

Psychology 7241 (Tuesdays)

Fall, 2024

Assignment: Into the Mouths of Babes (by James Traub; NYTimes Magazine 7/24/88)

Expected Due Date: October 22

Total size: three-page maximum double spaced. **If you email the paper** to me (rather than handing it in, in class), please send in some format **other than** Microsoft Word (such as a pdf document).

Throughout the ‘case’ described in the NY Times, Hoyvald & Lavery say and do ‘one thing’ while Licari, their subordinate, says and does ‘another thing’, as they are at odds with each other. The question to be addressed in this paper is: who did the “right” thing (acting **with** legitimacy and authority) and who did the “wrong” thing (acting **without** legitimacy and authority) in this case and why is this so? Who acted with authority and who acted without authority? Address these questions: first, **just** from Weber’s perspective and, then separately, **just** from Barnard’s perspective.

Hoyvald & Lavery, on the one hand, and Licari, on the other hand, engaged in a number of activities in this Beech-Nut case. Take the theoretical perspectives of Max Weber and Chester Barnard separately (with one and a half pages, maximum, for each of these 2 perspectives) and then (first for Weber and then for Barnard) do the following: name and evaluate the relevant actions of Hoyvald & Lavery and of Licari separately (with ½ of the one and a half pages maximum for each “character” from each of the two theoretical perspectives). How would Weber see these actions and why, in **his** ‘language’, would he say so? And then how would Barnard see these actions and why would he, in **his** ‘language’, say so? That is, in this case for Weber, what were some of the “important” actions of Hoyvald & Lavery, on the one hand, and Licari, on the other hand, and were those actions legitimate (i.e., **with** “authority” and “right”) or illegitimate (i.e., **without** “authority” and “wrong”)? And why would Weber say this is so (using the theory and language of his approach)? And then, do the same thing for Barnard and explain why would Barnard say this is so (using the theory and language of **his** approach)?

That is, for a page and a half maximum, adopt Weber’s perspective and assess the legitimacy of the actions of Hoyvald & Lavery and then separately of Licari (half a page or so each) and justify that assessment **in Weber’s “language.”** And then, for a page and a half maximum, do the same thing from Barnard’s point of view, using **his “language.”**

Do **NOT** address how one would go about fixing things (if they need to be fixed).

Do **NOT** address whether or not **YOU** think anyone in the case acted rightly or wrongly. Just provide an assessment of the legitimacy of the important actions as you might name and describe them from Weber’s versus Barnard’s point of view and their respective justifications for these assessments.

Just address, for Weber versus Barnard: what happened, who did the “right” (with authority) versus “wrong” (without authority) thing, and why this is so. There is **no need to provide a general ‘introduction’** at the beginning of your paper, generally summarizing the facts of this case. You can presume that I know the facts.