CHAPTER – 6

GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF MANAGEMENT

This can be discussed under three heads namely:

☆ Classical School of Management

☆ Neo-Classical School of Management or Human Relations School

☆ Classical School of Management:

This approach was developed through three main streams

☆ Scientific Management of F.W. Taylor (1856 - 1915)

☆ Administrative Management of Henry Fayol (1841 – 1925)

☆ Bureaucratic Management of Max Weber

☆ Principles of Classical organizational theory:

Henry Fayol (1841 – 1925) has stated fourteen general principles of management.

They are as follows:

⇒ Division of work: Division of work leads to specialization.

⇒ Authority and responsibility: The right to give orders and power to exact obedience. Authority leads to responsibility.

⇒ Discipline: It implies respect for agreements designed to secure obedience.

⇒ Unity of Command: Every employee must receive orders and be accountable only to one boss.

⇒ Unity of direction: There must be one head and one plan for the group of activities having the same objective.
⇒ Subordination of Individual to General Interest: When there is a conflict between the two, the interest of an organization prevails over the individual interest.

⇒ Remuneration of Personnel: It must be fair and just and must provide satisfaction to both the employer and the employee.

⇒ Centralization: The consolidation of the management function according to the circumstances surrounding the organization.

⇒ Scalar Chain: There must be a clear unbroken chain of authority and communication ranging from the top level of the organization to the lowest level.

⇒ Order: It is concerned with the arrangement of things and the placement of people. A place for everything and everything in its place is material order. A place for everyone and everyone in his place is social order.

⇒ Equity: Employees should be treated with justice and kindness.

⇒ Stability of Tenure of Personnel: Employees cannot work efficiently unless job security is assured to them.

⇒ Initiative: Initiative refers to the freedom to think for oneself and use discretion in doing work.

⇒ Esprit de corps: Union is strength and management should not follow the policy of divide and rule.
Fredric Winslow Taylor’s Scientific Management (1856 – 1915)

- Taylor gave the following principles of scientific management.
- By means of time and motion studies the standard time and standard way of performing each job was established.
- Co-operation not individualism: There must be co-operation between the management and the workers. The management will make more profits only when the workers work properly and increase production. On the other hand the workers will get more wages and better working conditions only when the management makes more profits. Therefore a complete mental revolution is required on the part of both the workers as well as the management.
- Maximum output and net restricted output:
- Scientific management aims at maximizing production because it will lead to reduction in cost and increase in profits.
- Scientific selection and training of workers: Workers must be selected for the jobs for which they are best suited.

Max Weber’s Bureaucratic Management

The German sociologist, Max Weber, evolved bureaucracy. It visualizes a machine model of organization characterized by a hierarchy of authority, web of rules and regulation and impersonal control over human beings

Neo Classical Theory Of Management or Behavioural Approach

Professor Elton Mayo is considered to be the father of the behavioural school of thought (i.e.) human relations. He conducted the famous Hawthorne experiments over a period of eight years. These experiments were
⇒ Illumination experiment
⇒ Relay assembly test room experiment
⇒ Mass interview programs
⇒ Bank working observation room experiment

These experiments revealed the overwhelming influence of social and physiological factors on employee morale and productivity. A new movement known as human relations movement emerged. The features of human relation school are:

⇒ An organization is a socio technical system
⇒ A wide range of factors influence interpersonal and group behaviour of people for organizations
⇒ There should be a fusion between organizational goals and human needs.
⇒ Several differences for the attitudes, perceptions and values of employees exist and influence their behaviour and performance.
⇒ Some degree of conflict may be inevitable and even desirable for organizations.
⇒ Human relation is motivating people in organizations in order to develop teamwork, which effectively fulfils their needs and achieves organizational goals.

**MODERN THEORY OF MANAGEMENT**

This can be discussed under two headings namely:

☆ System approach to management
☆ Contingency or situational approach
System Approach

An organization is a system consisting of several subsystems for example. Production department, Sales department, etc. are subsystems. All these subsystems are functionally interacting and interdependent. They are tied together in to an organic whole though goals, authority flows, resources flows and so on.

Contingency Approach

The basic theme of this approach is that organizations have to cope with different situations in different ways. There is no single best way of managing applicable to all situations. Management must therefore match or fit its approach to the requirements of the particular situation. The organization structure, the leadership style, the control system all should be designed to fit the particular situation. All the above schools of management can be found in Valmiki’s Ramayana abundantly.
VALMIKI AND SRI RAMA

Valmiki, the composer of Ramayana, himself was a master of human relations and psychology and his portrayal of characters reveal his remarkable insight into human nature. Sri Rama the central character in Ramayana is a perfect example to the world in practicing human relations. All the qualities required for the modern management are present in Rama.

Rama had learnt the art of conversing with people. He would listen patiently to others and make proper reply when questioned. Rama was trained by great teachers and would never forget what had been taught. Rama was greatly attached to his father's subjects and the people of Ayodhya loved him. Rama had conquered the greatest enemy, anger. Rama knew how to keep his thoughts to himself. He would not talk about any tasks, which he had undertaken until it was completed. Rama was a sincere friend, compassionate and would always sympathize with anyone in trouble. Rama was wise to the proper use of wealth as to when it should be acquired and when it should be spent.

Rama was fully conscious of his own shortcomings and that of others. Rama knew how to act according to situations in which he found himself. Rama would always find new ways of doing things. Rama firmly believed that adherence to dharma was only pathway of Artha, Kama and Moksha. Rama had never been known to speak a word, which did not befit any situation. He was well-versed in the shastras, fine arts and archery. Above all he had studied the nature of man well, man and his behaviour and the variation of the nature in its various aspects. Rama was handsome, pleasing and charming to look at. He was never affected by the sway of emotions.

Rama was always bent at honouring elders and scholars. Various incidents in Ramayana indicate situational approach to management. The alliance between Rama and Sugreeva is an example. Both of them had their own problems, but could not solve them individually. Therefore a friendship was forged between them to help each other and make the best of situation.
In the Aranya Kandam when Rama lived in exile in Dandaka Forest, the Rishis and holy men requested him to protect them from the troubles given to them by the evil Rakshasas, as he is their king. Rama studies the situation carefully and makes up his mind to protect the Rishis in the forest. Sita admonishes Rama on this issue by pointing out that hurting someone who has not affected one in any manner is the worst of all sins. But Rama explained to Sita that protecting the virtuous and destroying the evil was his duty. Rama wanted to make Dandaka a safe and happy place for the Rishis and holy people and tame animals. Henri Fayol’s principles of management can be noticed in the Valmiki’s Ramayana. Authority is one of the principles given by Fayol. In Ramayana Sugreeva and Ravana practice formal school of authority. King Dasaratha is the example of competence school of authority. Hierarchy (Scalar Chain) was strictly followed by Dasaratha, Sugreeva and Ravana.

There is both material and social order in the kingdom of Dasaratha. The country was prosperous, the earth was fertile and productive and rainfall was measured and periodical. Taxes were not unjust. Dasaratha had eight different ministers to advice him in different areas properly. Rama could have easily remained in Ayodhya and overruled Kaikeyi’s desire. But he wanted to be an ideal son, a model to the world. Therefore he agrees to go the Dandaka Forest for a period of fourteen years. This is similar to the principle of subordination of individual interest to general interest. Whenever there is a conflict between the two the interest of organization should prevail over the individual’s interest.
TIME MANAGEMENT

It is very popular in modern management. Time management means making the best use of time at our disposal.

- Yesterday is a cancelled cheque.
- Tomorrow is a promissory note.
- Today is ready cash, use it.

Effective time management consists of the following

A number of tasks are assigned to us, which we are expected to complete satisfactorily in a specified time period. Effective time management means that we are able to complete the tasks to the satisfaction of all persons concerned. It also means that work is completed in a tension free atmosphere.

- Time is a valuable resource, which once lost can neither be retrieved nor replaced.
- Time management may also be described as eliminating wastage and maximizing efficiency.

Factors responsible for wastage of time

- Working in a unplanned manner
- Failure to set priorities
- Doing too many things at same the time
o Failure to delegate

o Procrastination (i.e.) delaying.
RAMA

Time management is found in many places of Valmiki's Ramayana. Rama is the best example for effective time management. Even in his youth Rama had never wasted a single moment and used to do everything at the proper time.

Rama spent his period of exile in the Dandaka Forest very effectively. The Rishis of Dandaka Forest seek Rama's protection as the Rakshasas were frequently harassing and killing them. Rama decides to protect them and in the process he kills Khara, Dushana, and all the fourteen thousand warriors at Janasthana. Rama who was welcomed everywhere in the forest would spend his time in several ashrams. In some places they spent ten months and in some places one year. Several ashrams hosted him for four months and thus in different places he spent nearly ten months.
PANCHAVATI

Even at Panchavati, Rama Sita and Laxmana spent their time effectively. They spent their time adhering to a routine and wandering in the near by forest. They were happy, they would bathe daily in the river Godavari, worship the sun and recite verses in the praise of gods whom they worshipped. When Hanuman meets Sita in the Sundara Kandam, Sita informs him that time is very important. This was because there were only two months for Sita to remain alive. Ravana had already given twelve months time to decide and already ten months were over. Hanuman inspired Sita by pointing out that Rama will very soon reach Lanka with his army of monkeys and bears and rescue Sita. This is another incident of time management in Ramayana. The building of bridge to Lanka in the Yuddha Kandam is another example of time management in Ramayana. The bridge was built in an amazingly short period of 5 days.
BUILDING OF THE BRIDGE NALASETHU

Nala\(^2\), a vanara, and the son of Viswakarma (the architect of devas) was an expert in the art of building and was assigned the job of building the bridge to Lanka. Nala informs Rama that there is nothing like the method of Danda to get one's work done. It is the most rewarding of all the methods and is the best rule to be adopted. Nala instructs the vanara army to collect the materials needed for the bridge. The vanaras were excited and they worked under the direction and command of Nala. Fourteen yojanas had been built on the first day and twenty on the next. The bridge was built in five days and the mountain by name Suvela formed the other end of the bridge.
Notes and References

1. Management and Organisation – C.B.Gupta, Part I, Chapter 4, Page 1.72

2. Nala - the architect among the vanaras since he was the son of Viswakama. He was responsible for the building of the bridge across the ocean and the bridge is named Nalasethu after him.
KAUTILYA

I. INTRODUCTION
Kautilya, also known as Chanakya or Vishnugupta, was a great scholar who played a dominant role in founding and growth of the Indian empire during the fourth century B.C. He was also an advisor, minister and king-maker who helped overthrow the Nanda dynasty and place Chandragupta Maurya on the throne of Magadha in 321 B.C.

KAUTILYA'S MAJOR WORK

Arthasastra. Kautilya's Arthasastra, a scholarly treatise is claimed to have been written in the period 321-296 B.C. Some historians place the work between first and third centuries A.D. The work, consisting of fifteen adhikaranas or books, attempts to set forth general principles and detailed rules for the administration of a despotic State.

Book I is concerned with education and duties and qualities of a king, the appointment of ministers and other executive officials; Book II exhibits a picture of State activities in different fields; Book III sets forth a code of law; Book IV is concerned with suppression of crime; Book V is devoted to the methods of recruitment, training and grades of salaries of State employees; Book VI gives an introduction to the State's relations with its neighbour; Book VII is devoted to the tactics of foreign policy; Book VIII deals with calamities and certain other matters; Book IX deals with matters related to the preparation for war; Book X deals with fighting; Books XI, XII and XIII are concerned with problems related to conquest; Book XIV presents occult practices; and Book XV describes methods of dealing with a study subject. Out of fifteen, books I, II, V and VI deal with the pattern of public administration. In brief the Arthasastra concerns political, social and economic management of the State. It is a work on the organization and management of human affairs.

Meaning of Arthasastra: According to Kautilya, "Arthasastra" is the study which deals with the problem of "acquiring and maintaining the earth". The word "Arthasastra" consists of (i) 'artha' which is akin to economics, and (ii) 'sastra' to politics. It means "Arthasastra" is the combination of the
science of Wealth and the science of Government. The first constituent—the science of wealth—is of great value. Kautilya says: "It is by means of the treasury and the army obtained solely through Varta that the king can hold under his control both his and his enemy's party." Referring to the importance of the second constituent, Kautilya says: "It is on the science of Government that the course of the progress of the world depends."

II. APPLICATION OF PRINCIPLES

In his Arthasastra, Kautilya attempts to set forth general principles for the machinery of the administration and State. These principles can be grouped in two sets, one dealing with the State and the second with the machinery of the administration.

The first set of principles encompassing authority, responsibility, duty, and discipline, reflects the sovereignty of the State. The second set of principles encompassing division of labour, coordination, speciality, hierarchy and equity, governs the actual method of work of the administration.

The principle of authority is the essence of the State. "Thus people consisting of four castes and four orders of religious life, when governed by the king with his sceptre, will keep to their respective paths, ever devotedly adhering to their respective duties and occupations." Authority is obeyed by the people on account of sanctions backed by a series of punishments. Kautilya avers: "For punishment, when awarded with due consideration, makes the people devoted to righteousness and to works productive of wealth and enjoyment, while punishments, when ill-awarded under the influence of greed and anger or owing to ignorance excites fury even among hermits and ascetics dwelling in forests, not to speak of householders." Severe fines and punishments must be meted out for errors and carelessness.

The unity of command and direction is maintained because of King's authority. So that the king is able to exercise authority vested with him, he must take care to secure his person from external dangers. Not merely for the purpose of security of the King's person, but also for the purpose of maintaining security, integrity and stability of administration against the
dangers of internal dissension and external aggression, Kautilya outlines an elaborate system of spying and allurements. On the death of the king, Kautilya does not favour usurpation of royal power of the minister. He says: "But it is unrighteous to do an act which excites popular fury; nor is it an accepted rule."

Kautilya says that fear, duty and interest are the three main motivators behind the act of obedience of the orders of administration. He emphasizes the need on securing cooperation of the people as well as of the bureaucracy in carrying out orders of administration. People's cooperation could be secured by giving positive financial help to the needy and distressed, so also by ensuring just treatment to the people in administrative and economic matters. Government employees are to be enthused by granting them promotion in salary, pension, financial and other kinds of help.

In his discussion of administration, Kautilya lays down a series of qualities, differing in number and order, for officers holding different positions of responsibility. His job specification for a State officer covers many of today's demands.

Native born of high family, influential, well trained in arts, possessed of foresight, wise, of strong memory, bold, eloquent, skilful, intelligent, possessed of enthusiasm, dignity, and endurance, pure in character, affable, firm in loyal devotion, endowed with excellent conduct, strength, health and bravery, free from procrastination and fickle-mindedness, affectionate, and free from such qualities as excite hatred and enmity—these are the qualifications of a ministerial officer.

Kautilya also prescribes the principle of responsibility not only for the king but also for the government officers. To quote famous dictum in Arthasastra: "In the happiness of his subjects lies his happiness, in their welfare his welfare.....the king is, as it were, the aggregate of the people."

The second set of principles—division of labour, coordination, speciality, hierarchy—governs the machinery of administration. The principle of division of labour is fundamental for the smooth and efficient working of
the machinery of government. Kautilya says that "sovereignty is possible only with assistance." Hence the king "shall employ ministers, and hear their opinion." The principle of coordination evolves out of the principle of division of labour. The principle of hierarchy is followed to make coordination and division of labour possible. According to remuneration there are more than seven rungs of officers, the highest officer drawing 4800 panas per annum, and the lowest below 1000 panas per annum. There is little description as to inter-relation- ships between different officers.

III. STRUCTURE OF THE MACHINERY OF GOVERNMENT

The description on the machinery of government is the most important part of Arthasastra. At the top of the structure of the machinery of government is the king who is the supreme executive of the land. In the discharge of his duties, the king "shall employ ministers, and hear their opinion." "These ministers shall have to consider all that concerns the parties of both the king and his enemy," and shall be individually and collectively responsible to the king. The Prime Minister, the High Priest and with one or two additions they might form an inner cabinet. It is this inner cabinet which assists the king to examine the character of ministers appointed in government departments. In times of emergency, Kautilya asks the king to consult the Council of Ministers—a body larger than the inner cabinet.

In the management of domestic affairs, Kautilya points out the difficulty of finding men of high character to serve as ministers and other officials. Men "are naturally fickle-minded and exhibit constant change in their temper." They are apt to be disloyal and to plot rebellion.

In his discussion of the structure of the machinery, he counts the High Priest, the Prime Minister, the Commander of the Army, Treasure-General, the Collector-General, the teacher, and the sacrificial priest as the important ministers. In the hierarchy of officers, Kautilya attaches importance to superintendent, lower in position than the ministerial officer and belonging to the sixth order according to remuneration. He is not head of the department; he is the chief of the section dealing with varied
economic and administrative activities of the government. An excerpt from his job description for superintendent of commerce is given below: "The superintendent of commerce shall ascertain demand or absence of demand for, and rise or fall in the price of various kinds of merchandise which may be the products either of land or of water, and which may have been brought in either by land or by waterpath. He shall also ascertain the time suitable for their distribution, centralisation, purchase, and sale." He is under a dual control. He is under the Collector-General for the services of the personnel and collection of revenue. But in the matter of supply of produced and collected commodities and articles, he is accountable to the Treasurer-General. In addition he is directly under the control of the king to which all officers are finally subject.

The functions of the government have been arranged according to services required by people. They seem to have been arranged horizontally. Under the Collector-General are the Commissioner, the District Officer, and the Circle Officer, in charge of a division, a district and a circle of villages, respectively.

In his discussion of the administration of the State, Kautilya covers finance of the State, defense of the State, personnel, public works, urban affairs, and law and order and much more.

