

**BPS-6**  
**Block-2**



ଓଡ଼ିଶା ରାଜ୍ୟ ମୁକ୍ତ ବିଶ୍ୱବିଦ୍ୟାଳୟ, ସମ୍ବଲପୁର  
**Odisha State Open University**  
Sambalpur

# BAPS

*BACHELOR OF ARTS (HONOURS) IN*  
**POLITICAL SCIENCE**

**INTRODUCTION TO**  
**PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION**

***Theoretical Perspectives***  
***(Classical Theories)***



The BAPS, Self Learning Materials follows the UGC prescribed State Model Syllabus under Choice Based Credit System (CBCS). This course material is designed and developed by Indira Gandhi National Open University (IGNOU), New Delhi and K.K Handiqui Open University.



ଓଡ଼ିଶା ରାଜ୍ୟ ମୁକ୍ତ ବିଶ୍ୱବିଦ୍ୟାଳୟ, ସମ୍ବଲପୁର, ଓଡ଼ିଶା  
Odisha State Open University, Sambalpur, Odisha  
Established by an Act of Government of Odisha.

# **Bachelor of Arts POLITICAL SCIENCES (BAPS)**

## **BAPS-6 Introduction to Public Administration**

### **Block-2**

#### **THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES (CLASSICAL THEORIES)**

---

**UNIT-4 SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT: F.W TYLOR**

---

**UNIT-5 IDEAL-TYPE BUREAUCREACY: MAX WEBER**

---

**UNIT-6 ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT: GULLICK,  
URWICK AND FAYOL**

---

---

## **UNIT-4 SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT: F.W TYLOR**

---

### **Structure**

- 4.1 Objectives
- 4.2 Introduction
- 4.3 F.W.Taylor: His Writings and Early Works
- 4.4 Taylor's Concept of Management
- 4.5 Mental Revolution
- 4.6 Taylor on Deficiencies of Management System
- 4.7 Scientific Management Approach: The Context
- 4.8 Scientific Management: The Basic Principles
- 4.9 Scientific Management: Other Important Concerns of Taylor
- 4.10 Scientific Management Movement
- 4.11 Criticism
- 4.12 Scientific Management: Relevance
- 4.13 Summary
- 4.14 Key Words
- 4.15 Exercise
- 4.16 Reference

---

### **4.1 OBJECTIVES**

---

After going through this Unit, you should be able to understand:

- The importance of scientific management approach in the administrative theory;
- The contribution of the Taylor towards the scientific management approach;
- The basic principles of scientific management; and
- The relevance and criticism of scientific management approach.

---

### **4.2 INTRODUCTION**

---

In the previous units we have discussed the meaning, importance, significance of public administration. In this unit we will be discussing the contribution of F.W. Taylor to the scientific management approach.

Scientific Management Approach is one of the important approaches in the field of administrative theory. This theory came in the wake of new industrial revolution that

has taken place during the later part of the nineteenth century. Scientific Management approach is an attempt to solve the problems of complex organisations that have emerged as a result of industrial development. Frederick Winslow Taylor is generally regarded as the pioneer of the scientific management approach, which paved way for the modern management approaches and techniques.

F.W. Taylor was born in a German town in Pennsylvania on March 20, 1856. He received education in France and Germany. He also received Mechanical Engineering degree from Stevens Institute of Technology of Hoboken, New Jersey. At the age of eighteen he joined the Enterprise Hydraulic Works, Philadelphia and served as apprentice for four years. In 1878 he went to work at Midvale Steel Company as a labourer and he became the Chief Engineer of that company in 1884. He became General Manager of Manufacturing Investment Company in 1890. In 1893 he opened an office in New York as a consulting engineer.

As an engineer he is instrumental in the development of new technologies, he invented several tools to increase the production. Some of the important tools he developed were cutting tool, a heat-treating tool, a steel hammer, hydraulic power loading machinery, boring and turning mills etc. He was always interested in improving upon the techniques of management. He emphasised on the scientific way of developing the tools as well as scientific way of performing the job. He has passion for efficiency and scientific way of work in the organisations.

---

#### **4.3 F.W.TAYLOR: HIS WRITINGS AND EARLY WORKS**

---

The contribution of Taylor for the scientific management approach can be traced in his major writings. His writings bear his intimate observation of the work at the work place and his desire to improve the production and efficiency in the organisation. The major writings of Taylor are, A Piece Rate System (1885), Shop Management (1903), The Art of Cutting Metals (1906), The Principles of Scientific Management (1911) and The Testimony before a Special Committee of the House of Representatives (1912).

Taylor's contribution to the development of scientific management was recorded in his papers. Of these early ones are A Piece-Rate System, Shop Management, and The Art of Cutting Metals. Among his early works, Taylor also discussed defects of management and Time Motion Study.

##### **A Piece-Rate System**

Taylor's first paper on Piece-rate system was considered as an outstanding contribution to the principles of wage payment. He proposed a new system consisting of three parts: (a) observation and analysis of work through time study to set the 'rate'

or standard, (b) a 'differential rate' system at piece work, and (c) 'paying men and not positions'.

### **Shop Management**

In his second paper on Shop management he discussed at length workshop organisation and management. He focused attention, in this paper, on his philosophy of management as given below:

- The objective of management must be to pay high wages and have low unit production costs to achieve the increased industrial efficiency.
- Management has to apply scientific methods of research and experiment to the management problems.
- Standardisation of working conditions and placing the workers on the basis of scientific criteria.
- Management must give formal training to workers and specific instructions to perform the prescribed motions with standardised tools and materials.
- Friendly cooperation between workers and management on the basis of scientific system of labour organisation.

Taylor wanted to develop a new and total concept of management. He advocated that the traditional managers should develop a new approach and change to a more comprehensive and broader view of their jobs incorporating the elements of planning, organizing and controlling.

