it stresses loyalty to superiors and to the organization as a whole.

Step 7: Step 8: Step 9: Step 10: - Involve Unions and Employee Representation. - From the earliest stages of management approaches that are faced with a seemingly impossible task under traditional bureaucratic forms of organization, a management approach, typically found in most American correctional agencies and institutions today.

Step 8: Establish Union and Employee Leadership. - From the earliest stages of implementation, management should try to involve unions and employee representatives in the implementation of Theory Z. Traditional union diehards may initially be threatened by the Theory Z approach since it orientes management to address the types of worker concerns, such as working conditions and stabilized employment, which are typically represented by union and collective bargaining interests. If management is committed to making Z work, however, such resistance will be quickly overcome once employees recognize management's sincerity.

Summary and Conclusion

Increased workload and decreased budgets are realities facing correctional management during the remainder of the 1980's. This means that few employees must be motivated to produce more and higher quality services. Without the availability of economic or promotional incentives, correctional managers are faced with a seemingly impossible task under traditional bureaucratic forms of organization. The following steps are a nontraditional approach.

Step 1: Read About Theory Z. - Ouchi notes that the first step to implementing Theory Z is to get managers to read and understand the works of the late management theorist, Tomichi Ouchi. In order to become familiar with the ideas and limitations of this approach to the end, additional references are provided at the end of the article.

Step 2: Get Top Management Involved. - The second step involves selling top management on the potential benefits of Theory Z. To have any chance of success, top management must be convinced and committed to the idea of implementing Theory Z on an organization-wide basis.

Step 3: Establish Union and Employee Leadership. - From the earliest stages of implementation, management should try to involve unions and employee representatives in the implementation of Theory Z. Traditional union diehards may initially be threatened by the Theory Z approach since it orientes management to address the types of worker concerns, such as working conditions and stabilized employment, which are typically represented by union and collective bargaining interests. If management is committed to making Z work, however, such resistance will be quickly overcome once employees recognize management's sincerity.