The Finance Department

The Finance Department in Arthasastra includes three officers: (i) the Collector-General of ministerial level in charge of revenue collection; (ii) the Treasurer-General of ministerial level in charge of treasury; (iii) the Superintendent of accounts much below the ministerial level according to remuneration. Both the Collector-General and the Treasury-General are independent, the former controlling revenue collection and the latter controlling supplies of expenditure. Both exercise control over superintendents of several sections. Both the accounts and audit are looked after by the superintendent of accounts who is under the collector-general.

The king is required to personally attend to the accounts of receipts and expenditure. He is also expected to listen to the narrative of the whole of actual accounts pertaining to each department from the minister concerned.
The Home Department

The Home Department consists of a minister (duty not mentioned), the doorkeeper and the superintendent (takes care of personal safety of the king), the superintendent of country parts and boundaries (partakers defense duties), the superintendent of passports (issues passes to those who want to leave or enter the country) and the Superintendent of pasturelands (protects forests, arrests thieves to secure safety of traffic, protects cows, and also keeps roads in repair). The Collector-General, like the Deputy Commissioner of today also performs magisterial function.

The Defence Department

The Defence Department is headed by the Senapati but he is not the commander. Under his supervision, there are two branches. To the defence forces branch belong the commander, the chief constable in charge of infantry, the chiefs of elephants, cavalry and chariots, physicians of the army, and trainers of horses. The defence supplies branch consists of superintendents of infantry, cavalry, chariots and elephants, and guards of elephant forests.

Administration of Law

Administrative courts consisting of three persons proficient in Dharmastra and three ministerial officers in the administration of law, are referred to in Arthasastra. A hierarchy of courts from the court of a group of ten villages rising up to the king's court is presented in Kautilya's work. It is not clear whether the king personally or the Chief Justice presides over the supreme court.

Sacred laws (dharma), evidence (vyavahara), history (charitra) and edicts of kings (sasasana) are said to be the four bases of law. In case of conflict, edicts of kings are to override the other bases. Under the law, slavery is legitimate.

Arthasastra also contains references to code of law. The code is set forth under seventeen heads including marriage, property, slaves and labourers, forcible seizure of an object, physical injury, theft, defamation, assault, etc.

The Foreign Affairs Department
References are also made in Arthasastra to envoy, charge d'affaire and conveyor of royal and their duties. The duties of an envoy (such as transmission, maintenance of treaties, issue of ultimatum, gaining of friends) are looked at in Arthasastra more from the point of view of advancing the war-and-peace policy of the country rather than of advancing the cause of country in economic, social and cultural aspects. Foreign policy consists of adjustments in the various concentric rings.

Social Welfare Activities
Chapter 1 of Book I details many activities of social welfare in which the government ought to take interest. Kautilya writes that the king should provide the orphans, the aged, the helpless women, the infirm, the afflicted, and the helpless with maintenance. The king is under an obligation to carry out injunctions about social and economic justice in Dharmasastras and customs among the people. The departments in the charge of the superintendents of a slaughter-house, of prostitutes, of liquor, and of weaving are social welfare departments.

Public Works and Stores
Housing in villages, cities and forts and town planning has been a special care of government in Kautilya's work. An important officer for public works is the sannidhata (the Chamberlain). He is to build and maintain important state buildings. "The sannidhata shall build the treasury, the house of saleable commodities, the house of the produce of the land, the house of forest produce, the armoury and the jail." He also has overall responsibility for the safe-keeping and storage of all State wealth-cash and kind. The work also attaches significance of administrative architecture in the context of the construction of harem and of buildings in forts.

The number of departments mentioned in Arthasastra is exhaustive. Each department is again subdivided into sections. For example, under the Treasurer-General, there are officers (coordinating the work of clerks), clerks (drafting and noting) and servants (performing merely physical work). Functions in sections seem to have been arranged horizontally, that is, according to subjects.

He attaches importance to statistics also. The district and circle officers are asked to collect a variety of statistics regarding lands and other property, families and persons. He decries retrenchment of expenditure on
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'profitable works'. He advocates frequent meetings between the king and members of public as he is alive to the evils of bureaucratization. In his description of business departments, Kautsiya makes references to the laws of supply and demand and to other business methods.

**Personnel Administration**

In the administration of domestic affairs, Kautsiya emphasizes the difficulty of men of high calibre to serve as officials. He attaches more attention to the higher officials for the fact that they are invested with more authority and responsibility than the lower officials. The officials in the higher rungs are expected to possess intellectual, moral and physical qualities. There is little about the education, training and qualities to be possessed by the lower officials except that they should be incorruptible and good at work. Nothing is said in detail about the grades of each category of personnel, training after recruitment, methods of promotion, leave, pension and superannuation. Recruitment of those getting 1000 panas per annum seems to be made by the king assisted by the higher priest and the Prime Minister. Superintendents are vested with the power to regulate the salaries, transfer and appointments of the servants under him getting 100 to 1000 panas per annum. Transfer of personnel is suggested as a precaution and a remedy against misappropriation of government money. He does not favour the transfer of employees employed in guarding royal buildings, forts and country parts.

Each government employee is subject to punishment if he is found corrupt, disloyal and harassing to the people. A code of conduct to be observed by government servants, of course, figures in Arthasastra. Although Arthasastra does not prescribe rules of pension for retired employees, pensions to sons and wives of those servants who die in harness are allowed. "The fundamental principle which Kautsiya wants the king 'to observe is that he should look to the bodily comforts of his servants by providing such emoluments as could infuse in them the spirit of enthusiasm to work.'"
Government’s servants do not seem to come within the purview of the courts of law if they violate rules in administration. But for breach of law in their private conduct, he can, of course, be tried by courts of law. Kautiyya gives great attention to the education and training of the king and the princes. Kautiyya’s approach is more practical. One of his principles in the training of princes is the selection of mature and learned men. In the morning he should receive training in military science. The second half can be divided between the “sacred canon”, philosophy, economics and politics. The prince shall also learn self-discipline and self-control “at first from the teachers” and afterwards, he shall constantly associate with those of mature learning.

IV. Conclusion

Kautiyya’s Arthasastra is a comprehensive treatise that attempts to set forth general principles and detailed rules to be applied to specific problems of government. Dealing with a large variety of subjects, it covers almost every aspect of the public administration—duties of the king, his ministers and his councillors, diplomats, organization and management of agriculture, trade, commerce, law and law courts, municipal government, factories, markets, social customs, marriage and divorce, rights of women, census operations, and so on.

Because of his contempt for morality and human compassion as is evident from Arthasastra, Kautiyya’s name has become synonymous with sinister and unscrupulous administration. His approach is no different from that of Machiavelli which laid stress on unscrupulous practices that ought to be followed for political success in the future. Kautiyya’s Arthasastra, therefore, is a sincere attempt at scientific enquiry which deals with the organization and management of human affairs of the State.

MAX WEBER AND BUREAUCRATIC THEORY

I. INTRODUCTION

Among the pioneers of administrative thought, Max Weber (1864-1920) is regarded as the greatest scholar. Born of an upper middle class family in Germany in 1864, Max Weber completed preliminary education in 1882 and joined law study at the University of Heidelberg.
Eventful Years _ I

1891: Initially he was appointed as an instructor in law at the University of Berlin and completed his work on "Roman Agrarian History and its significance for Public and Private Law" in 1891.

1894-1920: In 1894, he was appointed Professor of Economics at Fidelburg University and after two years he accepted a position at the University of Heidelberg.

He remained an academic for the rest of his life, having great interest in the methodological controversies of the social sciences as in the political controversies of his time and country.

**Weber's Major Works**

1. **The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism (1904).**
   This is a volume dealing with sociology of religion, published by Alien & Unwin in London in 1930.


3. **From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology**: This work comprising different sections from The Theory of Economic and Social Organization, along with representative selections from Weber's other works, have been made available by editors H.H. Gerth and C.W. Mills. This work has been published by Routledge and Kegan Paul in 1948.

4. **Wirtschaft and Gesellschaft (Economics and Society)**: Unfinished at his death, this work depicts the development of western rationality through the instrumentalities of capitalism, science and bureaucracy. Also unfinished at the time of his death were the lectures published in English under the title of General Economic History.

**II. WEBER'S TYPOLOGY OF AUTHORITY**

(1') **Legitimacy:** Weber's most widely acknowledged contribution to the study of organizations has been his theory of authority. He was concerned with the distribution of power among the organizational positions in the bureaucratic structure. His concern was as to why individuals obey
commands. To deal with this problem Weber made a distinction between power and authority.

An organization, according to Weber, is a bureaucracy which sets norms and orders which must be obeyed if the organization is to function effectively. To that extent, an organization can rely on its power to make the individual obey. The exercise of power, however, has a major limitation. It keeps the subject, as he conforms, alienated. On the other hand, when the exercise of power gets legitimation—that is when the orders issued or rules set conform to the values to which the subjects are committed—compliance will be more effective. The subject will internalize the orders and rules.

Weber uses (1) power to refer to the ability to force people to obey orders; (2) legitimation to refer to the acceptance of the exercise of power because it conforms to the values held by the subjects; and (3) authority to refer to the combination of the two—that is, to power which is viewed as legitimate.

(ii) Authority: Under an authority system, orders are voluntarily obeyed by subordinates. They see the issuing of orders by those in the superordinate role as "legitimate". Weber's concept of authority is based on the legitimation and not on power. He distinguishes three pure types of legitimate authority: "traditional", "charismatic" and "rational-legal" authority, each of which is expressed in an organization.

1. Traditional Authority

Traditional authority rests on "an established belief in the sanctity of immemorial traditions and the legitimacy of the status of those exercising authority under them." The mode of exercising authority is based on precedent and usage. New rules are not enacted, they are found. The ruler or a leader in such a system has authority by virtue of the status that he has inherited, and the extent of his authority is fixed by custom or usage.

The organizational form under a traditional authority system can be either (i) patrimonial or (ii) feudal. Under the patrimonial form, the officials are personal servants who depend on their ruler for remuneration. But under the feudal form, the officials have much more autonomy with
their own sources of income. Although Weber gives examples from the historical past, his insight is equally applicable to modern organizations. Managerial positions and appointments in private firms are still justified in terms of hereditary transmission (from father to son) rather than on the basis of a rati ground.

2. Charismatic Authority

Charismatic authority rests on "devotion to the specific and exceptional sanctity, heroism or exemplary character of an individual person...." In other words the mode of exercising authority is based on the personal qualities of the leader. Weber used the Greek term Charisma to mean exceptional, supernatural or superhuman qualities of a ruler or individual's personality. This is the position of the prophet, the warrior chieftain, or political leader. Those who submit to this authority are followers, not subjects. In this type of authority, the question of succession arises on the death of a leader. Even if the leader himself nominates his successor, he may not be accepted. The only basis of legitimacy is personal charisma, so long as it receives recognition. Mahatma Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru, Mahatma Buddha, etc. are some examples of charismatic leaders.

3. Legal Authority

Legal authority rests on "a belief in the legality of patterns of normative rules and the right of those elevated to authority under such rules to issue commands...." Under this system, obedience is given to the rules. It is legal because authority is exercised by means of a system of rules, norms and procedures through the office which an individual holds at a particular time. For such an organization Weber uses the term 'bureaucracy'. He hailed "monocratic bureaucracy" as "capable of attaining the highest degree of efficiency."

As compared to legal authority, the other two types of authority place major obstacles in the way of rational action. Thus Weber refers to legal authority as legal-rational authority.

Weber suggests that to be effective and efficient as an organization, a modern organizational structure needs bureaucratic authority. Charismatic authority relations lack specialization or stability. On the other hand traditional authority relations are typically found in a diffuse status
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structure, as for example in an aristocracy. Hence, bureaucracies are the social units most suited for modern organizations.

III. THE BUREAUCRATIC STRUCTURE CHARACTERISTICS
The most rational form of organization is the pure bureaucracy. Weber does not define the term 'bureaucracy'. He only describes its characteristics. To Weber, bureaucracy is "an administrative body of appointed officials", and "it is superior to any other form in precision, in stability, in the stringency of its discipline, and in its reliability. It thus makes possible a particularly high degree of calculability of results for the heads of organizations and for those acting in relation to it. It is finally superior both in intensive efficiency and in the scope of its operations, and is formally capable of applications to all kinds of administrative tasks."

1. Bound by Rules
A pure bureaucracy functions in accordance with abstract rules. Although the bureaucrats may be immune from such rules in their personal affairs, there is systematic control over their official actions. A system of rules facilitates standardization and equality in the treatment of many cases. It also excludes the intervention of personal discretion and emotions.

2. A Sphere of Competence
According to Weber, a specific sphere of competence involves "(a) a sphere of obligations to perform functions which have been marked off as part of a systematic division of labor; (b) the provision of the incumbent with the necessary authority to carry out these functions; (c) that the necessary means of compulsion are clearly defined and their use is subject to definite conditions."

Thus a systematic division of labour, power and responsibility defined by administrative regulations, are essential for the functioning of a rational organization. Not only must each office holder know his job and have the necessary authority to carry it out, but he also must know the limits of his job, obligations and power so as not to undermine the organizational structure.

3. Principle of Hierarchy
Weber observes: "The organization of office follows the principle of hierarchy; that is, each lower office is under the control and supervision of a higher one." This means that every subordinate in the administrative hierarchy is accountable to his superior for his actions.

4. Need of Specialized Training
"The rules which regulate the conduct of an office may be technical rules or norms. In both cases, if their application is to be fully rational, specialized training is necessary." According to Weber the root of the authority of the bureaucrat is his knowledge and skill.

5. Impersonal Detachment
"It is a matter of principle that the members of the administrative staff should be completely separated from ownership of the means of production or administration.... There exists, furthermore, in principle, complete separation of the property belonging to the organization, which is controlled within the spheres of the office, and the personal property of the official...."

Further there has to be a complete absence of appropriation of official position by the office holder. These personal separation from the organization would enhance the organizational efficiency, and prevent the office holder from misusing his position. The ideal administrator performs the functions in a spirit of formalistic impersonality, that is without affection or enthusiasm.

6. Keeping Records
Another principle of bureaucracy is that the "administrative acts, decisions, and rules are formulated and recorded in writing." Weber stresses the need of maintaining a systematic interpretation of norms and enforcement of rules which cannot be maintained through oral communication.

7. Career Service
Weber's bureaucratic structure provides for (a) payment of salaries in accordance with responsibility as well as social status, (b) promotions and career advancement on the basis of both seniority and achievement, and (c) appeal and grievance machinery. Service in a bureaucratic organization constitutes a career. Consequently the employees identify
themselves with the organization and this prompts them to work for the organization's productivity.

According to Weber the bureaucratic form is "capable of attaining the highest degree of efficiency." Further he says that the structure inherent in an organization makes the bureaucratic form of administration a system far superior to any other as regards its accuracy, stability, strict discipline and reliability. Thus Weber's bureaucratic form of organization creates conditions that make every official act only in accordance with the "rational aims of the organization as a whole."

8. The Non-bureaucratic Head

Organizations which Weber refers to as bureaucracies have non-bureaucratic heads. The non-bureaucratic head sets the rules to be followed, and decides which goals are to be served by the administrative staff. Although the bureaucrats are recruited and appointed, the non-bureaucratic or political head (President, Prime Minister, Minister, etc.) is often elected or inherits his position.

These political or non-bureaucratic heads perform an important activity in helping to maintain the emotional commitment to the rules of the organization.

IV. A CRITICAL EVALUATION Criticism

In recent years Weber's bureaucratic form of organization has become the subject of some serious criticism.

1. Peter Blau says that Weber's model explains the social structure only through the functions of its elements. It does not investigate into disturbances or "dysfunctions" that various elements produce in the structure of an organization. Blau points out that Weber could not recognize that "...the same factor that enhances efficiency in one respect often threatens it in another; it may have both functional and dysfunctional consequences." Blau feels that a fresh look has to be taken at the concept of rational administration. In a fast changing environment "the attainment of organizational objectives depends on perpetual change in the bureaucratic structure." According to Blau, efficiency in administration can
be secured only when an individual is allowed to identify with the purposes of the organization and to adopt his behaviour to his perception of changing circumstances.

2. A close examination of Weber’s model shows that it contains some contradictions, (a) The two principles “impersonal detachment” and “esprit de corps”, which according to Weber achieve administrative efficiency, are incompatible, since if the relations between the administrative staff are dictated by impersonal detachment, it becomes difficult to see how an esprit de corps can emerge, (b) Likewise, rigid adherence to the principle of hierarchical relations between the superiors and subordinates gives rise to mutual suspicion, as the latter tends to conceal defects in their work and interfere with the upward flow of information, (c) Similarly there is a contradiction between the systems of promotion according to seniority and according to merits which again cannot fail to reflect on the hierarchically built relations, (d) Philip Selznick pointing to the division of functions, shows how sub-units set out goals of their own which may contradict with the purposes of the organization as a whole. Critics, like Gouldner feel that Weberian model does not include the orientations of members in relation to the rules in organization. This model ignores the human touch.

3. Weber’s bureaucratic form of organization based strictly on formalistic structure is criticized by Chester Barnard and Simon. According to Barnard, “informal organizations are necessary to the operation of formal organizations.” Blau also maintains that “informal relations and unofficial practices often contribute to efficient operation.”

4. Philip Selznick also criticizes Weberian model for its neglect of the treatment to power which a bureaucrat assumes in the organization whereby he is “increasingly preoccupied with his own social position and in the end subverts the professed goals of the organization by concentrating only on his own power position.” Further in a democratic country like India, it becomes difficult for a bureaucrat to remain impersonal in the face of growing personal needs.