### **Art of Cutting Metals**

Taylor experienced bitter labour-management conflict particularly between foreman and workers over the quantity of output. He failed to resolve the problems by persuasion and force. Realising that a new industrial scheme was essential to prevent encounters he began searching for a science of work. In the process he conducted a series of experiments for more than two decades. He experimented with machine tools, speed, metals, materials, etc. His experiments at the Midvale and Bethlehem Steel Company led to the discovery of high speed steel and revolutionised the art of cutting metals, his paper on "The Art of Cutting Metals" considered as the most remarkable piece of research ever presented at a conference. The paper was based on the longest and most exhaustive series of about 30,000 experiments conducted over a period of 26 years at a cost of about \$ 2, 00,000. The achievements of metal cutting experiments are considered more important than Taylor's other contributions, because they initiated a major breakthrough in the development of American industry.

### **Defects of Management**

While at Midvale Steel Company, Taylor made serious observations and study of operations of many factories, and identified the following major defects in management:

- Management had no clear understanding of worker- management responsibilities;
- Lack of effective standards of work;
- Restricted output because of 'natural soldering' and 'systematic soldering' of work by the workers;
- Failure of management to design jobs properly and to offer proper incentives to workers to overcome the soldering;
- Most decisions of the management were unscientific as they were based on hunch, intuition, past experience, and rule-of-thumb;
- lack of proper studies about the division of work among departments; and
- Placement of workers without consideration of their ability, aptitude and interests.

### **Time and Motion Study**

In his other experiments he studied through motion and time study and analysed how the workers handled materials, machines and tools, and developed a coordinated system of shop management. Taylor set out to detuning scientifically the ability of workers in dealing with equipment and materials and this approach led to the true beginning of scientific management.

In the development of his shop system Taylor wished to know that unties optimum conditions, how long a man or a machine would or should take to perform a given task, in a specified process, using specified materials and methods. He used scientific fact-finding methods to determine empirically the right ways to perform tasks with the help of stop watch.

Taylor also recognised the need for scientific method of selecting the right men for the right jobs considering their initial qualifications and potential for further learning, Me wanted effective supervision of a worker and his working conditions after placing the worker in the right place: Taylor wanted to lay down the foundation for sound personnel management i.e. to match the worker's abilities to the job.

---

## **4.4 TAYLOR'S CONCEPT OF MANAGEMENT**

---

Before we discuss Taylor's 'great principles of management', it is desirable to know his views on the concept of management. Taylor pointed out that management is a true science 'The Paradigms resting upon fixed laws, rules and principles. He argued that management comprised a number of principles which are applicable to all organisations-both private and government. The main object of management, according to him is to secure the maximum prosperity for the employer, coupled with the maximum prosperity for each employee. His philosophy of scientific management is that there is no inherent conflict in the interest of the employers, workers and consumers. The primary concern of Taylor was that the results of higher productivity should equally benefit all people i.e. workers, employers, and consumers in the shape

of higher wages to the workers, greater profits to the management and payment of lower prices for the products by the consumers.

Taylor observed that management neglected its functions and shifted its burden to the labour while keeping for itself minor responsibilities. He advised that management should take the responsibility of determining standards, planning work, organising, controlling and devising incentive schemes.

---

#### **4.5 MENTAL REVOLUTION**

---

Scientific management, in its essence, according to Taylor, primarily involves a complete mental revolution on the part of workers and management regarding their duties, towards their work, towards their fellow workers, and towards all of their daily problems. It demands the realisation of the fact that their mutual interest is not antagonistic; and mutual prosperity is possible only through mutual cooperation.

According to Taylor, in every organisation a conflict exists between workers and management due to improper division of output, to avoid this, it is essential to change the mental attitude of both sides. Thus Taylor propagated the concept of 'mental revolution'.

Taylor was of the view that in an organisation both workers and employers should cooperate with each other and work together towards increasing the productivity. The workers and management should concentrate only on increasing output and nothing else; they should continue to do so until the output increases to such an extent that it becomes unnecessary to quarrel over its division. Increased output would give better wages to worker and high profit to management and this atmosphere of conflict will be replaced by peace and harmony.

---

#### **4.6 TAYLOR ON DEFICIENCIES OF MANAGEMENT SYSTEM**

---

F.W. Taylor's important ideas on scientific management approach are explained in his writings. In 'A Piece Rate System' he propounded three basic principles. (1) Observation of work through time study (to complete the work and to determine the standard rate) for completion of work, (2) differential rate system for completing piecework and (3) payment to men not to positions. In his article on "Shop Management' he focused basically on organisation and management of workshop. He dealt about the need to maintain low production unit costs and payment of high wages, applying scientific methods of research, standardisation of working conditions, need for training and cooperative relations between workers and managements.

Taylor's stay at Midvale Steel Company and his close observation and study of different operations in different factories, made him to know the defects in their

management. They are: lack of clarity of responsibilities by workers and managements, lack of standards of work, restricted output because of soldering of work, lack of job clarity which promotes soldering of work, lack of scientific base for decisions, lack of division of work, and placement of workers at different jobs without considering their ability, skills, aptitude and interest.

His work on ‘The Art of Cutting Metals’ is based on extensive research of thousands of experiments conducted over a period of 26 years. He developed instruments for cutting of steel, studied motion and time and analysed how workers handle materials, machines and tools when they perform different works. Taylor felt that there is a best way to do every work and scientific selection of right men for right job is essential for maximum production in any organisation.

---

#### **4.7 SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT APPROACH: THE CONTEXT**

---

As mentioned above the scientific management approach developed in the early phases of industrial revolution. It tried to address some of the problems of industrial society. The basic concerns of industrial society were to improve efficiency, to reduce the cost of production and to increase the profits. This can be achieved through two-pronged strategy. One is related to improving the technology and the techniques of work along with efficient management of workers. The second is expansion of market to the new colonies. Taylor was trying to address the first concern of the industrial society. Hence he emphasised more on scientific knowledge of doing things and scientific way of managing organisations.

---

#### **4.8 SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT: THE BASIC PRINCIPLES**

---

To overcome the deficiencies in the management Taylor formulated four new principles / new duties to be assumed by the management which are known as the principles of scientific management. They are:

- The development of a true science of work
- The scientific selection of workmen and their progressive development
- Bringing together of science of work and the scientifically selected workers
- The equal division of work and the responsibility between management and workers

##### **The Development of a True Science of Work**

Taylor believed that there is a need to develop science of work. He further believed that there is one ‘best way’ of doing every job. This can be achieved by systematic study of any work and replacing the old thumb-rule method by developing a scientific method. This requires gathering mass of traditional knowledge, recording it, tabulating it and in many cases finally reducing it to laws rules and even to

mathematical formulae. And later these laws and rules are to be applied to the everyday work of all workmen of the organisation. The scientific method of work saves worker from unnecessary criticism of the boss and the management to get maximum work from worker. It also results in establishing a 'large daily task' to be done by the qualified workers under the optimum conditions.

### **Scientific Selection and Progressive Development of Workmen**

To ensure effective performance of the scientifically developed work there is a need to select the workers on scientific basis. It is the duty of the management to study the character, the nature and the performance of each worker with a view to finding out his limitations and possibilities for his development. Taylor believed that every worker has potentialities for development. Every worker must be systematically and thoroughly trained. Scientific selection involves selecting a right person for a right job. It is also necessary to ensure that the employee accepts the new methods, tools and conditions willingly and enthusiastically. There should be opportunities for advancement to do the job to the fullest realisation of his normal capabilities.

### **Bringing together of Science of Work and Scientifically Selected Workers**

The third principle of the scientific management is bringing of science of work and scientifically selected and trained workmen together. Taylor says 'bringing together advisedly because you may develop all the science that you please and you may scientifically select and train workmen just as much as you please, but unless some men bring the science and workmen together all your labour will be lost'. Taylor felt it is exclusive responsibility of the management to do this job. He believed that workers are always willing to cooperate with the management but there is more opposition from the side of management.

### **Division of Work and Responsibility between Worker and Management**

Traditionally the worker bears the entire responsibility of the work and the management has lesser responsibility. But Taylor emphasised on equal responsibility between worker and management. This division creates understanding and mutual dependence between them. This results in elimination of conflict and mistrust between the worker and management. Taylor thinks that scientific management can be justly and truthfully characterised as management in which harmony is the rule rather than discord.

---

## **4.9 SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT: OTHER IMPORTANT CONCERNS OF TAYLOR**

---

In addition to the above four basic principles Taylor also expressed the concern for the following in the scientific management method. They are:

Mental Revolution

- Functional Foremanship

- Work Study and Work Measurement
- Standardisation of Tools
- Selection and Training of Workers
- Task Prescription
- Incentive Schemes
- Work as an Individual Activity
- Trade Unions
- Development of Management Thinking
- Division of Work

**Mental Revolution:** Taylor was of the view that scientific management requires a great revolution that takes place in the mental attitude of management as well as the workers. Instead of focusing more on the division of surplus they should together turn their attention towards increasing the size of the surplus until the surplus becomes so large that it becomes unnecessary to quarrel over how it should be divided. Both should stop pulling one another and instead both should work together in the same direction to increase the surplus. They should realise that the friendly cooperation and mutual help results in increasing the surplus. Once the surplus increases there is ample scope for increasing the wages for the workers and increase in profits for the management. It is along this a complete change in the mental attitude of both the sides is required. Taylor further emphasised that the scientific management involves change in the attitude of the workers and the management with regard to their duties and responsibilities and towards their fellow workers. It demands the realisation of the fact that their mutual interest is not antagonistic and mutual prosperity is possible only through mutual cooperation. The principle object of management is to secure maximum prosperity for the employer as well as the employee. Taylor believed that there is no conflict in the interest of employees, workers and consumers. His major concern was that the results of higher productivity should equally benefit the employer, worker and consumer.

**Functional Foremanship:** Taylor is critical of linear system of organisation in which each worker is subordinated to only one boss. He replaced this system with what is called functional foremanship. In the functional foremanship the worker receives orders from eight different specialised supervisors. Thus he divided work not only among the workers but also at the supervisory level. Out of the eight functional supervisors, four functional foremen, namely the gang boss, the repair boss, the speed boss and the inspector will look after the execution of work and the remaining four will take care of planning aspects. They are the route clerk, the instruction clerk, the time and cost clerk and the shop disciplinarian. Through this functional foreman system Taylor wanted to create the narrowly specialised supervisor for each type of skilled work. He thought this will result in efficiency rather than one supervisor looking after all the activities. He further believed that in this type of organisation a foreman can be trained quickly and specialisation became easy.

**Work Study and Work Measurement:** Taylor advocated the need for systematic study of work. The use of time study can help us in finding out the optimal way of study carrying out a task. He considered it as an essential component of scientific management. It involves measuring and studying the 'unit times'. Taylor conducted several studies to find out the standard unit of work to be carried out by an individual worker. He studied each and every movement of the worker in performing a particular task with the help of a stopwatch. By studying each and every movement of the work we can eliminate the unnecessary movements of the workers and find out the time required for the each movement. With the help of time study and work-study it is possible to perform a particular task with a lesser movement. The purpose of work-study is to eliminate not only unnecessary movements but also to eliminate the slow movements and fatigue of the workers there by it is possible to find out 'the best way' of performing each activity.

**Standardisation of Tools:** Taylor maintained that in addition to determining the best methods, the management also should standardize the tools in the light of the needs of the specific jobs. In an experiment at Bethlehem Steel Works on shovelling of coal, Taylor found that the average shovel load varied from 16 to 38 pounds. Further experiments showed that good workers were able to shovel more tonnes per day if they used a shovel carrying the load of 21 to 22 pounds. Subsequently Taylor found that with the different types of materials to be shovelled, about 15 different types of shovels were needed. From then on when workers arrived in the morning they received written instructions on what to shovel and what type of shovel to be used. After three and half years 140 men were doing the work formerly handled by 400 to 600 workers. This shows that by using a proper instrument for each type of work we can achieve more work with the help of less number of workers.

**Selection and Training of Workers:** Taylor insisted that each worker should be given the job for which he was best suited. According to Taylor 'one of the very first requirements of the worker who is fit to handle the pig iron as a regular occupation is that he shall be stupid and so phlegmatic that he more nearly resembles in his mental makeup the ox than any other type' (cited in Bertram Gross, 1964, p.123). Taylor further felt that "there is work for each type of man; just as for instance, there is work for the dry horse and work for the trotting horse. There is no type of work, however, that suits all types of man" (Bertram Gross, p.123). It is therefore essential to find the realistic ways of judging their capacities of different workers. The management should give them formal training and clear instructions on precisely how to perform the prescribed motions with the standardized tools and materials. (Bertram Gross, p.124)

**Task Prescription:** Not only the tasks be divided and optimal methods of achieving the tasks be prescribed, the worker should also be given clear description of what he

should do. Here Taylor emphasises that the tasks should be well planned in advance and the worker be given clear instructions concerning his particular task to be done. Proper task prescription will provide clarity to the worker as well as the management.