4. Joseph LaPalombara believes that Weberian bureaucracy “may be a less efficacious instrument of economic change.” Citing an example of
India, he adds that "in a place like India, public administrators steeped in
the tradition of the Indian Civil Service may be less useful as development
entrepreneurs than those who are not so rigidly tied to motions of
bureaucratic status, hierarchy, and impartiality." The bureaucratic model,
developed by Weber, predominates in the business practice of the
capitalist world.

Conclusion
Despite all the differences previously noted, Max Weber's model of
bureaucratic form of organization has gained widespread recognition in the
practice of organization both in developed and developing countries. His
model continues to influence the development of modern organization and
administration.

Weber correctly maintains that "a fully developed bureaucratic
administration stands in the same relationship to non-bureaucratic forms
as machinery to non-mechanical modes of production." According to
Weber, the bureaucratic form makes the members of the administrative
staff work efficiently when they possess the requisite skills and know-how,
and use them rationally.

Weber's bureaucratic model has been criticized against its stress on
formalism. However, it has been rightly added by Albrow that "the formal
rationality has increased manifold in the present day administration.
Thanks to the advancement of management techniques."8

Weber's principles on bureaucratic form of organization have been
subjected to severe criticism, but it would be wrong to look upon them only
from strictly negative positions. Some of his principles tend to rationalize
the functioning of public organizations.

Most studies of formal features of organizations after the Second World
War have started from the work of Max Weber. Weber, undoubtedly,
appears to be the source of inspiration for the scholars of bureaucracy.
Weber's importance lies in having made the first attempt to produce
systematic categories for organizational analysis.9 Bendix observes : "In
the present era of scientific specialization, he (Weber) appears already like
a man of the Renaissance, who took all humanity for his province11."
I. INTRODUCTION

Luther Gulick and Lyndall Urwick are the prominent administrative thinkers of the "classic" theory of the management. Both of them have made substantial contributions to the development of administrative thought. Their work crystallizes the similar concepts and principles that have been independently developed, thereby giving them more credence and making them more unified to serve as a system of management thought.

Their edited book titled *Papers on the Science of Administration* (1937) is considered to be a significant contribution in the development of the science of administration. In this book, they have attempted to demonstrate that the body of knowledge about management is sufficiently large to make it more scientific, more unified field than was commonly supposed.

Luther Gulick

Born in Osaka, Japan in 1892, Luther Halsey Gulick studied at Columbia University from where he obtained his Ph.D. degree in 1920. In 1954 he was conferred the LL.D. degree. He held many positions. He served on the National Defence Council during the First World War. During 1954-56, he held the post of Administrator at New York city. He was associated with the Institute of Public Administration, New York for over 60 years, first as its President, and later as its Chairman from 1962-1982. He was a member of the President's Committee on Administrative Management, besides a consultant in administration for several countries.

Gulick’s Major Works

1. *Administrative Reflections on World War II* (1948);

2. *Metropolitan Problems and American Ideas*;

3. *Modern Management for the City of New York*;


Lyndall Urwick
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Lyndall Urwick, on the other hand, was born in Britain in 1891, who majored in history at Oxford University. During the First World War, he was a Lieutenant Colonel in the British Army. Urwick was an outstanding consultant on industrial management, and was associated with a number of International Management Associations. He held the post of Director of the International Management Institute in Geneva also.

**Urwick's Major Works**

2. *Management of Tomorrow* (1933)
3. *The Elements of Administration* (1944)
5. *Notes on the Theory of Organization* (1952)
7. *The Pattern of Management* (1956);
8. *A short Survey of Industrial Management* (1957);

In addition, Urwick published numerous articles and research papers. Gulick and Urwick developed significant formulations of organizational principles. Although they worked on certain formal aspects of administration, they encouraged the presentation of other viewpoints. Both were consultants, advisors and served on public bodies. Gross writes: "Both were indefatigable publicists, propagandists and promoters of the gospel of neutral principles directed at raising the level of organizational efficiency."

In 1937 Gulick and Urwick jointly edited "Papers on the Science of Administration" which was hailed as a classic work.

**II. CHIEF EXECUTIVE WORK—POSDCORB**

Gulick expands Fayol's definition of management comprising five elements (managerial activities) : planning, organization, command, coordination and control, and coins a new word "POSDCORB". It is made up of initial letters of seven types of administrative activities.
1. **Planning**: that is working out in broad outline (a) *the things* that need to be done and (b) *the methods* for doing them (c) to accomplish the *purpose* set for the enterprise;

2. **Organizing**: that is (a) the establishment of the formal structure of *authority* (b) through which *work subdivisions* are arranged, defined and coordinated (c) for the defined *objective*;

3. **Staffing**: that is (a) the whole *personnel function* of bringing in and (b) *training* the staff and (c) maintaining favourable *conditions of work*;

4. **Directing**: that is (a) the continuous task of *making decisions* and (b) embodying them in specific and general *orders and instructions* and (c) serving as the *leader* of the enterprise;

5. **Co-ordinating**: that is all important duty of *interrelating the various parts of the work*;

6. **Reporting**: that is keeping those to whom the executive is responsible informed as to what is going on, which thus includes (a) *keeping himself* and his *subordinates* informed (b) through records, research and inspection;

7. **Budgeting**: with all that goes with budgeting in the form of fiscal planning, accounting and control."

Although Gulick goes much beyond in using Fayol's elements, POSDCORB has served as a convenient starting point for many writers on public or business administration, who have often adapted it to meet their needs.

**III. ORGANIZATIONAL PRINCIPLES**

Gulick and Urwick are better known for promoting the gospel of "neutral principles" directed at raising the level of organizational efficiency. These principles, they maintain, deal with the "architectonics" of formal organization, although at various points they speak of the importance of informal factors in the administration of which eight deserve more attention.

Gulick postulates ten principles of organization. The principles are:

1. Division of labour or specialization;
2. Departmentalization on the basis of purpose, process, clientele or place;
3. Coordination by hierarchy;
4. Coordination by ideas;
5. Coordination by committees;
6. Decentralization or the 'holding company' idea.
7. Unity of command
8. Staff or line
9. Delegation and
10. Span of control.

In working out these principles Gulick was highly influenced by Fayol's fourteen principles.

Urwick, on the other hand, identifies eight principles of administration. These are:
1. Principle of objective—that an organization should be objective-oriented
2. Principle of correspondence—that authority and responsibility must be coequal
3. Principle of responsibility—that the responsibility of higher authorities for the work of subordinates is absolute
4. Scalar principle—that a pyramidal type of structure is built-up in an organization
5. Principle of span of control
6. Principle of specialization
7. Principle of coordination and
8. Principle of definition—clear definition of duty, authority and responsibility.

Here we discuss eight principles, which deserve more attention.

1. Fitting People to Structure

Urwick defines organization as "determining what activities are necessary to any purpose (or 'plan') and arranging them in groups which may be assigned to individuals." But he warns that it should be undertaken "in a cold blooded, detached spirit," like the preparation of an engineering design without reference to any individual who may be working in the organization. He says that the organization must be designed without bias and only then are steps to be taken "to find or fit people to the structure". In other words, before fitting people to the structure, it should be first worked out.
2. One Top Executive

The "Classic" theory emphasizes the importance on "one-man administrative responsibility" principle. Insisting on this principle, Urwick warns against the use of committees for the purpose of administration. "For purposes of management, boards and commissions have turned out to be failures. Their mechanism is inevitably slow, cumbersome, wasteful and ineffective and does not lend itself readily to cooperation with other agencies.... The conspicuously well-managed administrative units in the Government are almost without exception headed by single administrators." Gulick, a member of the U.S. President's Committee played an active role in striving to work the principle of "one top executive" into the structure of many U.S. boards and commissions.

3. Unity of Command

The principle of unity of command is taken over bodily from Fayol's dictum that "A man cannot serve two masters." Gulick is aware that rigid adherence to this principle may lead to some absurdities, he nevertheless maintains that these are "unimportant in comparison with the certainty of confusion, inefficiency and irresponsibility which arise from the violation of this principle".

Gulick himself, however, provides an exception to this principle in the case of field office specialists. This reinforces Simon's objection that these principles are proverbs.

4. Staff : Special and General

As the activities of the organization increase in size and complexity, higher executives need the assistance of an ever-increasing number of staff, both general and special. This raises the question of the relation between the "staff experts" and regular "line officials".

Elaborating the functions of staff experts, he says that they should not be given administrative authority but are to render technical advice. The chief executive is faced with the problem of how to control effectively the activities of a large number of subordinates, not only of the "line officials", but also that of the "special staff." With a view to improving the
organization of the activity of top administrators including the chief executive, Gulick and Urwick consider it necessary to have "general staff officials" for assisting the executive in the central tasks of command, control and coordination. As distinguished from special staff officials, they are not restricted to the proffering advice, but must draw up and transmit orders, follow up on operations and help coordinate the work of "staff specialists" without themselves taking on any specialized functions. Acting not on their own but within the confines of decisions made by the top executive or superior, the general staff officials relieve the top executive of the burdensome detail of administration, allow him to exercise a larger span of control and also, free him to concentrate upon the most important activities of the organization.

5. Division of Labour or Specialization

The principle of specialization states that as far as possible each individual should perform a single function only. Luther Gulick identifies four bases on which work or specialization may be divided and departments created: the purpose they serve, the processes they use, the persons or things they deal with, or the place where they work.

First, specialization should be based on the purpose of administration, that is, the tasks within the organization can be grouped so as to promote the implementation of a common task.

Second, specialization can be carried out according to types of technical operations or skills specialization. In this case all activities involving the implementation of identical operations (such operations as documentation, statistics, personnel files, etc.) are concentrated in a single administrative sub-unit. This form of specialization corresponds to the idea of the division of labour.

Thirdly, specialization is often carried out according to the clientele served. Here Gulick mentions the specialized skills that officials of such department develop in serving the particular groups.

Fourthly, Gulick distributes the functions of administrative unit on the basis of geographical criteria which he calls zonal specialization. In this case, all
questions linked with geographical zone are considered by a single administrative unit. Gulick describes the advantages and disadvantages of adopting each form of specialization. Gulick and Urwick, however, do not propose any standard methods for the creation of subdivisions in an organization.

6. Delegation

The principle of 'delegation' figures prominently in Gulick—Urwick works also. Urwick maintains that "lack of the courage to delegate properly and of knowledge how to do it is one of the most general causes of failure in organization." In Urwick's opinion, delegation of responsibility is certainly an important condition for the efficient work of the chief executive.

7. Matching Responsibility with Authority

As distinct from Fayol who placed an emphasis on promoting a sense of responsibility, Urwick deals with both sides of the authority—responsibility relationship. Urwick says that it is not enough to hold administrative staff accountable, for certain activities, but that it is also essential to delegate to it "the necessary authority to discharge that responsibility". Urwick argues that superiors must take absolute responsibility for what their subordinates do. He says that "at all levels authority and responsibility should be coterminous and coequal." Further there should be a clear line of authority, known and recognized, from the top to each individual. Urwick's Principle of Definition is that the duties, authority and responsibility of each position, and its relationships with other positions, should be defined in writing and made known to everyone concerned in the organization.

8. Span of Control

Urwick finds that "no supervisor can supervise directly the work of more than five, or at the most, six subordinates whose work interlocks". This is because of the fact that he has to supervise not merely individual subordinates but the numerous interrelationships between them. If, as Urwick maintains, the number of subordinates increases in arithmetical progression, there is a simultaneous geometrical growth in the permutations and combinations of the relationships requiring the attention of the superior.
It may be noted that Gulick is less categorical about the maximum number of subordinates. He identifies various factors affecting the optimum span, notably the capacity of an individual executive, the nature of the job performed, the stability of an organization and territorial proximity to the subordinates he controls. At the same time, Gulick emphasizes the importance on the general validity of this principle.

IV. EMPHASIZING HUMAN WELFARE AND TIME VALUE
Gulick in a recent article notes that "after all, governments are constituted of human beings, are run by human beings and have as their main job helping, controlling and serving human beings". Therefore he insists that main function of the state should be human welfare, survival and improvement to meet the challenges of every changing environment and not war. But unfortunately, the structure of the modern State is distinctly military. He observes that in public administration, our very vocabulary is military in origin. We talk about "line and staff, "field commanders", and "material and manpower", and when we make cost-benefit analyses we manipulate hard statistics, not human values and human welfare.

Gulick attaches too much importance to the time factor. He notes that all public policy innovations are rooted in timing, and in democracy timing is the hallmark of the state-craft. To him, timing is essential for any organization as it is not a machine but an organism. He stresses that time must become a central strategic and moral concern in public management. Hence it is important for the government to plan and work with this flow in time and for time.

Elsewhere Gulick says: "The present challenge is not primarily managerial; it is first of all ethical and political, and it is aimed at the core of our democratic faith."

V. A CRITICAL EVALUATION Criticism
Gulick-Urwick and their principles of organizations are subject to severe criticism. Among the several critics who have attacked their principles, Herbert Simon's name stands high. He criticizes these principles on the ground that these were not scientific but were based on the rules of thumb. Simon described the "Principles of Administration" as the mere "Proverbs
of Administration." He says that "it is a fatal defect of the current principles of administration that, like proverbs, they occur in pairs. For almost every principle one can find an equally plausible and acceptable contradictory principle. Although the two principles of the pair will lead to exactly opposite organizational recommendations, there is nothing in the theory to indicate which is the proper one to apply." For example, one of the proverbs emphasizes that administrative efficiency is increased by specialization. But there is no clarity whether area specialization is superior to functional specialization.

On the principle of "Span of Control", Simon says that there are two principles involved: the principle of the span of control and the principle of the number of levels. One principle states that the span of control should be kept narrow, that is, the number of subordinates should not increase to five or six. The other principle is that the number of levels should be kept to a minimum. Clearly, these principles contradict each other. For, if we reduce the span of control, the number of levels rises. For instance, suppose a supervisor 'has twelve subordinates. It means that his span of control is twelve. But if we want to reduce his span to six subordinates, we shall need one more supervisor, and these two supervisors will need a head supervisor also for coordinating their activities. Simon also points out to the contradictions involved in choosing between the principles of unity of command and principle of specialization. Simon considers that the principles of administration are at best criteria for describing and diagnosing administrative situations.

L.D. White also criticizes these principles for they are not rules. They suggest only working rules of conduct which wide experience seems to have validated. They provide no guidance as to whether a given system more or less should be highly centralized, nor as to whether auxiliary agencies should be given more or fewer duties or authority. The theory is more concerned with the work than the human being doing it.

Using Fayol as a framework, Gulick and Urwick tabulated points of similarity and advantages of organizational principles. Most of the Gulick-Urwick principles, however, deal with formal organization. They do not
take into consideration of the influencing factors of the informal organization. Neglect of the informal organizational processes is very unrealistic as far as the administrative processes are concerned. There is also little appreciation of the role of motivators and cognition in task identification and classification.

Conclusion
Luther Gulick and Lyndall Urwick are not innovator in the field of management in the sense of Taylor, Fayol, Follett and Sheldon were. These proponents of management, belonging to different cultures, different professions and different countries, often developed principles and concepts which though worded differently, were alike in many respects. Gulick and Urwick felt that a highly useful and reliable body of management knowledge already existed and needed correlation.

MARY PARKER FOLLETT AND CONCEPT OF PARTNERSHIP
I. INTRODUCTION
Among the women contributors to Administrative Thought, Mary Follett's name ranks first. Although less known to the public at large, her achievements are no less significant than Nightingale's. Mary Follett (1868-1933) was born in Boston and educated at Harvard and Cambridge concentrating on Philosophy, Law and Political Science. Right from the start of her social and educational work in 1891 until her death, Miss Follett endeavoured to develop a new managerial philosophy incorporating motivating desires of the individual and the group. She felt that basic problem of any organization was the harmonizing of group efforts to achieve the most efficient effort toward completing a task. Her writings reflect an outlook on management in which organization, leadership and power are dealt with as human problems.

Follett's Major Works
1. The Speaker of the House of Representatives (1896)
2. The New State (1920)
3. Creative Experience (1924) and
4. *Dynamic Administration; The Collected Papers of Mary Parker Follett* (a set of her papers was edited by Henry Metcalf and L. Urwick in 1941).

**Follett's Thinking on Administration**

Mary Follett criticizes the classic theory of management mainly for its mechanical approach and for ignoring psychological aspects.

**II. PLANNING AS COORDINATION Coordination**

Coordination as a principle for planning figures prominently in Follett's work. In her view, coordination is the central core of management and to her it "implies harmonious ordering of parts." To achieve coordination, Follett calls attention to four of its facets:

1. **Coordination by direct contact:** The responsible people, particularly responsible heads of industry, must be in direct contact. This may mean "cross relations between heads of departments instead of up and down the line through the chief executive".

2. **Coordination in the early stages:** The people concerned should be involved in policy or decisions while these are being formulated. This will help in the implementation of decisions.

3. **Coordination as a continuous process:** Coordination must be viewed as a continuous process. Follett emphasises the need for a permanent machinery to identify problems and achieve coordination.

4. **Coordination as a reciprocal relation of all factors in a situation:** All factors have to be related to one another. Thus the task of a National Board should be to facilitate the coordination process.

In addition to these four principles for planning, Follett emphasizes the importance of information based on continuous research.

**Collective Planning**

Although, Follett favours collective planning on a national or even international scale, yet she opines that central government planning imposed from the top down is doomed to failure. According to her, national planning need not be in opposition to individualism. If national planning is based on the principle of "the interpretation of authority instead of a super-authority", it would offer much scope for individual initiative.
III. PROBLEM OF POWER AND AUTHORITY

At the outset Follett charges management thinkers and political scientists of confusing power and authority. She is critical of the use of authority in the sense of bureaucratic concepts of the classic theory, and endeavours to separate power from authority.

In Follett's view, power is "simply the ability to make things happen". She regards power as an immanent function of management. While advancing the idea of 'joint power' instead of dominant power, she argues that the division of power and its delegation contradicts the very idea of management which in her view, is an inalienable form of power. She feels that manager cannot share power with his division heads. But "he can encourage them to integrate their activities in order to achieve "jointly-developed power".

Authority, on the other hand, is vested power—the right to develop and exercise power. A person's authority flows from the function and job he performs, and from the changing situations in which he finds himself. To Follett, "authority belongs to the job and stays with the job."

Although favouring the idea of 'functional authority' or 'pluralistic authority' (because of the necessity for expertise), Follett admits the necessity of a certain form of central authority in the shape of the chief executive. But this authority may be seen only as a means of satisfying the need for a focus of the basic functions of organization.

Follett is against thinking of organization in terms of 'over' and 'under'. She believes that "the only legitimate boss, sovereignty" is the interweaving experience of those who perform some technical function in the organization. She maintains that organizational objectives cannot be achieved merely by "the consent of the governors" or mere consent on the part of the governed. Neither form of consent is enough. What is really important is participation at all levels, interweaving and integration.

IV. CUMULATIVE RESPONSIBILITY
Follett's concept of authority entails a revision of the classic concept of responsibility. Responsibility, like authority is an attribute of the person's function in the organization. Emphasising that function is more important, Follett writes that a person should not ask "To whom is he responsible?" but rather "For what is he responsible?"

Since the final responsibility (owing to diffusion of function) is partly an illusion, Follett introduces the concept of pluralistic, group or cumulative responsibility. Each individual function must not be seen in isolation. Rather it must be seen in terms of its interdependence with other functions. Each sub-executive (holder of the office) has the responsibility to integrate his work with other sub-executives rather than merely pass on the task of coordination to higher executives. This requires organizational arrangements for intimate cross-relations. In her view the work of individuals and sub-units should be coordinated through 'cross-functioning', 'group responsibility' and 'cumulative responsibility'. This interweaving of responsibility should start at the earliest stages and at the lowest levels.

From this analysis of responsibility, Follett draws the conclusion that workers also have a responsible role in management. Assuming that there is no sharp line dividing planning from execution, she maintains that "the distinction between those who manage and those who are managed is somewhat fading." Follett is among the first to advance the idea of workers' participation in management. She says that workers should be involved in deciding how orders should be carried out. For this a progressive management must develop in the workers not only a sense of individual responsibility but a sense of joint responsibility. Hence, Follett says, employee representation should be "an integral part of a certain plan of organization".

In dealing with executive functions, Follett contends that effort must be made to fix responsibility. When things go wrong, "we have to discover how far each one concerned has contributed to the failure or partial failure". The purpose of fixing responsibility for a failure, is not just to allocate reprimands. On the other hand, it is to discover ways of doing better in the future. The idea is to give education rather than blame.
V. CONFLICT AND INTEGRATION

Constructive Conflict

A good deal of discussion is devoted to the problem of conflict in Follett's works. In Creative Experience, she says that it is possible "to conceive conflict as not necessarily a wasteful outbreak of incompatibilities, but a normal process by which socially valuable differences register themselves for the enrichment of all concerned."

To Follett, conflict is not warfare, but is only an appearance of difference—difference of opinions, of interests not only between employer and employees but also between managers, between directors or wherever differences appear. Because of the distinct nature of human behaviour, conflict is bound to take place in the organizations.

To deal with conflict, Follett distinguishes three ways: domination, compromise, and integration. The first is domination, which means a victory for one side or the other. Though it is the easiest way of resolving conflicts, the repressed tendencies in the sense of 'Freudian Psychology' are bound to rebel against the dominator. The second is compromise, which means that each side gives up something in order to have peace. Though it is a widely accepted method of resolving conflicts, often people resist the temptations of reaching compromises. The third is integration, which means neither side sacrifices anything. In this method, both sides stand to gain.

Steps for Integration

Follett attaches importance to the method of integration and attempts to formulate some recommendations for achieving integration. The first step toward integration is to break the demands and interests of both sides into their component parts in order to find the genuineness of demands. She says that attention should be concentrated on concrete measures rather than on discussing theoretical dispute. These steps, in Follett's view, can lead to a "revaluation of interests" and a "revaluation of desire." She opposes an authoritarian approach to the solution of organizational problems and leadership. Realising that it is difficult to do away with the element of coercion entirely, Follett, nevertheless, insists on the need for
some "jointly-developed power, a coactive, not a coercive power." that would be based on the interaction of all members of the organization.

VI. DEPERSONALIZING ORDERS

Like classic management thinkers—Taylor, Fayol, Gulick and Urwick—Follett also is concerned with the question of "how orders should be given". Follett points to the need of building habits among the employees for acceptance of orders. She also stresses the importance of such factors as the time, place and circumstances in which orders are given. To her "the strength of favourable response to an order is in inverse ratio to the distance the order travels".

Follett observes that people cannot be made to do things most satisfactorily by orders alone. She feels that too much bossism provokes the people to resent receiving orders. This difficulty cannot be solved merely through the art of persuasion, since persuasion too may be regarded as an act of domination by the subordinate.

To avoid too much of bossism in giving orders, on the one hand, and giving no orders at all, on the other, Follett proposes that the giving of orders should be depersonalized. She replies: "My solution is to depersonalize the giving of orders, to unite all concerned in a study of the situation, to discover the law of the situation, and obey that." By this approach X refrains from giving orders to Y. On the other hand both X and Y do what the situation demands. According to Follett, the orders "should be the composite decision of those who give and those who receive them."

Further she says that orders should come from action, and not action from orders. Follett stresses that the most effective work methods should be standardized. She also insists that men should follow standard practice rather than obey arbitrary commands.

In this context we find that Follett’s depersonalization of orders is not different from Taylor’s mechanistic approach and Weber’s idea of detached bureaucratic spirit. However, unlike Taylor and Weber, Follett stresses that human factors must be given importance and tries to depersonalize the need for subordination by lending it a humanistic form.
Follett recognizes the need by emphasizing: "We cannot have any sound relations with each other as long as we take them out of that setting which gives them their meaning and value."

**VII. LEADERSHIP**

Follett develops a new approach to the analysis of leadership. To Follett, a leader is not the president of the organization or head of the department, but "the man who can energize his group, who knows how to encourage initiative, how to draw from all what each has to give." He is "the man who can show that the order is integral to the situation." Thus leadership goes to the man who possesses the knowledge of situation, and who understands how to pass from one situation to another.

For instance, Follett says a store clerk can tell the man in charge of purchasing when to act. According to Follett, a leader should perform three important functions: coordination, definition of purpose and anticipation. Agreeing with Fayol and Sheldon, she stresses that leaders are not born only, but could be made through education in human behaviour.

While distinguishing between three-types of leadership: leadership of position (holding a position of formal authority), leadership of personality (holding personal qualities), and leadership of function (holding both position and personality), Follett believes that leadership of function is more important than leadership of personality and position. In modern organizations, it is not the persons of formal authority or of personality who 'lead' but those who possess functional knowledge. She writes: "The man possessing the knowledge demanded by a certain situation tends in the best managed business, and other things being equal, becomes the leader at that movement."

Follett is of the view that for the successful operation of any organization, it should be "sufficiently flexible to allow the leadership of function to operate fully—to allow the men with the knowledge and the technique to control the situation." Thus Follett's views on 'leadership by function' precedes long before the term 'situational approach' acquired prominence in American life.
VIII. PROFESSIONALIZATION OF BUSINESS MANAGEMENT

Follett's ideas on profession of business management are no less important. She believes that a true profession is based on two factors: the service motive and the scientific foundation.

(i) The Service Motive

In regard to the motive of service, Follett criticizes the old idea that a business man makes money for himself. On the contrary she maintains that businessmen, like doctors, lawyers, engineers, teachers, are rendering equally great service to the community. She does not find any basic inconsistency between the service motive and profit motive. The real service of businessmen is not to be seen in terms of production and distribution of manufactured articles alone. It is "to give an opportunity for individual development through the better organization of human relationships.... The process of production is as important for the welfare of society as the product of production."

For service motives, personal standards—"the love of work, the craftsman's and artist's joy in work well done"—must be developed and maintained, and these may be broadened into group standards.

(ii) The Scientific Foundation

In regard to the scientific foundation, Follett contends that two steps are needed. The first step is to develop and apply a scientific standard (dealing with both technical side and human relations side) to the whole of business management. The second step is to develop an organized body of knowledge (obtained by research and executive experience) which must be applied to the whole of business management.

In the task of developing standards of service and building an organized body of knowledge, managers themselves must play a vital role. Follett observes: "All professions have been developed by the work of their own members." The manager must contribute his very best to the development of his profession not merely by activity in a management association.

IX. A CRITICAL EVALUATION Criticism
Follett and her ideas have been subjected to bitter criticism. Few writers on management regard her as a 'classical' thinker. On the other hand, a handful of writers do not agree with the comment that "there is nothing classical in her ideas." But Follett herself criticizes "the 'classic' theory of management mainly for its one-sidedness, mechanicism, and for ignoring psychological aspects." But her own ideas on a variety of subjects are not free from becoming subjected to severe criticism.

Although Follett produces a variety of articles, she does not present a systematic formulation of her views on management literature. Baker observes that Follett was never a systematic writer. She threw out interesting ideas more or less randomly and therefore, the thread of consistency was hard to find and harder to follow.

Follett's views have been also criticized for ignoring the social nature of the processes involved in the management of organizations. In this context, Gvishiani observes: "...although she made a positive contribution to the theory of management, her approach was purely empirical and did not interpret the social content of organisation scientifically."

Contribution

Mary Parker provided several contributions to the development of management, "he most important being her managerial philosophy with its emphasis on the spirit of democratic dynamism and human behaviour. This new philosophy focussed attention on the various psychological aspects. Appreciating her contribution, George writes: "Mary Parker Follett was a true management philosopher, a pioneer who helped span the gap between the mechanistic approach of Taylor and our contemporary approach emphasizing human behaviour." To the behaviourals school Follett developed two new concepts, 'partnership' and 'group thinking' which have subsequently altered the management literature, Metcalf and Urwick also observe that "her conceptions were in advance of her time. They are still in advance of current thinking. But they are a gold-mine of suggestions for anyone who is interested in the problems i.e. of establishing and maintaining human cooperation in the conduct of an it enterprise." ~ Indeed, much of what Follett wrote in her works has become
accepted and may now seem commonplace. Comparing Follett with Florence Nightingale (known for her founding of modern nursing), Bertram Gross comments: "But she was no less an innovator, and her intellectual horizons were much broader." Follett was again the first management thinker who endeavoured to build a theory for the professionalisation of business management.

ELTON MAYO AND HUMAN RELATIONS APPROACH

I. INTRODUCTION

Elton Mayo (1880-1949) widely known for his Hawthorne studies has been called the founder of both the Human Relations movement and of Industrial Sociology. Mayo was born in 1880 at Adelaide, Australia who, after graduation studied medicine in Edinburg, Scotland and deserted the same for psychology and philosophy. He successfully organized psychiatric treatment to the shell-shocked soldiers of the 1st World War in recognition of which he was made the Chairman of the Department of Philosophy at the University of Queensland in 1919. In the year 1922 he moved to the United States where he first joined the faculty of the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce of the University of Pennsylvania, and later to the post of Professor of Industrial Research at the Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University which he held from 1926 to 1947. It was here that Mayo started in 1927 the most intensive studies on human relations known as "Hawthorne Studies" conducted at the Western Electric Company's Hawthorne plant near Chicago. The studies lasted more than five years (1927-32). The resulting "Hawthorne studies" became an historic landmark in administrative thought as they helped in developing the "Human Relations" school. Mayo died in 1949.

Mayo's Major Works

1. The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization (1933);
2. The Social Problems of an Industrial Civilization (1945);
3. The Political Problem of Industrial Civilization (1947);
(Incomplete at the time of his retirement).
In addition he published five research papers in different journals. Fritz Roethlisberger, of the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration was Mayo's research assistant for the Hawthorne studies.

Roethlisberger's Major Works
1. Management and the Worker (1939), written in collaboration with William J. Dickson
2. Management and Morale (1941);
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II. HAWTHORNE EXPERIMENTS

Prior to the entry of Mayo and his followers into the "Hawthorne studies", a research project was already under way at the Western Electric Company to determine the effect of illumination on the worker and his work. Two groups of workers had been separately formed, and the lighting conditions for one had been varied and for the other held. After two and a half years' investigation, the investigators found no significant differences in output between the two. Still eager to find out such differences, Mayo and Fritz Roethlisberger were invited.

Relay Assembly Test Room: The first stage of their inquiry is known as the Relay Assembly Test Room in which six female-operatives engaged in assembling telephone relays, were placed in order to observe the effect on their output and morale of various changes in the conditions of work. During one and a half years of investigation more than ten changes (such as special group payment scheme, rest pauses, shorter hours and refreshment) were introduced under friendly atmosphere and a continuous record of output was maintained. Almost without exception output rose with each change introduced.

Period XII: After charting these changes, the next stage was to return to the original conditions at the beginning of the experiment. The operatives reverted to a 48-hour week, with no rest pauses and no refreshment. Surprisingly, output increased to new heights. The general upward trend
was astonishing. To quote Mayo, "that the itemized changes experimentally imposed could not be used to explain the major change—the continually increasing production." The explanation given was that the female operatives had greater freedom in their working environment and since the supervisors took a personal interest in each girl, they had become a social group. Mayo's conclusion was that work satisfaction depends largely on the informal social pattern of the work group. Where norms of cooperativeness and productivity are established because of a feeling of importance, physical conditions have little effect. This confirms the recognition of informal social groupings in determining levels of output. Taken as a whole, the human relations between workers and their supervisors and among the workers are important influences on workers' behaviour at least "as important as physical working conditions and monetary incentives." It is this view that many commentators have hailed it as the "great illumination."

**Human Relations and Sentiments**

In 1928, Mayo and his team turned to study the human attitudes and sentiments. For this purpose employees were asked "to express frankly their likes and dislikes about their working environment." After interviewing over 21000 employees by adopting the 'indirect approach', it was found that "there was no simple and direct relations between the complaint and the object toward which the complaint was directed." The team concluded that the pre-occupation of the employee with personal problems like family tragedies, sickness, etc. which Mayo had called 'pessimistic reveries' in his early research, affected his performance in the industry. The results of the investigation led the team to acclaim the project a success in three ways:

First, the employees "appreciated being recognized as individuals who had valuable comments to make." They felt that they could freely express their views.
Second, the interviewing programme created a change in supervision also. The supervisor felt that "his methods were being made the subject of research."

Third, interviewers felt that "they had acquired a new and improved way of understanding and dealing with their fellow-men." They found that social structure was "an intricate web of human relations bound together by a system of sentiments."

**Social Organization**

Bank Wiring Observation Room: The final stage of the investigation of the study team was to analyse the group behaviour in a non-experimental situation. In November 1931, therefore, the team set up what became known as the Bank Wiring Observation Room where 14 men—9 wiremen, 3 solderers and 2 inspectors—worked together for 7 months under careful observation. The objects of the study included the behaviour of 4 supervisory officials (group leader, section officer, assistant foreman, and foreman) who came into contact with the workers. It was found that they restricted their output and deliberately held down their own wages. This was in contrary to Taylor's conception of worker's behaviour—that workers are lazy. The group had a norm for output and this was not exceeded by any individual. The group had developed its own code of behaviour which clashed with that of management. Apparently this code was composed of solidarity on the part of the group against management.

The group as a whole held the idea that not too much and not too little work should be done in order to avoid rate busting and chiselling. An individual worker was required to refrain from telling anything to the supervisor that reacts to the detriment of an associate. Further an individual should not attempt to maintain social distance or act officious. Therefore, an individual's status in the group was determined largely by his conformity to these ideas. For such a group, the introduction of technical innovations which impair the workers' status and efficiency was resented. Both technologists and supervisors were seen as a source of interference and constraint.'
Major Findings of the Hawthorne Studies

In brief following are the major findings and generalization of the Hawthorne studies:
1. The output or the amount of work of a worker is not determined by his physical capacity but by his social capacity.
2. Non-economic rewards and sanctions significantly affect the worker's behaviour.
3. A worker often does not act or react to management as an individual but as a member of groups.
4. Communication, participation and leadership play a central role in worker's behaviour.

Taken as a whole the human relations between workers and their, supervisors and among the workers are significant influences on the behaviour of the workers. The significance of the Hawthorne investigation lay in discovering the informal organization which it is now felt exists in all organizations. It confirmed Mayo's earlier view that what he calls the 'rabble hypothesis' about human behaviour (that is, each individual pursues his own rational self-interest) was false. Mayo emphasized that management must develop a new concept of authority and foster a new social order based on the individual's cooperative attitude.

THE SOCIAL EQUILIBRIUM

Both Mayo and Roethlisberger lay an emphasis on maintaining social equilibrium. According to them a cooperative system can continue to operate indefinitely even in the face of external adverse factors, just as long as internal equilibrium is preserved. Mayo, by explaining the continuously high performance of the female operatives in the Relay Assembly Test Room, observes that "by strengthening the 'temperamental' internal equilibrium of the workers, the company enabled them to achieve a mental 'steady state' which offered a high resistance to a variety of external conditions." Applying the equilibrium concept to the industry, Mayo observes that the modern industry has violated non-logical social code (which regulates the relations between persons and their attitudes to
one another) by insisting upon "a merely economic logic of production." In the factory this leads to less production. In the larger community it leads to the social disorganization taking the form of delinquency, suicide and obsessions. Mayo maintains that problem of industrial civilization "is not that of the sickness of an acquisitive society; it is that of the acquisitiveness of a sick society."