**Incentive Scheme:** Taylor suggested that the pay should be linked to the piece of work done by the worker. Payment should depend upon his achieving the prescribed output. In the event of achieving a greater output, then a bonus payment should be made to the worker. The bonus paid should be generous and consistent. This system will provide encouragement to the workers to produce more.

**Work as an Individual Activity:** Taylor is always opposed to any kind of group activity. He believes that people are motivated by personal ambition, and that once put into a group the individual loses his individual drive. He believes that the influence of the group makes one produce less. Further he argued that female workers were prone to such personal pressures and indeed separated them in such a way that verbal interaction was impossible. (Clegg and Dunkerley, 1980.p.89).

**Trade Unions:** Since Taylor was critical of group activity he was also against trade union movement. He regarded trade unions as unnecessary under his system of work. The employer according to him was on the same side of the workers. The goal of the workers and the employers is the same. Acceptance of scientific management principles would reduce conflict between workers and the management. Since management itself laid down what was the 'fair day's pay' for fair day's work through objective rationale means, the need for trade unions does not arise.

**Development of Management Thinking:** Taylor through scientific management saw the development of management as a science. It implies that specific laws could be derived for management practice and those laws relate specifically to wage rates and ways of doing work. Arriving at these laws involved management in the use of scientific method.

**Division of Work:** Taylor felt that not only there should be a division of labor on a shop floor but also the division of work between the worker and management. According to Taylor the main function of management should be planning for future. The responsibility of worker is to concentrate totally on carrying out the given task. He believed that there were distinct personality types for performing planning function and doing function. The planning function relates to the managements and doing function relates to the workers. He also recommended minute division of tasks for each individual in the organisation.

---

## **4.10 SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT MOVEMENT**

---

Earlier days Taylor usually referred to these techniques as the “Task System” or “Task Management”. Later Taylor welcomed the more appealing nomenclature and declared “management is a true science resting upon clearly defined laws, rules and principles” (Bertram Gross, p.127). He felt that his work covered the entire sphere of Industrial Management. He was convinced that same principles could be applied with equal force to all social activities “to the management of our homes; management of our farm; management of our business of our tradesmen; of our Church; our philanthropic institutions; our universities and our government departments”. (Cited from ‘Scientific Management’ of Taylor by Bertram Gross, p.127)

Very soon Taylor became very popular. His close associates such as Henry Grantt, Frank Gilbreth and Lillian Gillberth etc., carried out further research in the area and published many articles and books. Many followers of Taylor served as advisors to hundreds of companies. Engineering Schools began to give courses on shop management and industrial management. Schools of business administration also started giving courses in these areas. Many special disciplines rooted in scientific management have emerged.

In brief scientific management became a “movement”. It offered the hope of resolving industrial problems through the use of objective principles. The movement soon became replete with popularisers, traditionalists and dissidents. It had a tremendous effect on industrial practices in the United States. The movement soon became international, spread to Germany, England, France, Sweden and other European countries. Its greatest success however was in Russia. In 1917 immediately after the Bolshevik revolution, Lenin welcomed Taylor’s techniques to Russia. He referred to Taylor’s system as “a combination of subtle brutality of bourgeois exploitation and a number of its greatest scientific achievements”. (Bertram Gross, p.128) The movement seems to have been supported by all contending factions at the higher levels of the Russian Communist Party. Taylor’s ideas were built into the curriculum for the education and training of the engineers who subsequently tended to monopolise managerial posts in the Soviet industry.

---

## **4.11 CRITICISM**

---

Though scientific management became a movement and offered solutions to some of the industrial problems, it was equally opposed and criticised by many people. The scientific management has emerged at a time when capitalist development had reached the stage of requiring organisational changes in the functioning of industrial enterprise. Hence it is considered more as a pro-capitalist theory. The critics considered that the scientific management helped more the owners of industries than the workers. The trade unions were against scientific management methods. They

considered Taylorism as not only destroying trade unionism but also destroying principles of collective bargaining. They felt that the scientific management was a menace to the community at large as it causes continuous increase in unemployment. Trade unions felt that Taylor was more interested in mechanical aspects of work and not much concerned about the total work situation. As a result there were a number of agitations by labour unions in America, which led the American Congress in 1912 to appoint a special committee of the House of Representatives to investigate in to Taylorism. The trade unions in 1915 succeeded in getting an amendment to the Army Appropriation Act forbidding the use of stopwatches or the payment of premiums or bonuses in army arsenals.

A still stronger attack was made by the investigation conducted by Professor Robert Hoxie on industrial relations. The Hoxie Report concluded that the approach of Taylor and his associates dealt only with mechanical and not with the human aspects of production.

A strong criticism came from Harry Braverman who in his book 'Labour and Monopoly Capital' (1974) argued that an analysis of Taylor's work enables us to distinguish three general principles of scientific management (Clegg and Dunkerly, 1980). They are:

**The principle of dissociation of labour process from the skills of the workers:**

The Taylorism in other wards results in separation of worker from the knowledge that the worker might poses, particularly that knowledge deriving from a craft or traditional process. Now the labour process therefore is dependent upon managerial practices rather than worker abilities.

**The principle of separation of conception from execution:** By this Braverman refers to the division under the scientific management of manual and mental labour. The implementation of Taylorism leads to a situation where the organisation of work is the prerogative of the management where as the worker has to simply execute the work. In other words this is separation of 'mind' from the 'hand'. Those who work with hand and those who work with mind are two separate entities. This results in alienation of labour from the labour process.

**The principle of use of monopoly over knowledge to control each step of labour process and its mode of execution:** This principle is logically derived from the previous two. It shows that the Taylorism results in the managerial section monopolising the knowledge of work and controlling the worker in each and every aspect of execution of the work. This results in domination of managerial class over the workers.