**IV. SKILL AS A WAY OF LEARNING**

Both Mayo and Roethlisberger insist that in the modern world, social skills have lagged behind technical skills. The social skills are those through which, the administrator becomes "the guardian or pre-server of morale through the function of maintaining a condition of equilibrium which will preserve the social values existing in the co-operative system."

Administrative theorists must pay more attention to knowledge rather than skill, and more particularly to the social skill. To Mayo the lag in social skills is a threatening factor in social equilibrium. Although social skills are quite different from the specialist skills of engineers, economists, etc., yet these are the skills of the successful practical administrator. Mayo realizes that due to the scientific development, our administrators have developed mainly specialized skills. Ironically, their technical competence is accompanied by utter social incompetence. They fail to understand that the basic need of workers is to develop a co-operative social relationship. The worker is no more an economic man motivated solely by salary or pay.

Mayo hold that in order to overcome ignorance and to develop the required social skills, a new approach to administrative education is needed. The universities of the world must recognize that careful training is a prerequisite for developing administrators capable of dealing with the human problems of sustained cooperation.
V. THE HUMAN RELATIONS APPROACH

Emergence of the Human Relations Concept

In the 1930s the Classical formal approach came under severe criticism. The Classical theory of administration has been accused mainly of "limitations of a mechanistic nature" and of "a false evaluation of the sociological and psychological aspects" of individual's behaviour in an organization. As a reaction to the Classical approach, a new trend emerged in the theory of management which many writers called the "humanistic challenge." This period in the development of administrative thought is often called the epoch of "New Beginnings" as distinct from the period of the "Gospel of Administrative Efficiency." The emergence of the human relations approach is linked with the name of the American sociologist Elton Mayo, known for his Hawthorne studies. Mayo is generally recognized as the father of this school. John Dewey indirectly and Kurt Lewin most directly also contributed much to its initiation. Mayo's main conclusion was that mainly psychological and social rather than material factors affect the growth of productivity.

In brief, the human relations approach stresses the importance of informal factors in the organization's operations. The approach demands that a rigid hierarchy of subordination that formed part of the classic theory of management should be abandoned and that the informal aspects of the organization should be given much importance. New ways of raising output were recommended including employee education, group decisions, participative management, communicative leadership, etc.

The human relations approach assumes that the most satisfying organization would be the most efficient. Its approach maintains that "employees should have a feeling that the company's goal is worth their effort they should feel themselves part of the company and take pride in their contribution to its goal. This means that the company's objectives must be such as to inspire confidence in the intentions of management
and belief that each will get rewards and satisfactions by working for these objectives."

In short, the human relations doctrine points to an equilibrium, a perfect balance between the organization's goals and the worker's needs. Management manifestly cannot deal with individual workers as if they were isolated entities; it must deal with them as members of work groups, subject to the influence of these groups. Henceforth, management would be based on the sociological concept of group endeavour. With this new emphasis on human relations, the industry assumed a social dimension in addition to its economic aspect.

VI. A CRITICAL EVALUATION

Yet despite the widespread influence of the "human relations" school on industrial management in America, it has not acquired universal recognition. Mayo, findings of Hawthorne experiment and the human relations approach were subjected to severe criticism. Critics say that the human relations concept deals only with internal variables but ignores the environment. The approach tends to focus on a narrow range of variables. Critics like Carey criticize the Hawthorne group for having selected a small sample of five or six girls who could not be taken as a reliable sample to make generalizations. He also criticizes Hawthorne studies for their lack of scientific base.

Second methods adopted by the human relations school are regarded as manipulating methods which tend to impose leaders' views on the workers. Loren Baritz criticizes Mayoists as anti-union and pro-management. In America in 1949, United Auto Workers lashed out at Mayoism and branded the Hawthorne researchers as 'cow sociologists'. Peter F Drucker and many others reproach the human relations school for ignoring the "dignity of man." Drucker also feels that the Harvard group neglected the nature of work and instead focussed on interpersonal relations. Etzioni observes that "the Human Relations people tend to devote much attention to informal relations among workers and between workers and
supervisors, but little to the formal ones or to the articulation of formal relationships with informal ones." The adherents of human relations say "Remove fear and people will work." Yet the practice has shown that in absence of fear and of other negative motives workers tend to evade doing work.

Conclusion

Notwithstanding these few criticisms, social relationship in the work situation as emphasized by Elton Mayo remains a significant factor to organization's productivity. Mayo is generally recognized as the father of the Human Relations School. The Hawthorne studies conducted under his leadership soon became an historic landmark in administrative thought. They serve as inspiration for scores of empirical studies of human behaviour in organizations and for new approaches to administrative education.' Peter Drucker also maintains that these studies "are" still the best, the most advanced and the most complete works in the field of human relations." The significance of the Hawthorne studies; lies in discovering the informal organization which it is now realized exists in all organizations. The findings of these studies led to the emergence of the human relations school of which he is regarded as the father. With his emphasis on human relationship, the industry assumed a social dimension in addition to its economic aspect. It was only after emergence of the human relations concept that a large number of social scientists began to think of industry and industrial psychology. Further his emphasis on the role of communication, participation, leadership, social skills, each of these insights has become 'classics' widely referred to by social scientists. The human relations school has influenced the character of management not only of America but also of other industrial societies. Harold Leavitt says that it was the "human relations" school that was able to make a correct analysis of the psychological, possibilities of individuals which were ignored by Taylor.

Drucker's critical attitude to this doctrine does not mean that he opposes its social demagogy. He says: "This does not mean that we have to
discard Human Relations. On the contrary, its insights are a major foundation in managing the human organization. But it is not the building. Indeed, it is only one of the foundations." In the beginning of 1950s, American researchers like Rensis Likert, Douglas McGregor and Robert McMurray started making efforts to reconcile classical conceptions of management with the human relations doctrine. Professor Warren G. Bennis called these researchers as "revisionists." They share a common concern for revising naive and unsound aspects of the human relations approach without sacrificing its radical departure from traditional theory. The fact that some researchers and adherents of the human relations school have revised or begun to revise its fundamental propositions is noteworthy.
I. INTRODUCTION

Chester Irving Barnard (1886-1961) was born of a poor family at Maiden, Massachusetts (U.S.A.) in 1886. Beginning a life of hardwork at the age of 12, Barnard rose to the position of President of the Rockefeller Foundation. Until his death in 1961, he occupied many positions both in public and private sector, and was conferred with seven honorary doctorates even though he did not possess a bachelor’s degree.

Eventful Years;
1906: After initial education at Mount Hermon Academy, Barnard entered Harvard in 1906, leaving three years later without a degree.
1909: In June 1909, Barnard entered the employ of American, Telephone and Telegraph (Boston) as translator.
1922: In 1922 Barnard joined Pennsylvania Bell Telephone where he felt the experience of general management.
1927: In 1927, Barnard was appointed the President of the big New Jersey Bell Telephone Company and served in it till his retirement in 1948.
1930s: During 1931-33 and in 1935, Barnard served as the Director of State Rehabilitation Organization, New Jersey.
In 1937 he was invited to give a series of lectures on administration at the Lowell Institute in Boston.
1940s: In 1946, Barnard was appointed a member of the Atomic Energy Commission of the State Department. After retirement from the Bell Company, he worked as President of the Rockefeller Foundation from 1948 to 1952.
1961: From the early 1930s to his death in 1961, Barnard was deeply involved in the analysis of organization structure and the nature of contemporary management.
Source of Inspiration

Barnard was inspired by the work of Oliver Sheldon, Elton Mayo, Mary Follett, and others. Although these thinkers varied considerably in their academic interest, they were all concerned in developing a new conceptual scheme to explain the behaviour of men in modern organizations. Barnard was not directly involved in the Western Electrical experiments conducted mainly at the Hawthorne plant, but his association with Elton Mayo and the latter’s colleagues at Harvard Business School had a profound bearing on his ideas. Barnard’s executive experience at American Telephone and Telegraph Company was paralleled and followed by a career in Public Service.

Barnard’s Major Works
1. The Functions of the Executive (1938): This book is, to this day, considered a classical work on management.
2. Organization and Management (1948): This publication represents a collection of his reports and lectures read in different years.
3. Elementary Conditions of Business Morals: This is based on a lecture given in 1958.

In these two books Barnard seeks to build a rounded theoretical system for administration.

II. ORGANIZATION AS COOPERATION

Barnard was not satisfied with the traditional definition of organization which laid stress on ‘membership’ and not on its functioning. In Barnard’s opinion, the hard core of the group concept is the "system of interactions." Correspondingly, Barnard regards an organization as "a system of consciously coordinated or forces of two or more persons", and then indicates that the executive is the most strategic factor in organized or cooperative systems. As a system, it is held together (1) by some common purpose, (2) by the willingness of certain people to con-
tribute to the functioning of the organization, and (3) by the ability of such
people to communicate with each other. To Barnard, all organizations,
with the exception of the State and
the Church, are partial systems since they are dependent upon more
comprehensive systems. The most comprehensive formal organizations
are included in "an informal, indefinite, nebulous, and undirected system
usually named a society."
The 'scalar or hierarchical' type, in which coordination is secured through
the subordination of its parts to central authority, is regarded by Barnard
as formal organization. This type of organization makes it possible to
lessen the friction and consolidate the strength of the organization. On the
contrary, a 'lateral' organization secures coordination by agreement. A
lateral type of organization "lacks its own formal means of preventing
friction, strife and disruptive action."

III. THEORY OF CONTRIBUTION—SATISFACTION

EQUILIBRIUM
The problem of motivation of people's actions figures prominently in
Barnard's works. Barnard begins with the thought that an individual, who
has a little freedom of choice, does parcel out his contributions to those
which give him the greatest return in the form of personal satisfactions.
Thus, according to Barnard, the existence of an organization depends
upon the maintenance of an equilibrium between contributions and
satisfactions. While contributions are the work of an individual, the j
satisfactions are the inducements or incentives, which he derives in
exchange for his contributions. That is why, it is important for an executive
to handle the "economy of incentives" within organization. Yet' Barnard
strongly disassociates himself from viewing contributors to organizations
as 'economic men'.

Specific Inducements: In analysing man's satisfactions in an
organization, Barnard identifies four specific inducements
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1. Material inducements (such as money or physical conditions)
2. Personal non-material opportunities (for distinction and personal power)
3. Desirable physical conditions of work
4. Ideal benefactions (such as the pride of workmanship, sense of adequacy, loyalty to organization, altruistic service for family, etc.).

Analysing the relationship between the specific inducements, Barnard maintains that "material rewards are ineffective beyond the subsistence level."

**General Incentives:** Barnard also spells out four types of general incentives, which affect man's behaviour in an organization.
1. Associated attractiveness (based upon compatibility with associates);
2. The adaptation of working conditions to habitual methods and attitudes;
3. The opportunity for the feeling of enlarged participation in their course of events; and
4. The condition of communion with others, a condition based upon personal comfort in social relations and the opportunity for comradeship and for mutual support in personal attitudes.

**Concept of Efficiency:** Barnard defines the term of efficiency in the sense of an organization's "capacity to offer effective inducements in sufficient quantities to maintain the equilibrium of the system." The best test of efficiency of an organization, according to Barnard, is its survival. He further says that the survival of any organization depends both upon its internal equilibrium and upon "an equilibrium between the system and the total situation external to it."

**IV. INFORMAL ORGANIZATION**

Barnard also discusses the problems of informal organizations in his works. He describes an informal organization as a system of unconscious activities and is essentially structureless. According to him the existence of formal organizations presupposes the existence of informal ones. It is from the informal organizations that formal ones emerge and, the creation
of formal organizations inevitably brings into being informal ones, which, in turn, influence the formal, making them viable. At times, informal organizations may act contrary to the purposes of the formal organizations. Yet there are three positive functions, Barnard maintains, which can be performed only by informal organizations:

1. One is to perform "the communication of intangible facts, opinions, suggestions, suspicions that cannot pass through formal channels without raising issues."

2. The second is to maintain cohesiveness in formal organizations.

3. The third is to help maintain the feeling of personal integrity, of self-respect, of independent choice. It may be regarded as "a of means of maintaining the personality of individual against certain effects of formal organization, which tend to disintegrate the personality."

Barnard also points out that individuals who are unable to maintain a sense of self and a sense of ability to make choices of their own cannot function efficiently in a cooperative system.

V. CONCEPT OF ACCEPTED AUTHORITY

Barnard introduces the concept of 'accepted authority'. To him authority is "the character of an order in a formal organization by virtue of which it is accepted." Hence the decision as to whether an order has authority or not does not reside in persons who issue it, on the contrary, it (decision) lies with the persons to whom it is addressed. Hence the final test of authority is the acceptance by individuals to whom it is addressed. For the acceptance of an order as authoritative, Barnard continues, it must (a) be intelligible, (b) conform to the purpose of the organization, Barnard, be compatible' as a whole with his own personal interests, and (d) be feasible.

The acceptance of authority within an organization is facilitated by the 'zone of indifference,' which implies that every individual contributor readily accepts only within definite bonds, which are subject to change. Executives must be able to determine this zone, if they want the subordinates to obey their orders. Conformance of all orders within the
zone of indifference is also promoted by 'organization opinion' and 'group attitudes'.

Emphasizing the concept of accepted authority, Barnard points out that unaccepted authority represents "the fiction of superior authority", which is based on the 'power of veto', which lies in the hands of those who receive orders. This veto can be exercised if those in positions of authority display inability, ignorance of conditions, or failure to communicate what ought to be said. On the other hand, people will generally grant much greater authority to those superiors who combine the formal authority of position with ability, knowledge and understanding, which in the final count gives them also the authority of leadership.

VI. MORAL RESPONSIBILITY

The concept of responsibility, in Barnard's view is "the power of a particular private code of morals to control the conduct of the individual in the presence of strong contrary desires or impulses." Responsibility is determined not by any single code, but by a complex set of moral, legal, technical, professional, and organizational codes. These codes are effective not because of external sanctions, but owing to the sense of moral duty among members of an organization, and the painful sense of internal guilt which arises when they refuse to discharge certain duties.

In Barnard's opinion, the failure of many executives often results not from their technical inability, but from a kind of 'paralysis of action' owing to complexity of internal organizational codes and individual's participation in different organizations with conflicting codes. Code conflicts become much more serious at the higher levels of executive responsibility which get differentiated from the lower levels mainly by conditions of greater moral complexity. In his last published writing, Barnard maintains that "management decisions are concerned with moral issues." Yet the best known moral principles—Christian ethics—seem to have "little application or relevance to the moral problems of the world of affairs." Therefore Barnard in his book "Elementary Conditions of Business Morals" insists on
the importance of research between executive behaviour and principles of morality.

VII. PRINCIPLES OF COMMUNICATION

Problems of communication figure prominently in Barnard's works. According to Barnard, a cooperative system is held together by the ability of its members to communicate with each other. Hence a primary function of executives is to create and maintain a communication system. From this point of view, the formal organizational structure is if to be regarded as a 'communication network', the lines of authority as JI 'channels of formal communication', and an executive as 'a communication centre'. Barnard does not build the theories of communication, which were themselves developed under the auspices of telephone company. He lays down such formal principles of communication as these:

1. Channels of communication should be definitely known which can be done by fixing and publicizing the authority of both position and person.
2. Everyone in an organization must have a definite, formal relationship of subordination or super-ordination to someone else in the organization.
3. The line of communication should be as direct or short as possible.
4. The complete line of communication should usually be used. 'Jumping of the line' usually leads conflicting communications, misinterpretations, and the undermining of responsibility.
5. The competence of persons serving as communication centres (that is, officers, supervisory heads) must be adequate. In the large organizations, the top executive authority is exercised sooner by an organized group than one executive.
6. The line of communication should not be interrupted during the time when the organization is functioning. This requires elaborate provisions for "the temporary filling of offices automatically during incapacity or absence of incumbents."
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6. Every communication must be authenticated. This means that the person communicating must be within the bounds of his ting authority. Barnard maintains that in small organizations, most of these principles operate automatically, in large organizations, their application is a complex task.

VIII. ORGANIZATIONAL DECISION-MAKING

Barnard attaches great importance to the system of decision-making for the functioning of an organization. Instead of individual decision-making based on unconscious and automatic response, Barnard believes in organizational decision-making, which is based more upon deliberation and calculation. Barnard says that while making a decision, the decision-maker must distinguish between those facts, which influence the fulfilment of an organization's purpose and those, which are mostly irrelevant. For this a search for 'strategic factors' is to be done. Yet it is a difficult task because the technical methods of disclosing such factors in economic and social parts of the environment have been little elaborated. In view of the complexity of the economic and social organization, Barnard says that the solution of this difficulty cannot be found merely through logical techniques. Therefore, it is necessary to develop 'non-logical mental processes' which, according to him, are "not capable of being expressed in words or as reasoning." A strict logical conclusion for the mathematician, lawyer or book-keeper is possible only on the basis of precise information. But when this information is of a 'speculative' or 'hybrid' character, Barnard argues, it "cannot bear the weight of ponderous logic."

IX. PLAN AND PLANNING

According to Barnard, most national plans have been based upon great uncertainties. The planners have usually ignored the realities of behaviour in complex organizations. They try to escape their own freedom of choice by seeking "constantly to devise rules, norms, formulas and organization by which decisions are made for them."
For Barnard, 'genuine planning' is "a process of developing and applying knowledge and intelligence to our affairs." He asserts that each plan represents much more than which may be expressed in formal documents. It is "not a plan until it is accepted as a basis of action." From this viewpoint every plan must include the following elements: (1) ends to be attained, (2) feasibility, (3) the "materials" of the situation, (4) commitments, (5) positive provision for uncertainties, and (6) responsibility for action. Moreover, any plan for internal organization should recognize "the informal organization of the world as the indispensable base for any stable organization."

**X. EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS**

To Barnard, executive is the most strategic factor in the organization. For him, the executive work involves "the specialized work of maintaining the organization in operation."

**RENSIS LIKERT AND SYSTEM 4 MANAGEMENT APPROACH**

**INTRODUCTION**

Rensis Likert is a well-known theoretician of the "human relations" school. He is known for developing the system 4 theory in management. He is also considered to be one of the pioneers in developing means of measuring human variables.

Born in 1903, Likert received his doctorate in 1932 from Columbia University. He held many positions of distinction both in public and private organizations. After serving as the chief of the Morale division of the United States Strategic Bombing Survey for a couple of years, Likert set up the Survey Research Centre in 1946 which was subsequently (in 1948) enlarged to become the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan.

For nearly 25 years (1946 to 1970) he directed the nation's largest academic social science centre. During this period, Likert assisted by a team of forty researchers conducted extensive research studies on railways, hospitals, schools, industrial and commercial firms, and voluntary
organisations covering persons ranging from unskilled workers in factories to top scientists in research laboratories.

In the course of these researches, Likert developed certain ideas and approaches important to understanding leadership behaviour. He has also propounded the concepts of participative management and supportive relationships.

**Likert's Major Works**

1. *New Patterns of Management* (1961);
2. *The Human Organization: Its management and Value* (1967);

**II. SYSTEMS OF MANAGEMENT**

Likert's research at the University of Michigan over the years has revealed to him that the best managerial producer (1) is supportive in that he lends support and help to those reporting to him; (2) facilitates people's work with the necessary tools, training and other resources necessary to ensure action; (3) encourages interaction, talk, and mutual help among all members of the work group; (4) expects high performance standards. Likert refers to this type of management as "system 4" or participative—group, management.

**System 4 Management**

Likert describes an organization as an "Interaction influence system" and regards the most effective organizations as those in which reciprocal influence by many members leads to greater influence as a whole. As guidelines for research and for the clarification of his concepts, Likert has distinguished four systems of management.

1. **System 1 Management**: System 1 management is called "exploitive-authoritative" in that managers (a) are highly authoritarian and autocratic, (b) have little confidence and trust in subordinates, (c) motivate people through fear and punishment, (d) engage in downward communication, and (e) make decision at the top of the organization, and exhibit similar characteristics.

2. **System 2 Management**: System 2 management is described as "benevolent authoritative" in that managers (a) have a condescending
confidence and trust in subordinates, (b) motivate people with rewards and through some fear and punishment, (c) engage in some upward communication, (d) seek some ideas and opinions from subordinates, and (e) permit some delegation of decision-making at lower levels with close policy control.

3. System 3 Management: System 3 management is described as "consultative" in that managers (a) have substantial but not complete confidence and trust in subordinates, (b) try to make use of ideas and opinions from subordinates, (c) motivate people through rewards with occasional punishment and some participation, (d) engage in both downward and upward communication, (e) make broad policy decisions at the top with specific decisions at lower levels, and (f) provide consultation in other ways.

4. System 4 Management: System 4 management is referred to as "participative group." Likert sees this system as the most participative of all. In this system 4 management managers (a) have complete trust and confidence in subordinates in all matters, (b) make constructive use of ideas and opinions after getting them from subordinates, (c) give economic rewards on the basis of group participation and involvement in setting high performance goals, improving work methods, etc., (d) engage in much communication flow both down and up with peers, (e) encourage decision-making throughout the organization, and operate s with themselves and their subordinates as a group. In general, Likert has observed that those managers who applied the system 4 approach to their management had greatest success as leaders.

Moreover, he found that companies managed under the system 4 approach were most effective in achieving performance goals and were generally more productive. Applying the survey feedback method, Likert proposes an organizational improvement cycle. He proposes the following guidelines for using organizational improvement cycle.

1. Focus the action efforts on the causal variables, such as leadership behaviour and structure. Do not try to change by direct action the
intervening variables such as motivation and control. If the causal variables are improved, there will be subsequent improvements in the intervening variables;

2. Move from System 1 to 4 gradually. Do not attempt one big jump from System 1 to 4. Both leaders and members of the organisation lack the skills for interaction and adaptation and many find it different to make a sudden, sizeable shift from System 1 to 4;

3. Involve those whose behaviour has to be changed to bring the desired improvement, in planning the action to be taken, involve all the persons affected in all the steps of the improvement cycle;

4. Use objective, impersonal evidence as much as possible in the action planning process;

5. As far as possible, ensure the initiative and active participation of those in the most powerful and influential positions in the improvement programme; and

6. Conduct the action planning in a supportive, helpful atmosphere.

Likert's conviction is that application of above guidelines would result in the organizational improvements under System 4 theory of management.

III. MEASURING AND CONTROLLING THE HUMAN ORGANIZATION

A significant area of control is measuring critical human variables like measuring activities in such operating areas as profits, costs, sales, and production output for which techniques are available. Rensis Likert is a pioneer in developing means of measuring human variables.

Since Likert's research findings indicate that shifts towards system 4 management bring an improvement in productivity, better labour-management relations and greater involvement of individuals, he has sought out the underlying variables that indicate managing, and developed a means of measuring them.

1. Measuring Causal and Intervening Variables

Likert maintains that (i) causal variables of managerial behaviour and organization structure interact with (ii) certain intervening variables (such
as motivating factors, goal performance, extent of communication and the interaction-influence factors) to cause end-result variables in such operating areas as profits, costs, sales, production output, plus the end-result of human satisfaction.

Likert's approach in the control has two aspects: measuring individual managers and their groups; ii) measuring the value of the human assets of an enterprise. In other words, through measuring the causal and intervening variables at regular period, Likert argues, that any enterprise can see what is happening to the ability of a group's performance. Likert, however, made it clear that there may be a time lag (i.e., costs were reduced and profits increased by highly authoritative managing) before end results may figure.

Further, it is Likert's conviction that an attempt to measure the causal of managerial behaviour and organization structure as well as the intervening variables, is likely to be an essential and helpful approach to the overall control of performance of an enterprise.

Although the system of measurement is crude and suffers from a variety of defects, the measurement and control of human variables are important for improving the quality of management.

2. Human Asset Accounting
In analyzing the neglect of human assets by departments and business organizations, Likert emphasizes that managers would be better able to see the whole picture if they had "accounting procedures showing the investment in the human organization." Likert and his associates have undertaken experiments in human assets accounting." To cover the entire spectrum of human resources, the originators of this kind of accounting would have to include not only the asset represented by people within the enterprise but also values represented by customer good will. While it is believed that present "value" of human resources, at least for those internal to the enterprise, can be reasonably well approached through the use of the Likert measurements, there is little evidence that this has been done with an acceptable degree of credibility. As the same time, there is much to be done for continuing efforts in this area.
SUPERVISORY STYLES

Likert's findings have indicated that departments, which are less efficient tend to be in the charge of supervisors who can be referred to as "job-centred." According to Likert, supervisors who are job-centred "tend to concentrate on keeping their subordinates busily engaged in going through a specified work cycle in a prescribed way and at a satisfactory rate as determined by time standards." This is in line with Taylor's approach of breaking down the job. The supervisor sees himself as getting the job done with the resources at his disposal.

On the other hand supervisors who are employee-centred tend to focus their attention on the human aspects of their subordinates' problems, and on building effective work groups. Likert's conviction is that supervisors who are employee-centred achieve better performance due to their following attributes: (i) They consider their jobs to be concerning with human beings rather than with the work; they perceive their function as helping them to do the job efficiently; they exercise general rather than detailed supervision and are more concerned with goals than procedures; and (iv) they permit maximum participation of subordinates in decision-making process.

Likert says that if high productivity is to be attained a supervisor must not only be employee-centred but must also have high performance goals and be capable of exercising the decision-making processes to attain them.

V. PRINCIPLE OF SUPPORTIVE RELATIONSHIPS

1. Leadership

Likert postulates the principle of supportive relationships which is similar to Theory Y as discussed by McGregor. The focus in this model is on participation and involvement of individuals in the managerial process. The aim of managers is to support employees in their achievement of results. Likert and Likert state:

"The leadership and other processes of the organisation must be such as to ensure a maximum probability in all interactions and all relationships with the organisation. Each member will, in the light of his background,
values and expectations, view the experience as supportive and one which builds and maintains his sense of personal worth and importance."

Likert recognizes that management is a relative process. Therefore, a leader must adapt his behaviour to take account of the persons whom he encounters. Likert says there are no specific rule which will work well in all situations, but only general principles which must be interpreted to consider expectations, values and skills of those with whom the manager interacts. Sensitivity to these values and expectations may lead to organizational conflicts. Therefore, organizations must create a working environment in which a manager is able to deal with the people whom he encounters in a manner fitting to their values and their expectations.

2. Interaction—Influence System

Likert conceives an idea of interaction—influence system in order to increase skills, resources and motivation of individuals at different levels of the organization. He says that such a system would facilitate the integration of organizational (in terms of skills, resources and motivation of individuals) and managerial processes such as coordination, control, decision-making, direction, etc. The effectiveness of these processes, therefore depends on the efficacy of the interaction-influence which, in turn, determines the capacity of the organization to optimize the skills and resources of individuals and workgroups.

Some of the characteristics of an ideal interaction-influence system are: (I) Each member's goals and values would be reflected in those of the workgroups and organization as a whole. (ii) The urge for high performance goals, efficient methods and skills development comes from the members themselves. (Hi) Each member of the organization will be able to exert his influence on decisions and actions of the organization through cooperative motivation, communication and decision processes. Although there is a considerable support for the interaction-influence system as propounded by Likert, it is not without limitations.

VI. LINKING PIN MODEL

Likert is also known for theorizing 'Linking Pin Model' of organization structure. According to him the application of this model would remove the
obstacles found in traditional hierarchies and 'would facilitate the growth of interaction-influence system. It is based on the idea that every individual in the organization is an important member of two groups. He is a member of a higher level group and leader of a lower level group. Thus an individual functions in an organization as a linking pin for the units in the organization above and below him. In this model instead of man'-to-man relationship, a group-to-group relationship exists. The focus in this model is upward. Communication, supervisory influence, decision-making processes and high performance goals grow upwards from the organizational base in comparison to top-down management of classical organization.

Likert has developed this model further and added horizontal linkages to the model. He gives illustrations to explain this point: (a) subordinate serves as a linking pin for horizontal coordination; (b) vertical overlapping linkages of line and staff agencies; (c) vertical overlapping linkages of product departments; and (d) multiple overlapping group structures of both horizontal and vertical linkages. Likert's Linking Pin arrangement with lateral linkages appears to be definitely better than the traditional hierarchical arrangement but its application remains to be tested.

VII. MANAGING CONFLICTS

The conflict problem also figures prominently in Likert's works. He says: "There is ample evidence in the mass media and elsewhere that bitter, unresolved conflict is widespread and increasing in frequency. It occurs at all levels of society; among nations and within nations, among organizations and within them." He refers to conflict "as the active striving for one's own preferred outcome, which if attained, precludes the attainment by others of their own preferred outcome, thereby producing hostility." He distinguishes substantive conflict from affective conflict. Whereas the former is rooted in the substance of the task, the latter is derived from the emotional, affective aspects of interpersonal relations.
The widely prevalent win-lose strategies of conflict resolution in organisations distort the perceptions of individual and groups, maintain a polarised adversary orientation at all times and escalate the costs of chronically defeated groups to organisations. Likert suggests the application of System 4 management for resolving conflicts. In general he found that business organizations and departments managed by the System 4 approach had greatest success as leaders.

VIII. A CRITICAL EVALUATION Criticism

Likert's ideas and approaches have been subjected to criticism. System 4 Approach: Although there is considerable support for system 4 approach, it is not without its critics. The research focus of this theory is on small groups, yet the findings are applied to the total organization. Likert and his associates felt the need for clarity in role definitions, but simultaneously they suggested, for example, cross-functional teams and matrix departmentalization that usually increase role conflict and uncertainty. Further, since system 4 approach is often applied at the time companies are profitable, the results attributed to the survey feedback method may actually be due to general prosperity of the company. Human Asset Accounting: Likert has suggested methods for measuring the value of the human assets of an enterprise. But it is difficult to do so. While it is believed that present value of human resources, at least for those internal to the enterprise, can be reasonably approached through the application of the Likert measurements, there is little evidence that this has been done with an agreeable degree of credibility. These are problems with this approach. In fact, there is conflict among management experts, between the proponents of human resource accounting and the financial people who have to develop the system for measuring the human assets. Measuring Variables: While Likert has developed a means of measuring the participative group management under system 4, the measurement is still rather crude and much more empirical research is needed to verify its utility.
Linking Pin Model: Likert's Pin Model is also criticized on the ground that it is just doing nothing more than drawing triangles around the traditional hierarchical structures. Moreover, this model is also criticized for slowing down the process of decision-making.

Interaction-Influence System: Likert's idea of interaction-influence system has many distinctive features. But in actual practice these features are not found in any enterprise. One may rarely finds pressures for high performance goals, efficient methods and skill development coming from the employees themselves. These are all ideal features often considered, but rarely applied.

Conclusion
Despite the fact that a good deal of criticism has been levelled against his ideas and approaches, Likert's contributions to management thought are regarded of great value. He has given new ideas of participative management, linking pin model, supportive relationships, interaction-influence system all have far-reaching impact on modern management. While Likert has made too much of his system 4 approach and appears to be highly biased towards a highly participative managing style, the underlying facts support this approach. For example, few managers would disagree with characteristics of system 4 managing: (a) communication initiated at all levels; (b) full use of economic, and other motives; (c) high performance goals; (d) personnel feeling responsibility for the organization's goals ; (e) decision makers being well aware of problems; and (f) widespread responsibility for review and control. These variables are very important and are regularly associated with good managing.

ECOLOGICAL APPROACH
Riggs in the beginning has been primarily interested in conceptualizing the interactions between the administrative system and their environment. He maintains that administration does not function in isolation from its environment (socio-cultural, political and economic) and there is a
continuous interaction between the two, both influencing each other. The understanding of the dynamics of this process of interaction between the two is necessary for the understanding of the problems of administration. This approach adopted is called the ecological approach, which is the focal point of Riggssian analysis and has been one of the most creative models in analysing the administration of developing countries. Thus to study the behaviour of a particular administrative system, it is necessary to have a deep understanding of the environment in which it functions, because the environment has a direct effect on its component system. It may be mentioned here that the ecological approach to the study of public administration was initiated by J.M. Gaus, Robert A. Dahl and Robert Merton long before Riggss has developed it on the basis of his studies in Thailand, the Philippines and, to a degree, India. He finds that most of the Western concepts and theories look "inside" the system, not "outside"—socio-economic environment. That is why, he observes that Western concepts of public administration have major shortcomings for understanding the problems of developing countries.

**Structural—Functional Approach**

In explaining the concept of ecological approach, Riggss takes the help of structural-functional systems. Riggss holds the view that each system is made up of various structures, which perform specific functions. A structure may be defined as a pattern of behaviour, which has become a standard feature of the system, and functions can be related to the role— the structure plays in a system. Instead of concentrating on one aspect of the society, the ecological approach takes the holistic view of the organization. Accordingly Riggss suggests that administrative structure and behaviour being an integral and interacting part of the

**RIGGS' IDEAL MODELS**

Riggs has built certain theoretical models, better known as "ideal models" to explain the change in the transitional societies. Riggs first constructed the "Agraria" and "Industria" model in 1957 taking the examples of Imperial
China and contemporary United States of America. According to him all societies move from agraria to industria stage at a given point. This is a unidirectional movement. Riggs later postulated an intermediate model which he labels "transitia" which represents the transitional societies, having the attributes of both Agraria and Industria (agricultural and industrial societies). The characteristics of Agraria and Industria, according to Riggs are:

**Characteristics of Agraria and Industria**

*Agraria Industria*

1. Ascriptive values Achievement norms
2. Particularistic Universal
3. Diffuse pattern Specificity
4. Limited social and spatial higher social and spatial mobility mobility
5. Simple and stable occupational well developed occupational differences patterns

Riggs' models are discussed as follows:

**1. Fused Society (Model)**

Riggs explains the concept of fused society by referring to the examples of Imperial China and pre-revolutionary Siamese Thailand. These agrarian societies had practically a single structure performing all the functions. The king and the officials nominated by him performed all administrative, economic and other activities by themselves. Their economic system was based on the law of exchange and barter system (exchange of goods without the use of money) which, Riggs calls a re-distributive model. People showed reverence to the king by offering their services and material goods to him without expecting anything in return. The government was not accountable to the people though the public had an obligation to obey the dictates of the government. The Royal family played a prominent role in the administration of the fused societies.

Thus a fused society is structurally undifferentiated and is multifunctional in character. Communications in such a society are very weak and
people's relations with the government are at low ebb. The behaviour of the people is highly traditional and is characterized by ascription and particularism. Age-old customs, beliefs and traditional ways of living enable the people to live together.

2. Diffracted Society (Model)
In contrast to the fused society, a diffracted society is highly differentiated (For Riggs "differentiation" is the criterion of development). There is a high degree of specialization and each structure performs a specialized function. Functions in such a society (like an American society) are very specific and the degree of integration and differentiation is very high. Ascriptive values cease to exist giving way to achievement in the society. All structures in the society are created and based on rational considerations. The economic system based on market mechanism has its effect on the other facets of the society which Riggs calls "marketized society." In a diffracted society, communications and technology are highly developed and Government gives top priority to the maintenance of cordial public relations. Government is responsive to the needs of the people and protects human rights. Government officials have no coercive and absolute powers, and the people are expected to respect the laws of the land.