Several others criticised scientific management. Even the managers at that time were critical of scientific methods. They did not appreciate his comments on ‘thumb-rule’ methods. Managers were opposed to the Taylor’s ideas of training programmes for the managers. It is interesting to note that Taylor had to resign from Midvale Steel Works and Bethlehem Steel Company because of the differences with the company managers.

The other critics of Taylor’s scientific management include Oliver Sheldon, Mary Parker Follett, Elton Mayo, Peter Drucker and others. They charged that Taylor’s scientific management was impersonal and underemphasised the human factor. This criticism led to a series of experiments in industrial sociology and social psychology. The studies of Elton Mayo and other researchers on human relations have rejected Taylorism. Taylor’s philosophy that men were generally lazy and try to avoid work has also been criticised.

Another criticism of Taylor is that he did not properly understand the anatomy of work. His emphasis on minute division of work was criticised on several grounds. Firstly, the work gets de-personalised and the worker becomes a mere cog in the machine. The worker lacks the sense of participation in the work; the worker has no outlets to exhibit all his potentialities. Secondly, Taylorism may lead to automation of workers, which may have psychological consequences. Peter Drucker, management expert, aptly says that the organisation became a piece of poor engineering judged by the standards of human relations as well as those of productive efficiency and output. Taylor’s functional foremanship was criticised by many saying that it will lead to confusion when each worker kept under the control of eight supervisors. A worker may not be able to satisfy eight supervisors in all the aspects.

---

#### **4.12 SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT: RELEVANCE**

---

Scientific management helped many industrial organisations in the United States to overcome the problems of workers. In the similar way Taylorism spread to England to resolve industrial crises in that country. At a time when there is an industrial unrest and increasing unemployment, the scientific management came to the rescue of industrial organisations. Any developing country like India which are facing similar industrial problems can learn lessons from scientific management. With the application of principles of scientific management it is possible to improve the efficiency of organisations. As it is discussed earlier, even the socialist societies such as Russia have welcomed the scientific management principles, which are developed in the context of capitalist economy. This shows the relevance of Taylor’s scientific management to the organisations irrespective of the nature of economy.

---

### 4.13 SUMMARY

---

The above discussion on scientific management shows that the Taylor's scientific management was responding to the problems of the early industrial organisations. Taylorism provided certain practical solutions to the problems of industries and they got benefited from scientific management. Taylor firmly believed that there is a 'best method' for doing any work. One has to find out the best method by systematic study of work. Taylor emphasised that the management has to take up equal responsibility for the work done in the organisation. He also emphasised that there is a need to select the right type of persons to perform the job and also train them in improving the performance. Apart from systemic study of the work, the standardisation of tools and procedures are necessary. There is also a need for complete understanding and cooperation between the worker and the management. They should instead of focusing on increase in the wages and profits; they should give importance to increase the production.

Taylor's ideas have helped the industrial societies to overcome the basic problems of low production and labour problems. Because of the scientific nature of Taylor's ideas they have spread not only to the European countries but also to the socialist societies like Russia.

---

### 4.14 KEY WORDS

---

**Bonus:** It is an incentive given to the worker who produces over and above the prescribed amount of work.

**Division of Work:** In the context of scientific management Taylor emphasised on equal division of work and responsibility between the worker and management.

**Functional Foremanship:** Taylor suggested eight different supervisors at the work place as against the earlier practice of one supervisor looking after all the activities of the workers under him.

**Mental Revolution:** It means the change of attitudes of both the workers and the management. They should work with mutual cooperation and mutual interest focusing on increase in the production rather than asking for it's sharing.

**Scientific Management:** Scientific management became popular with the writings of F.W. Taylor. It broadly indicates undertaking of any work in an organisation in a systematic, planned and organised manner. It includes evolving a correct way of doing work and selecting a suitable individual to perform that work.

**Scientific Selection:** Selecting the right person for the right job in the organisation and imparting them the necessary skills.

**Work Measurement:** Measuring of the amount of work done by the individual with the help of a stopwatch with an objective to establish a standard unit of work to be done by the worker.

**Work Study:** It indicates the study of different aspects of work and time and motion involved in completing the work. The objective of work-study is to fine out the best method of doing any work.

---

#### **4.15 EXERCISE**

---

1. What is scientific management theory?
2. What is Piece-Rate System?
3. What is Time and Motion Study?
4. Explain Taylor's Concept of Management.
5. What are The Basic Principles of Scientific Management?
6. Writes a note on criticism of Scientific Management theory?

---

#### **4.16 REFERENCE**

---

- Ali, Shun Sun Nisa, 1977, Eminent Administrative Thinkers, Associated Publishing House, New Delhi.
- Bertram, M. Gross, 1964, the Managing of Organisations, The Administrative Struggle, The Free Press of Glencoe, Collier-Macmillan., London.
- Bhattacharya, Mohit, 1981, Public Administration: Structure, Process and Behaviour, The World Press Pvt. Ltd., Kolkata.
- Braverman, Harry, 1979, Labour and Monopoly Capital, The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century, Social Scientist Press, Trivendrum.
- Clegg, Steward & David Dunkerley, 1980, Organisation, Class and Control, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- Prasad, D. Ravindra, V.S. Prasad and P. Satyanarayan, 2004, Administrative Thinkers (Ed), Sterling Publishers, New Delhi.
- Pugh, D.S., 1985, Organisation Theory: Selected Readings (Ed), Penguin Books, Middlesex, England.

---

## **UNIT-5 IDEAL-TYPE BUREAUCREACY: MAX WEBER**

---

### **Structure**

- 5.1 Objectives
- 5.2 Introduction
- 5.3 Max Weber: His Life and Writings
- 5.4 Weber's Bureaucracy: The Context
- 5.5 Theory of Bureaucracy
- 5.6 Max Weber on Authority
- 5.7 Max Weber: The Concept of Bureaucracy
- 5.8 Max Weber: Elements of Bureaucracy
- 5.9 Max Weber: Limits on Bureaucracy
- 5.10 Max Weber's Bureaucracy: Criticism
- 5.11 Max Weber's Bureaucracy: Relevance
- 5.12 Summary
- 5.13 Key Concepts
- 5.14 Exercise
- 5.15 Reference

---

### **5.1 OBJECTIVES**

---

After studying this unit, you should be able to:

- understand the Weber's contribution to the theory of bureaucracy;
- explains the types of authority;
- know the elements of bureaucracy;
- discuss the limitation of the bureaucracy; and
- Analyse the criticism and relevance of Weberian model to the modern society.

---

### **5.2 INTRODUCTION**

---

In the classical approach to administration, Weberian model of bureaucracy finds a central place. Max Weber is the first thinker who has systematically studied the bureaucracy. He has provided a theoretical framework and basis for understanding bureaucracy. Max Weber's analysis influenced many modern writers on bureaucracy. Weber, apart from bureaucracy, wrote on various aspects of the society ranging from history, religion to legitimacy and domination. Weber was founder of modern

sociology and a greatest scholar among the pioneers of administrative thought. He was one of the towering thinkers of the twentieth century. The Weberian ideal type bureaucracy continues to be the dominant paradigm in the public administration.

---

### **5.3 MAX WEBER: HIS LIFE AND WRITINGS**

---

Max Weber (1864-1920) was born in western Germany. He studied law at the University of Heidelberg. He joined University of Berlin as an instructor in law. He wrote a number of papers on law, and social, political and economic factors prevalent during that time. His major writings were, 'The Theory of Economic and Social Organisations', 'General Economic History', 'Protestant Ethic and Spirit of Capitalism' (1904). He studied law and economics and he became a specialist in the interpretation of religious doctrines and he was a notable biblical scholar. He had a thorough grasp of ancient Roman administration, medieval trading companies and the modern stock exchange. He became a specialist in comparative history of urban institutions. He also made a special study of social and psychological conditions of productivity in a West German textile mill. He studied methodology of social studies. Weber always preferred knowledge obtained through practical experience than library research. His writings reflect the social conditions of Germany of his time. He saw the decline of liberalism and threat to individual in the bureaucratisation of the society. Unification of Germany under Bismarck and elimination of liberal middle class movement convinced Weber that the great goal could be achieved through power policies. (Prasad. et.al. p.77)

---

### **5.4 WEBER'S BUREAUCRACY: THE CONTEXT**

---

Scientific management and theory of bureaucracy mark the first major developments in the theory of organisation. These theories were responding to the needs of industrial organisations. Theory of bureaucracy was needed to bring the efficiency in its functioning. As stated by Weber 'no special proof is necessary to show that military discipline is ideal model for the modern capitalist factory. (Clegg and Dunkerley, p.75). The example of most developed form of organisation, bureaucracy, the theory of which Weber found, is developed from the Prussian military forces, and which enterprises such as the British Railway Companies actually found in the ranks of the British Army, was to become the specific form of management of big business. Weber felt that emergence of modern bureaucratic organisation is 'demanded', he further says 'a peculiarity of modern culture', and specific of its technical and economic basis, demands the very 'calculability of results' (Clegg and Dunkerley, p.81). More specifically 'today it is primarily the capitalist market economy which demands the official business of the administration be discharged precisely, unambiguously, continuously, and with as much speed as possible' (Clegg and Dunkerley, p.80.) Bureaucratisation offers above all, optimum possibility for carrying

through the principle of specialising administration functioning according to purely objective considerations. (Clegg and Dunkerley, p.80).

Above lines show that the Weber's theory of bureaucracy was a response to the demands of industrial capitalist economy, which required an efficient administration. While Taylor attempted to rationalise functions of modern factory, Weber made an attempt at the rationalisation of bureaucratic structures. Both of them emphasised on control and discipline in the working of organisations.

---

## **5.5 THEORY OF BUREAUCRACY**

---

Bureaucracy was discussed prior to Weber's writings. The invention of word bureaucracy belongs to Vincent de Gourney, a French economist in 1745. He took the conventional term 'bureau' meaning writing-table and office, and added to it the word derived from the Greek suffix for the 'rule', in order to signify bureaucracy as the rule of officials. It rapidly became a standard and accepted term in the conventions of political discourse. (Clegg and Dunkerley, p.75). By the end of 19th century the term was widely held to have been of German origin. J.S. Mill, an eminent political scientist included bureaucracy in his series of analysis. Karl Marx also discussed about bureaucracy at certain places. According to Marx, bureaucracy like a state itself is an instrument by which the dominant class exercise its domination over the other social classes. (Mohit Bhattacharya, p.52). Hegel conceived the governing bureaucracy of public administration as a bridge between the state and the civil society.

Bureaucracy as an institution existed in China even in the period of 186 B.C, public offices were in existence and persons for those offices were recruited through competitive examinations even then. (Prasad et. al. p.79).

The above discussion shows that there existed a bureaucracy much earlier to Weberian writings and also there were attempts to understand the bureaucracy by different writings. But the Weber is considered to be the first person to attempt at the systematic understanding of the bureaucracy.

---

## **5.6 MAX WEBER ON AUTHORITY**

---

Max Weber's concept of bureaucracy is closely related to his ideas on legitimacy of authority. He worked on theories of domination, leadership and legitimacy of authority. Weber differentiated authority, power and control. To him, a person could be said to poses power, if in a social relationship, his will could be enforced despite resistance. Such exercise of power becomes controlled. Authority manifests when a command of definite content elicits obedience on the part of specific individuals. For Weber, 'authority' was identical with 'authoritarian power of command' (Prasad,

et.al.p.77). Authority is state of reality where a person willingly complies with legitimate commands or orders because he considers that a person by virtue of his position could issue orders to him. Unlike in 'power' there is willing obedience on the part of clientele to legitimise authority.

### **Components of Authority**

Weber identified five essential components of authority. They are:

- An individual or a body of individuals, who rule,
- An individual or a body of individuals, who are ruled,
- the will of the rulers to influence conduct of the ruled,
- evidence of the influence of the rulers in terms of the objective degree of command, and
- Direct or indirect evidence of that influence in terms of subjective acceptance with which the ruled obey the command.

### **Categories of People in Organisation**

The authority exists as long as it is accepted as legitimate by the ruled. Thus, an administrator or organisation can rule only when it has legitimacy. While explaining authority in various organisations, Weber concluded "all administration means dominance" (Prasad. et. al. p. 77). Weber categorised persons in the organisations in to four types:

- Those who are accustomed to obey commands,
- Those who are personally interested in seeing the existing domination continue,
- Those who participate in that domination, and
- Those that hold themselves in readiness for the exercise of functions.