3. Prismatic Society (Model)
The prismatic society model on which Riggs has worked hard occupies an important place in Riggs' works. According to Riggs, the prismatic society is one, which has achieved a certain level of differentiation with specialization of roles necessary for dealing with modern technology, but has failed to integrate. It has moved away from the confused stage but has not yet reached the diffracted one. It is thus a transitional society, which is at a middle period where old customs and traditional ideas exist along with modern standards and values.

Characteristics of a Prismatic Society
Riggs says that a prismatic society has three important characteristics: (a) heterogeneity, (b) formalism, and (c) overlapping.

(a) **Heterogeneity:** The word 'hetero' is derived from 'heterus', which means different. A prismatic society has heterogeneous structures existing side-by-side. Due to the parallel co-existence of diametrically opposite viewpoints and practices, the social change in a prismatic society would be inconsistent, incomplete and unresponsive. These heterogeneous structures have often extreme qualities which reflect the wide disparities in society in social, economic, religious and cultural matters. Thus one may find extremely modern structures existing simultaneously with traditional ones. Consequently there is an uneven development in society. Urban areas are based increasingly on Western patterns and fashions, but in rural areas, people lead a highly traditional life with no facilities of modern living like use of computers, telephones, refrigerators, etc.

In a prismatic society, bureaucrats enjoy enormous influence, power and prestige and make money. The people who are in power would make all efforts in furtherance of their interests and stick to power. The problem becomes much more complicated in a poly-communal society where different communities strive to pull the society in different directions in promoting their own sectional interests. These sorts of disparities and differentiations lead to creation of administrative problems. The ruling elite would generally try to protect the interests of 'haves' and ignore the interests of 'have nots' which, according to Riggs, would create a 'revolutionary atmosphere' in the society.

(b) **Formalism:** According to Riggs 'formalism' refers to the extent "to which a discrepancy exists between norms and practices, between the prescriptive and descriptive, between formal and effective power...and actual practices and facts of government and society." Formalism is a situation where a law says one thing but the practice is something different. The level of formalism depends upon the type of pressures—exogenous or endogenous—applied for the development or change of the society. According to Riggs, if the pressure is exogenous in nature, the level of formalism will be higher. In contrast, there is relatively lesser formalism introduced in the society if the source is endogenous. For
instance the Constitution vests law-making responsibilities in legislators but in reality they spend only' a little time in law-making activities. They concentrate more in power politics than in discharging their political functions. This facilitates the bureaucracy to play a decisive role in policy-making process. Thus formalism theoretically, prevails in all aspects of social life, but in practice norms continue to dominate the affairs.

(c) Overlapping: To Riggs overlapping refers to "the extent to which formally differentiated structures of a diffraeted society co-exists with undifferentiated structures of a fused type." In a prismatic society functions are performed by old traditional structures as well as by modern ones leading to creation of confusion and disregularity. Thus in a prismatic society, the legislature, executive and bureaucracy perform various administrative, political, economic and social functions. In practice, their behaviour is largely governed and controlled by certain traditional organizations like family, religion, caste, etc.

Overlapping in a prismatic society manifests in several dimensions such as 'nepotism', 'poly-communalism', the existence of 'elects', 'poly-normativism' and lack of consensus and separation of 'authority from control'.

IV. SALA MODEL

Riggs says that a society comprises various economic, political, administrative, and cultural sub-systems. His prismatic society has also its own administrative sub-system, which he calls 'Sala'. He uses the terms 'Chamber' for the administrative sub-system of a fused society, and 'Bureau' or 'Office' for a diffraeted society. Each of them has it's own distinctive characteristics.

'Sala' is a Spanish word, which has been defined differently—a government office, a religious conference, a room, etc. It combines certain features of 'bureau' of a diffraeted society and 'chamber' of a fused society. The heterogeneous structures, traditional and modern values of the prismatic society are found in the administrative system in Sala.

**Characteristics of Sala Model**

Some of the features governing administrative sub-system in a sala model are:
1. Nepotism
In a prismatic society, nepotism and favouritism play a dominant role in the making of appointments to various administrative posts. Members of a family and their kin are given preference in employment and other matters. The close relatives of a government official derive a variety of advantages from his official position in various ways. On the contrary the considerations of kinship are kept out of the administrative behaviour in a diffracted society. In a fused society the politico-administrative system has a patrimonial feature in which family or kinship play a significant role. In a prismatic society, the laws, rules and regulations laid down in the statutes are not adhered to in practice. The Sala officer attaches importance to personal increase in power and material gains rather than paying attention to social welfare of the people. His behaviour and performance is influenced by parochialism, and consequently, the laws, the rules are not made universally applicable.

2. Poly-Communalism
Poly-communalism is the name given by Riggs to plural society where we find the simultaneous existence of several ethnic, religious and racial groups. Most of them are in hostile interaction with each other. They lack proper motivation for social change. This affects the society as well as the administration. If a member of a minority community is able to occupy a high position in a public or private organization, he begins to show preference to the members of his own community in administrative matters, such as recruitment, promotion, transfer, etc. Because different communities try to pull the society in different directions to fulfil their own communal interests, administrative problems are likely to arise. To prevent such a situation and to protect the interests of other minorities, the quota or reservation system may be adopted to provide some sort of proportional representation to all communities in the administration. However, such an arrangement may lead to mutual hostility among various communities thereby creating administrative crisis.

3. Existence of Clects
'Clect' is another word used by Riggs to mean a typical prismatic group, "which makes use of modern, associational methods of organisation, but retains diffuse and particularistic goals of a transitional type." Riggs says in a prismatic society there is a simultaneous growth of elects, which combine the features of 'sects' of the fused and 'club' of the diffracted society. Clects represent exclusively the people of a particular community or group, and government officials belonging to that category serve only the members of their respective 'elects' more effectively by ignoring others. Sometimes, the Sala officer or its subordinate develops close relations with particular elects or start functioning like a elect in itself. As a result, the elects foster close links with a particular group and function primarily in their own interest ignoring universalistic norms.

In a prismatic society, people subscribe to different values and norms of their own. These lead to differences in society. Moreover the traditional and modern ideas coexist and are in hostile with each other. As a result of overlapping, decision-making becomes more complicated.

The Sala bureaucrat may enter into service by virtue of his possession of educational qualifications or through success in competitive examinations, but in respect of his promotion and career development, he depends largely on ascriptive ties and seeks favours from his superior bureaucrats. The Sala official publicly may adhere to a modern set of norms but secretly reject them as meaningless. A Sala official may insist on a strict enforcement of regulations by the public, but when his personal issue is involved, he may openly violate them.

5. Separation of Authority from Control

Riggs says that the prismatic society consists of a "highly centralized and concentrated authority structure over-lapping a control system that is highly localized and dispensed." Thus, authority and control overlap each other. The authority of the sala overlaps with the control mechanisms, which are based on poly-communalism, elects and poly-normativism. This
form of overlapping influences the relationships between politicians and administrators.

According to Riggs a prismatic society is an "unbalanced polity" in which bureaucrats dominate the politico-administrative system. Bureaucrats in an unbalanced polity exercise much more power than their formal authority suggests. They have statutory authority which is used for influencing decision over the allocation of human and physical resources. Due to such a concentration of powers in the hands of bureaucrats, there would be lack of response to the demands of the people. Riggs also states that when such a weak political system and leadership fail to control the bureaucracy, the legislature, political parties, voluntary associations and public opinion also become ineffective.

The influence of a political executive varies considerably with his ability to reward or punish the administrators, but even then the role a bureaucrat plays in a prismatic society influences largely the level of output. Since the performance of the government largely depends on the level of output of the Sala official, Riggs says that there is an inverse ratio between administrative output and bureaucratic power. The more powerful the officials become the less efficient they become as administrators. Thus Sala in a prismatic society is characterized by nepotism in recruitment, institutionalized corruption and inefficiency in the implementation of laws.

**BAZAR-CANTEEN MODEL**

Riggs calls the economic sub-system of a prismatic society as "Bazar-Canteen" model. In a diffracted society, a market economy! exists in which market factors of supply and demand have an important role to play. In a fused society, 'arena' factors dominate, that is, a kind' of barter exchange system exists, and the question of price very rarely arises. In contrast to a diffracted society, the prismatic society has the characteristics of both market economy and traditional economy. In such a prismatic economy, a kind of price indeterminacy prevails.
In this model, a small section of people exercise control over economic institutions and exploit a large number of people. Bargaining, rebates, corrupt practices are some of the features of this model. The prices of goods and services vary from person to person, place to place and from time to time. The price of any commodity and service depends on family contracts, individual relationship, bargaining power and politics. There is a form of 'subsidised' canteen where the members of a particular group can buy things at subsidised prices. Conversely in a 'tributary' canteen, members of the less privileged, politically non-influential or members of the outside groups are charged higher prices for the same things.

The wage relations in a prismatic society are also determined on family and kinship considerations. A large number of public officials may get higher salaries without doing any work. On the contrary, people who work more may be given less pay. In such a situation, low-wage earners would be inclined to increase their incomes through illegitimate means. Thus, the norms of conduct of officials are affected which in turn, affect the economic sub-system of a prismatic society. Exploitation, social injustice, corruption, inflation and discrimination, therefore, become the major features of the 'bazar-canteen' model.

PRISMATIC SOCIETY THEORY REVISED

Riggs has revised his original views about the prismatic society. In his later publication "Prismatic Society Revisited" (1975) he realizes the limitations of 'one dimensional approach' (that is differentiation) and suggests a new definition of prismatic society based on a 'two dimensional approach'.

In his new formulation, Riggs introduces the second dimension of levels of integration among the societies that are characterized as diffracted and prismatic. Riggs, by introducing two dimensional approach of 'differentiation' and 'integration' arranges the societies on the scale of integration and mal-integration. The two basic societal models of diffracted and prismatic are further subdivided into finer types on the basis of degree of integration. Accordingly, diffracted societies are re-conceptualized as 'eco-diffracted', 'ortho-diffracted', and 'neo-dif-fr acted'. Likewise, prismatic
societies are reconceptualized as 'eco-prismatic', 'ortho-prismatic', and 'neo-prismatic'.

The two-dimensional approach means that the prismatic model would include any society that is differentiated but mal-integrated. Also a diffracted model would refer to a society that is differentiated and integrated. Prefixes of eco, ortho and neo are attached to both the prismatic and -diffracted types to suggest stages in the degree of differentiation and integration. The new formulation of two dimensional approach, as Riggs claims, has the advantage of conceding that prismatic conditions need not be confined to less developed countries only, but may take place in societies at any level of differentiation including those in developed countries.

To Riggs, the word "prismatic" is not a synonym for "transitional" or for "developing" He also maintains, that there is no fully developed country. Hopefully all are developing, and some may have developed more than others. But even the most developed countries are still far short of their own goals for development, because they still have major unsolved problems, and no doubt some of those problems, will become worse, not better, in the years ahead.

DEVELOPMENT AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION DEFINED

Riggs' views on 'development' and 'development administration' prominently figure in his works.

1. Development

Riggs first defines 'development' in terms of "rising levels of autonomy or discretion, in the sense of ability to choose among alternatives, not, of course, in the sense of caution or moderation." This conception of development overcomes the essentially static quality of systems theory. To him, goals of development are multiple. "It is concerned not only with raising levels of economic production and consumption, but with freedom, justice, security, and the basic integrity of man as a human being." Later on he sees "development as process whereby human societies become
less determined by environmental constraints, and more able to shape their own destiny."

Riggs considers differentiation and integration as the key ingredients in the process of development. According to him, the level of differentiation in any society depends upon the technological and non-technological factors. The more the development and change in technology is, the higher is the level of differentiation. The ingredient of integration depends on penetration and participation. To Riggs penetration is "a government's ability to make and carry put decisions throughout a count.

2. Development Administration
Fred W. Riggs defines 'development administration' as "organized's efforts to carry out programs or projects thought by those involved to serve developmental objectives." Further placing an emphasis on administration of development and development of administration, Riggs observes that "development administration refers not only to a government's efforts to carry out programs designed to reshape its physical, human, and cultural environment, but also to the struggle to enlarge a government's capacity to engage in such programs." Thus he says that the idea of development administration has two facets: 'development of administration' and 'administration of development'. Laying stress upon their close interaction, Riggs remarks: "The reciprocal relatedness of these two sides involves a chicken and egg type of causation. Administration cannot normally be improved very much without changes in the environmental constraints (the infrastructure) that hamper its effectiveness; and the environment itself cannot be changed unless the administration of developmental programs is strengthened." Although Riggs has been accused of supporting bureaucratic power and authoritarianism in developing countries, his ideas on development administration have gained wide recognition in the discipline of public administration.

A CRITICAL EVALUATION
Criticism
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The Riggsian theory of prismatic society is regarded as a valuable contribution to comparative public administration. Yet his models and propositions have been questioned and subjected to severe criticism. The Riggsian theory of prismatic society is 'primarily an explanation of the ecology of Thailand, the Philippines and, to a degree, India. But it may be more difficult to apply it to contemporary China, Iran, Cuba and a host of other developing countries. Until politics in the traditional sense gets incorporated into the theory, one fails to understand differential allocation of resources within the bureaucracy. The relating of different parts of the bureaucracy to the often shifting coalition of elites could eliminate the tendency of Riggs to treat bureaucracies in highly monolithic terms.

To explain his models and concepts, Riggs borrowed most of his terminology from physical sciences. But free use of certain new words with different meanings may create confusion instead of clarifying the concepts. Chapman, commenting on this aspect, writes that Riggs should have prepared his own dictionary to explain his terminology.

Hahn-Been Lee considers Riggs' models as equilibrium models, which explain in terms of preserving the system but, not introducing any change in the system. Lee observes that Riggs' models are not useful when the objective of administration is to change the system, rather than the maintenance of the system.

Daya Krishna points out that Riggs' prismatic model serves no purpose as it does not find out the stages in the process of development. He finds logic in the three-fold classification of the societies in the background of the concept of development. He feels that the Riggs' view of integration as the result of a penetration and participation cannot be relevant to all situations. Moreover Riggs models are mostly based on certain assumptions. But in the absence of a measuring scale, the identification of prismatic or diffracted societies becomes very difficult.

Riggs has not attached as much significance to the positive character of a prismatic society as to its negative character. For example he projected formalism as a negative aspect. But it is also true that sometimes the
people might stand to gain if the rules and regulations are not strictly adhered to. To counter-balance the Riggsian concept of negative formalism, Valson has presented a new concept of positive formalism. Riggs has also failed to recognize the role of internal as well as external forces in the process of development. While acknowledging the pioneering enterprise of Riggs, it needs to be admitted that the prismatic-Sala model has lost its specificity. Riggs has not given much importance to the basic problems of day such as poverty, environmental protection, population explosion an food production. On the aspect of development administration primarily developed by Riggs, Loveman writes: "By the 1970s administrative development and development administration had become euphemisms for autocratic, frequently military rule that, admittedly sometimes induced industrialization, modernization, and even economic growth? But this occurred at a great cost in the welfare of the rural and urban poor and a substantial erosion if not deletion of the political freedom? associated with liberal democracy."

**Conclusion**

Riggs' contribution to administration theory building is universally recognized by serious scholars of public administration and political science. Riggs is the foremost theory-builder in public administration. The influence of the Riggsian thought on contemporary administration is tremendous. His concepts and models, although have certain limitations, yet they may be regarded as more "sophisticated tools for describing and diagnosing administrative situations." They help us in understanding the administrative problems of the transitional societies.

**CHRIS ARGYRIS AND SELF-ACTUALIZATION**

**INTRODUCTION**

Amongst the contemporary organization theorists, Chris Argyris (1923- ) has acquired the unique distinction of being the foremost scholar who has contributed to the development of behavioural science. Argyris is best
known as a great psychologist and an organizational theorist. In developing his conceptualization on organizational behaviour, Argyris has applied research findings in the fields of psychology, social psychology and human relations.

Argyris has an excellent academic record with a background of economics and psychology. After taking his first degree in psychology he served as Professor of Industrial Administration at Yale University for many years. In 1971 he was appointed James Bryant Conant Professor of Education and Organization Behaviour at Harvard University.

Argyris' Major Works

1. *Personality and Organization* (1957);
2. *Understanding Organizational Behaviour* (1960);
3. *Interpersonal Competence and Organizational Effectiveness* (1964);
4. *Integrating the Individual and the Organization* (1965);
5. *Organization and Innovation* (1965);
6. *Intervention Theory and Method* (1970);
7. *Management and Organizational Development* (1971);
8. *The Applicability of Organizational Sociology* (1972);
9. *Increasing Leadership Effectiveness* (1976);
10. *Reasoning, Learning, Action* (1982);

II. ARGYRIS' MAIN THESIS

The focus of Argyris' study is on diagnosing the human relations in an organization. He has proceeded from the assumption that each individual person in the organization has a potential which can be fully realized. This potential for self-realization, or self-actualization benefits not only the (a) individual but also (b) the organization, and (c) the environment in which he works. Unfortunately present organizations and their members are mutually opposed to each other. They are run in a way which prevents any such benefits. Argyris is of the view that there are three sides to this problem (a) the development of the individual towards personal or psychological maturity, (b) the degree of inter-personal competence in
dealing with whom he works, and (c) the nature of organization for which he works. Argyris has consistently conducted research as to how the personal development of the individual is affected by the kind of situation in which he works.