### **Types of Authority**

Since Weber believed that authority could be exercised as long as it is legitimate he divided the authority in to three types based on sources of legitimacy for each authority. Weber classified authority in to three 'pure' or 'ideal' types based on its claim to legitimacy. They are: (1) traditional authority, (2) charismatic authority and (3) legal-rational authority.

### **Traditional Authority**

It rests on "an established belief in the sanctity of immemorial traditions and the legitimacy of the status of those exercising authority under them". (Bertram Gross, p.137). In this kind of authority a command is obeyed because of the belief in age-old customs, traditions, conventions and beliefs. Those who exercised authority does so under the rules that have always existed, but may also exercise personal prerogative. This is a pure type of feudal, patrimonial regime under which the organization consists of household officials, relatives, and loyalists. Under this type, obedience is given not to the rules but to the rulers, not to the superiors, but to the chiefs. New

rules are not enacted, they are “found”. The only documents in the administration of law are the “documents of tradition, namely precedents”. Resistance, when it occurs is directed against the person of chief or a member of his staff. The accusation is that he has failed to observe traditional limits of his authority (quoted from Weber by Bertram Gross, p.138).

Under the traditional authority a person enjoy authority by virtue of their inherited status. The persons who obey orders are called ‘followers’. They carry out the commands out of personal loyalty to the ruler and pious regard for his time honoured ‘status’. The system retains legitimacy as long as the customs and traditions are respected in the organization.

### **Charismatic Authority**

It “rests on devotion to the specific and exceptional sanctity, heroism, or exemplary character of an individual person and of the normative patterns or order revealed or ordained by him” (D.S. Pugh, p.15). The term charisma (gift of grace) is taken from the vocabulary of early Christianity. Here it is applied supernatural, super human or extraordinary qualities of a leader. Among the holders of charisma are the sorcerers, the prophet or the warrior of chieftain or the personal head of a party and demagogue. (Bertram Gross, p.138). In this type of authority obedience was justified because the person giving order had some sacred or outstanding character. The leader exercises authority based on his personal qualities rather than formal stipulations or prescribed norms. Those subject to the authority are “followers” of the leader, not “subject”. The only basis of legitimacy is personal charisma. He can exercise his authority, so long as it is proved, that is so long as it receives recognition and is able to satisfy the followers.

Under this authority the leader selects his disciples or followers as his officials based on their personal devotion to him rather than their special qualifications or status. These ‘disciple officials’ constitute an organisation and their sphere of activity and power of command depends upon likes and dislikes of the leader. (Prasad. et. al. p.79).

### **Legal-Rational Authority**

It 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. Obedience is owed to the legally established impersonal order. It extends to the persons exercising the authority of office only by virtue of the formal legality of their commands, and only within the scope of the authority of the office”. (Bertram Gross, p.139). Manifestations of legal authority are found in organisations where rules are applied judicially and in accordance with ascertainable principles valid for all members in the organisation. The members who exercise power under this authority are the superiors and are appointed or elected by legal procedures to maintain the legal orders. The

organisation is a continuous process and all its members are subject to certain rules. Weber considers the legal authority as the most rational form of authority.

Obedience to the authority depends upon certain related beliefs. They are: (1) that a legal code can be established which can claim obedience from members of the organisation; (2) that, the law is a system of abstract rules, these rules are applied to particular cases, and the administration looks after the interest of the organisation within the limits of the law; (3) that the man exercising authority also obeys this impersonal order; (4) that only 'qua' member does the member obey the law; and (5) that obedience is done not to the person who holds the authority but to the impersonal order which has granted him this position. (Martin Albrow, p.43).

Of all the three types of authority Weber considers the legal authority, not only the most rational authority, but also the most efficient form of authority. He considers bureaucracy as legal-rational type of authority.

---

## **5.7 MAX WEBER: THE CONCEPT OF BUREAUCRACY**

---

Weber never defined bureaucracy. He only described it as "an administrative body of appointed officials". (Prasad. et. al. p.80). He also described its characteristics. Bureaucracy includes explicitly appointed officials only leaving out the elected ones. Weber wrote a great deal about the place of the official in a modern society. For him, it has an increasingly important type of social role. As in the case of authority, Weber categorised bureaucracy into (1) patrimonial bureaucracy found in traditional and charismatic authorities and (2) legal-rational bureaucracy found only in the legal type of authority. Weber identified certain features of legal-rational bureaucracy.

### **Features of Legal-Rational Bureaucracy**

The model of legal-rational bureaucracy described by Weber has the following features:

1. Official business is conducted on a continuous, regulated basis,
2. An administrative agency functions in accordance with stipulated rules and is characterised by three interrelated attributes; (a) the powers and functions of each official is defined in terms of impersonal criteria, (b) the official is given matching authority to carry out his responsibility and (c) the means of compulsion at his disposal are strictly limited and the conditions under which their employment is legitimate are clearly defined,
3. Every official and every office is part of the hierarchy of authority. Higher officials or offices perform supervision and the lower officers and officials have the right to appeal,
4. Officials do not own the resources necessary for rendering the duties, but they are accountable for use of official resources. Official business and private affairs, official revenue and private income are strictly separated,

5. Offices cannot be appropriated by the incumbents as private property, and
6. Administration is conducted on the basis of written documents. (Prasad. et. al. p.81)

### **Features of Officials**

Weber also discussed in detail, as a part of his model of bureaucracy, the features of officials. They are:

1. The staff members are personally free, observing only the impersonal duties of their offices,
2. They are appointed to an official position on the basis of the contract,
3. An official exercises authority delegated to him in accordance with impersonal rules, and his loyalty is expressed through faithful execution of his official duties,
4. His appointment and job placements depend upon his professional qualifications,
5. His administrative work is full time occupation,
6. His work is rewarded by regular salary and by prospects of career advancement,
7. There is a clear cut hierarchy of officials, and
8. He is subjected to a unified control and disciplinary system.