A CRITIQUE OF FORMAL ORGANIZATION

Argyris has criticized the 'classic' theory of organization for creating incongruencies (inconsistencies) between the requirements of organization and the personal development of the individual. Argyris observes that the formal organizational principles make demands of relatively healthy individuals that are incongruent with their needs. Frustration, conflict, failure, and short-time perspective are predicted as resultant of this basic incongruency.

According to Argyris, (a) formal organization tends to reduce tasks to minimal (limited) specialized routines; and (b) there is an emphasis on directing and controlling the individual doing such tasks through a series of supervisors (the concern is with span of control principle). Consequently the specialists and subunits in the formal organization follow their own goals irrespective of interests of the organization and its members.

In such formal organizations, Argyris notes that (i) the individual is not a forward looking employee; (c) he is passive, not creative; and (d) his concerns are restricted to his own work difficulties.

In such situations, executives are liable to become yet more autocratic and directive. Their excessive control deprives employees of any opportunity of participating in the decisions, which affect their working life, giving rise to feelings of mutual distrust. Employees and even lower managers tend to perceive management controls as instruments of punishment.

Thus the principles of formal organization coupled with management controls, lack of employees' participation in important decisions, and use of control systems (such as work study and cost accounting) restrict the initiative and creativity of the individuals.
FUSION PROCESS THEORY

Argyris and P. Wight Bakke have developed what is known as 'Fusion Process' theory. Bakke and Argyris conducted extensive empirical researches for developing a new theoretical framework for organizations. From these researches emerged the fusion process theory of organization. The concept fundamental to this theory is that both individuals and organizations are entities trying for self-realization. In this an organization attempts to shape all the individuals who join it, and an individual who joins an organization likewise tries to shape it. Thus two behaviour processes operate simultaneously in a situation. These are called "the socializing process" and "the personalizing process." The socializing process is that by which individuals are made into agents of the organization. In the personalizing process, on the other hand, organizational groups are made into agencies for the individual self-actualization. Indeed, the fusion process is the simultaneous operation of both socializing and personalizing processes. Argyris says that both individuals and organizations are discrete organized systems each striving for self-actualization. He has even used the term 'organization' to include "all the behaviour of all the participants" in a group undertaking."

INCREASING ORGANIZATIONAL HEALTH

0 Individual Development Towards Personal Maturity

Argyris' personality model is regarded as a major contribution to the behavioural school of thought. According to him, the organization should provide an environment in which an individual is able to develop his personality from a state of infancy to a state of personal or psychological maturity. Argyris contends that this progression from infancy towards maturity consists of seven developments:
1. From infant passivity towards adult activity.
2. From dependence towards relative independence.
3. From limited behaviours to many different behaviours.
4. From erratic, shallow, brief interests to more stable, deeper interests.
5. From short time perspective to longer time perspective.
6. From a subordinate social position to an equal or superordinate social position.
7. From lack of self-awareness to self-awareness and self-control.

Like a child who is dependent and unaware of how his demands affect others, an immature individual person's activities are largely controlled by others. A mature person is active, independent and is self-controlled. According to Argyris personal or psychology maturity is achieved when the individual has acquired the ability to foresee consequences to pursue interests consistently, and to own responsibilities equal to superior or what others accept. With such development, the individual having potential will put all his energies into meeting the organizational challenges. However, such self-realization or self-actualisation is lacking. The reason is that lack of interpersonal competence and typical approach to the management of organizations prevent employees becoming mature in outlook and fail to arouse their energy to the full extent. Employees too often remain short-sighted in their actions on the job and seem to be reluctant in the growth of the organization. They shirk responsibility, and their approach to their work is apathetic. Effective management must aim at the development of individual towards personal or psychological maturity.

**Increasing Interpersonal Competence**

Argyris feels concerned to find the lack of interpersonal competence everywhere—in organizations (research institutions, hospitals, etc.) as well as among personnel (scientists, executives, etc.). That is, people do not trust each other; they find excuses for their acts; they stick to their old ways and never try new ones; they feel reluctant in being honest about their own feelings; they confine themselves to their limited routine tasks. Frank openness of manner and commitment to the job are lacking. This type of atmosphere is common in organizations, which are not 'axiologically good'. With a view to increasing interpersonal competence, Argyris has specified four specific types of behaviour: (i) accepting responsibility for one's ideas and feelings; (ii) showing openness to ideas and feelings of those above and below one's self;
(iii) experimenting with new ideas and feelings; and (iv) helping others to accept, show and experiment with their ideas and feelings.

In the context of interpersonal competence, Argyris says that top managers must not be reluctant in telling honestly about their feelings or those of the other persons. They must refuse to become defensive about what other people tell. This approach, according to Argyris, will then reduce tension and conflicts in the organization.

ORGANIZING FUTURE STRUCTURES

Looking to the future, different organizations have been suggested for different purposes. According to Argyris the organizations of the future will have mixes of characteristics of both the old and new forms of organizations. He suggests different mixes of organization with different pay offs.

(i) A Pyramidal Structure
The pyramidal type of organization is expected to perform limited routine tasks. It may be effective for non-innovative activity that requires little internal commitment. A post-office in a town represents the pyramidal type of organization.

(ii) An Adapted Formal Organizational Structure
A modified formal organizational structure is akin to Rensis Likert's participative structure. This type of structure is more effective because it offers much scope for subordinate participation with the option for the superior to take his own decision.

(iii) Defined but Participative Structure
Under this structure each employee has equal opportunity and can have more control over what is done in his own sphere of activities. This is used in situations involving group incentives, new product development, inter-departmental operations, etc.
(iv) *Matrix Organization*

In this form of the organization each employee has defined power and responsibility. He can have more control within his sphere of activities and greater participation in decisions about them. In matrix organization, superior-subordinate relationships are eliminated and substituted by self-disciplined individuals. Each individual has the power to influence the, nature of the activity. Under this system project teams are created to resolve specific conflicts. Members in each of the team project represent all the relevant managerial functions, such as manufacturing, marketing, finance, etc. All members function as a cohesive team. The team gets dissolved on the completion of its function. The leadership of the project team is required to be consistent with the management approach. The leader must be able to manage inter-group conflicts apart from helping the employees to understand internal environment.

(v) *T-Group or Sensitive Training*

Effective management must aim at the full development of individual potentialities. Greater attention to training of employees leads to more effective performance. Argyris believes that training enables employees to understand themselves and their situation at work better, lays emphasis on the T-group method (T-for training) or sensitive training. The T-group technique is a sort of laboratory programme designating to provide opportunities for employees to learn the nature of effective group functioning. The technique is also designed to provide experiences in order to increase psychological success, self-esteem an interpersonal competence.

Argyris says that sensitive training is not education for authoritarian leadership. Its objective is to develop effective, reality-centred leaders The most sensitivity training can do is to help the individual to see certain unintended consequences and costs of his leadership and to develop other leadership styles if he wishes.
In contrast to the conventional training programmes, the focus of T-group sessions is to create an atmosphere in which participants forgets hierarchichal identities and develop distributive leadership decision.

For reforming governmental organizations, Argyris suggests that al long-range programme is needed which would focus on the behaviour and leadership style of the senior participants. It should focus on organizational changes that would inculcate in the participants such attitudes as enable them to take more initiative and enlarge their responsibilities. Thus Argyris says that management must initiate programmes to "change peoples' attitudes" and to "make employees more interested in the organization."

**ENLARGING JOBS AND BUDGET PRESSURE**

*Job Enlargement*
Argyris favours the enlargement of jobs. This would help in expansion of the use of the individual's intellectual and interpersonal abilities. This would also permit each employee to exercise more control over what is done in his sphere of activities, and greater participation in decisions about them.

*Budget Pressure*
Argyris is of the view that budget pressure restricts human initiative and freedom. According to him it tends to unite the employees against management and tends to place the factory supervisors under tension. This tension among factory supervisors may lead to inefficiency, aggression and many human relations problems. Supervisors use budget

**CRITICISM OF SIMON AND SOCIO-PsyCHO**

**APPROACHES**
Argyris criticizes the approaches and work of both industrial psychologists (Hugo Munsterberg) and organizational sociologists (Blau, Thompson, etc.) for having ignored much of the research on personality, interpersonal
relationship and critical parts of the organization. According to Argyris, "Individual behaviour, small group behaviour and inter-group behaviour represent important parts that help to create the whole." Argyris is also critical of Herbert Simon's "rational man organization theory." According to Argyris, Simon's theory excludes variables of interpersonal relations, the need for self-actualisation, etc. which are central to organization behaviour. Further he criticizes Simon's reliance on the descriptive-empirical approach, mechanisms of organizational influence and his concept of 'satisficing man', being contradictory. Argyris accuses Simon and other traditional administrative thinkers for supporting authoritarian structures, for paying little attention to anger, conflict and emotional feelings of the man towards the organization and its goals.

A CRITICAL EVALUATION

Criticism

Chris Argyris and his ideas have been criticized on several grounds. First Argyris' concept of self-actualisation is being regarded as Utopia and without any precise operational indicators. Simon treats self-actualisation as synonymous with anarchy. Argyris' antipathy to authority is also being regarded as without any parallel. As Simon comments "Argyris...tended to choose de-emphasis of authority relations as the way out, but at the price of neglecting the consequences for organizational effectiveness.... What corrupts is not power, but the need for power and it corrupts both the powerful and the powerless." Argyris' contention that people in organizations are opposed to -authority has not been empirically supported by him. On the other hand it is maintained that people in the organization accept its authority and its goals because such acceptance is consistent with their values. Argyris' proposition that the pursuit of the goal of self-actualisation is a universalistic goal has also been questioned. Many may not like to self-actualise themselves and may feel satisfied under situations of directive leadership.
Chris Argyris has advocated for job enlargement and T-group sessions for increasing interpersonal competence. This remedial approach seems myopic in nature and cannot get to the root of the problem so long as the basic conflict of interests between the employers and employees exists. Rather these techniques cannot serve better than maintaining the status quo.

Conclusion
The focus of Chris Argyris' studies has been to analyse how the personal development of the individual is affected by the kind of situation in which he works. According to Argyris, the present organizational strategies developed and used by administrators lead to authoritarianism, de-humanization and organizational decay. His objective has been to increase organizational health and improve interpersonal competence. He advocates a basic change in organizations to provide an appropriate environment for self-realization. Gordon Lippitt observes that the greatest contribution of Argyris lies in his idea that 'formal organizations are basically anti-maturing and, therefore, act against employees achieving sense of self-actualization. However some of his propositions and ideas appear to be normative and lack empirical support. Important as he is, however, his contributions are considered contemporary and therefore it is difficult to give Argyris a precise place in a historically developed perspective. 

CYRIL NORTHCOTE PARKINSON AND PARKINSON'S LAW
INTRODUCTION
Cyril Northcote Parkinson, a British historian, has probably had a more profound impact on the administrative thinking. He acquired immense recognition for his work—Parkinson's Law. His work concerns political science, economics and history.

PARKINSON'S LAW
1. Work Expands to Fill the Time Available for its Completion
Parkinson's recognition grew since his publication of the paper "Parkinson's Law" in Economist (London) in 1955. Derived from his
experiences in the army, he has propounded what is known as Parkinson's Law that "work expands to fill the time available for its completion." His theory holds that as work expands to fill available time so subordinates are appointed, whose arrival necessarily expands the work further, and so on. Parkinson's theory explains that there is little or no direct relationship between the amount of work to be done in an organization and the size of the staff doing it. His theory explains two axioms: (a) "an official wants to multiply subordinates, not rivals; and (b) officials make work for each other."

(i) An Official Wants to Multiply Subordinates, Not Rivals

There is a general complaint from the subordinate officials that the work has increased considerably and that they find themselves overworked. This point of expansion of staff is illustrated by Parkinson: "...a civil servant, called A, finds himself overworked. Whether this work is real or imaginary (his sensation or illusion)...might easily result from his decreasing energy, a normal symptom of middle age,..., there are three possible remedies: (a) he may resign; (b) he may ask to divide his work half and half with a colleague called $B$; (c) he may demand the assistance of two subordinates to be called, $C$ and $D$. There is probably no instance in history, however, of $A$ choosing but the third alternative."

Hence rather than share the work with colleague $B$, over-worked official $A$ appoints subordinates $C$ and $D$. By appointing $C$ and $D$, $A$ has the merit of comprehending them both. When $C$, in turn, complains of overwork, $A$ preserves equity by allowing $C$ to have subordinates $E$ and $F$ and also by allowing $D$ to appoint $G$ and $H$. With these appointments of $E$, $F$, $G$ and $H$, the promotion of $A$ is now practically certain.

(ii) Officials make Work for Each Other

Consequently this expansion of staff leads to emergence of second axiom that is, "officials make work for each other." Now instead of one, seven are
doing the work. But routing of drafts, minutes and files between and among them ensures that all are working hard and that A is actually working harder than ever. Parkinson says that among the last to leave the office, A reflects with bowed shoulders and a wry smile that late hours, like grey hours, are among the penalties of success.

2. Expenditure Rises to Meet Income
Every activity including all forms of administration are prone to expenditure. To explain this proposition, he propounds Parkinson's Second Law that "expenditure rises to meet income." Parkinson illustrates this law by comparing an increase in the husband's income with administration. The widely understood domestic phenomenon, which appears after each increase in the husband's income is prevalent in administration as well. But in government administration, the expenditure rises toward a ceiling that is not there. He says that if revenue is reduced there would certainly be an improvement in services. The paradox of administration is that "if there were fewer official each would have less to do and therefore more time to think about what he was doing."

III. LAW OF TRIVIALITY
In modern organizations, administrative hierarchies are strewn with committees, councils and boards, which take decisions on issues placed before them and through- which matters of finance must pass. Now these committees, boards, etc. comprise of persons who are accustomed to think in trivial money. This typical pattern of committee work is referred to by Parkinson as "Law of Triviality." It means "that the time spent on any item of the agenda will be in inverse proportion of the sum involved." Parkinson cites an example to prove this Law of Triviality. Thus a contract for a £ 10,000,000 atomic reactor will be cleared after formal reference to the engineers' and the geophysicists' reports and to plans in appendices. In such cases, Parkinson says, Law of Triviality is supplemented by technical factors since half the members of the committee including the Chairman does not know what a reactor is and the other half may not be
knowing what it stands for. In contrast when it is a question of a roof for
the bicycle shed for the clerical staff, it raises controversy on both the topic
and the sum of money involved, which everyone understands. On such an
issue, as compared to a reactor involving huge amount, the discussion
and speech would continue for at least forty-five minutes and may result in
saving of some £ 100. Further where a committee consists of many
members, its efficient working is not only impaired but also becomes
impossible. On the subject of office decor, Parkinson discovered that the
more luxurious the surroundings, the more stagnant the company. And as
for cocktail parties, Parkinson found that executives mingle on schedule
from left to right.

IV. INDUCING INJELITANCE
Parkinson refers to injelitis as the disease of induced inferiority. His
analysis of moribund institutions reveals that the source infection comes
from an organization’s individual who combines both incompetence and
jealousy. At a certain concentration, these qualities react to promote
"injelitance," that is, soon the head of the organization, who is second-rate,
finds that his subordinates are all third-rate, and they, in turn, find their
subordinates are fourth-rate, and so on. The result is a typical organization
that accepts its mediocrity and does not endeavour to match better
organizations.

V. PERFECTING PLANNED LAYOUT ON COLLAPSE
Parkinson says that a perfection of planned layout is achieved by
institutions on the point of collapse. During progress or discovery, not
adequate attention is given to perfect headquarters. This comes
afterwards. Parkinson cites examples to prove this. Thus the League of
Nations had practically ceased to function on the opening of the Palace of
Nations at Geneva in 1937.

A CRITICAL EVALUATION
Criticism
Parkinson's theory has been criticized for its lack of understanding of political, economic and social dimensions of the society. The theory had not taken into consideration the problems of population explosion, environmental stresses and growing challenges of poverty, unemployment, social backwardness and the like. The functions of modern governments have practically expanded in size and complexity. Parkinson does seem to have failed to realize the complexities of growing organizations and their impacts on the society. Parkinson's law and its axioms are theoretically important but these do not serve useful purpose for a big society like India.

Parkinson's first law that "work expands to fill the time available for its completion" and second law that "expenditure rises to meet income" have been questioned. The paradox of administration is that if there were fewer functionaries, each would have less to function and therefore, more time to ponder about what he was doing. Parkinson has not properly understood the anatomy of the work and its implications. He has been criticized for ignoring the social and psychological nature of the man and the organization in which he works.

**Contribution**

Parkinson provides several contributions to the development of administrative theory, the most important being his Parkinson's Law. This
CONCLUSION

Ramayana of Valmiki is landmark in the history of Sanskrit literature. Ramayana has universal appeal because its theme is human nature and human conduct, which are of perpetual interest. Management consists in making ordinary people do extraordinary things. The composer of the epic sage Valmiki himself is an example in point. From a high way robber, he rose to ethical excellence and achieved perfection. Valmiki is the best example of a person who full filled his self- actualisation needs.

Different management concepts like synergy, motivation, leadership, communication etc are found plenty in Valmiki's Ramayana. It is sad to know that we always look to the west for studying all management principles and practices while forgetting the fact that they are contained in Ramayana itself. Ramayana is a Dharma Shastra. It explains the Sanathana Dharma and gives concrete examples of Sadacharya.

The epic emphasizes the pursuit of various objectives without mutual conflict. Rama Rajya stands for good administration, material, prosperity and spiritual well-being. Valmiki has shown that poetry can be a moral power of highest order. Ramayana teaches us that the only safe path is the path of Dharma and the performance of one's duty.