---

## **5.8 MAX WEBER: ELEMENTS OF BUREAUCRACY**

---

When we closely observe the above-mentioned features of bureaucracy we can identify certain important elements of Weberian model of bureaucracy. They are:

1. Impersonal Order
2. Rules
3. Sphere of Competence
4. Hierarchy
5. Separation of Personal and Public Ends
6. Written Documents
7. Monocratic Type

### **Impersonal Order**

Weber emphasised that the official should perform their duties in an impersonal manner. The subordinates should follow both in the issuance of command and their obedience impersonal order. According to Merton, “authority, the power of control which derives from an acknowledged status, inheres in the office, not in the particular person who performs the official role”. (Prasad. et. al. p.82). It talks about the de-personalisation of relationship in the organisations.

## **Rules**

Rules are the basis for the functioning of the legal-rational authority. Officials are bound by the rules. The rules regulate the conduct of an office. Their rational application requires specialised training. In this regard Merton felt that adherence to rules originally conceived as a means, becomes an end in itself. Rules become more important than the goals of the organisation.

## **Sphere of Competence**

It involves a sphere of obligation to perform functions, which have been marked off as a part of a systematic division of labour. It also implies provision of the incumbent with the necessary authority to carry out the functions.

## **Hierarchy**

According to Weber every office and every official is a part of a hierarchy. Under this system the lower office functions under the control of higher office. He attaches greater importance to the principle of hierarchy in the organisation of office.

## **Separation of Personal and Public Ends**

Weber pleads for separation of officials from their ownership of the means of administration. Officials cannot use his office position for personal ends. The office property is separated from personal property; at the same time the official is accountable for the use of office property.

## **Written Documents**

Written documents are the heart of Weberian bureaucracy. All administrative acts, decisions and rules are recorded in writing. These documents make the administration accountable to the people and provide a ready reference for future action.

## **Monocratic Type**

It means certain functions performed by bureaucracy cannot be performed by any other organisation. They monopolise certain functions and only the authorised official can perform that function, makes them monocratic in nature. For all types of authority, Weber wrote “the fact of the existence and continuing functioning of an administrative staff is vital. It is indeed, the existence of such activity which is usually meant by the term organisation”. (Bertram Gross, p.139). Weber considered pure or monocratic bureaucracy is the most rational form of administrative staff. He further felt that “it is superior to any other form in precision, in stability, in the stringency of discipline and in its reliability. It thus, makes possible a particularly high degree of calculability of results for the heads of organisations 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”. (Bertram Gross, p.139).

For bureaucratic administration is, other things being equal, always, from a formal technical point of view, the most rational type. According to Weber “for the needs of mass administration today, it is (bureaucracy) completely indispensable. The choice is only that between bureaucracy and dilettantism in the field of administration”. (Bertram Gross, p.140). Thus Weber believed that rational bureaucracy is technically superior and capable of attaining high degree of efficiency.

---

## **5.9 MAX WEBER: LIMITS ON BUREAUCRACY**

---

Weber while emphasising on the necessity of bureaucracy was aware of the fact that, the bureaucracy has inherent tendency of accumulation of power. The sources of this power could be seen in the special knowledge, which the official poses. In the course of his duties he acquired a great deal of concrete information much of it artificially restricted by ideas of confidentiality and secrecy. Nevertheless he was convinced that bureaucratisation was inevitable and that bureaucrats gained power. Weber resisted any identification of bureaucracy with rule by officials.

In order to prevent the bureaucracy from acquiring powers Weber suggested certain mechanism for limiting the scope of systems of authority in general and bureaucracy in particular. These mechanisms fall in to five major categories. The categories are: (1) collegiality, (2) separation of powers, (3) amateur of administration, (4) direct democracy, and (5) representation. (Martin Albrow, pp.47-49). They are explained below:

### **Collegiality**

In a monocratic bureaucracy, Weber meant that at each stage of the official hierarchy one person and one person only, had the responsibility for taking a decision. This makes the bureaucracy more powerful. To prevent this Weber suggested the principle of collegiality involving others in the decision making process. Weber considered that collegiality would always have an important role to play in limiting bureaucracy. But it has disadvantages in terms of speed of decision and attribution of responsibility.

### **Separation of Powers**

Separation of powers meant dividing responsibility and functions between two or more bodies. For any decision to emerge a compromise between them had to be reached. This will avoid monopoly of decision by a single body or person. Weber regarded such a system as inherently unstable. One of the authorities was bound to have edge over the other.

### **Amateur Administration**

Since there is possibility of professional administration become powerful, Weber suggested the involvement of amateur administration in certain activities. Such men have sufficient public esteem to command and general confidence. But this system

could not measure up to the demands for expertise which modern society made, and where the professionals assisted amateur it is always the professional who dominated the scene.

### **Direct Democracy**

To limit the power of bureaucracy Weber suggested direct democracy, where the officials were guided by and answerable to an assembly. Short term of office, permanent possibility of recall was designed to serve the purpose of direct democracy. But this system is possible only in small organisations and in local governments.

### **Representation**

Another method of limiting bureaucracy is sharing of authority of bureaucracy with the elected representatives of the people. With this method it is possible to control the power of the bureaucracy. But here, there is a possibility of representatives being bureaucratized. However Weber thought that through this medium there was a greater possibility of check on bureaucracy.

Through all the above means Weber wanted to limit the powers of the bureaucracy.

---

## **5.10 MAX WEBER'S BUREAUCRACY: CRITICISM**

---

The Weberian bureaucracy has attracted criticism from several corners. The criticism however revolves around the Weberian model, its rationality concept, administrative efficiency, formalism and the relevance of bureaucracy to the changing circumstances. Some of the very advantages of the bureaucracy claimed by Weber were turned against his own model.

Robert Merton and other sociologists have questioned the rationality of Weber's model saying that it results in certain dysfunctional consequences. Merton says that the structure of the bureaucracy especially its hierarchy and rules can easily result in consequences which are detrimental to the attainment of objectives of an organisation. Merton emphasises that the bureaucracy means inefficiency.

Phillip Selznick, pointing to the division of functions in an organisation shows how sub-units setup goals of their own sometimes conflicting with the organisation as a whole. Both Merton and Selznick have shown that the structure of formal organisations described by Weber is insufficient as a description of how bureaucrats behave clearly brought out this limitation of Weber's bureaucracy.

Talcott Parsons questioned the internal consistency of Weber's bureaucracy. Weber expected the administrative staff to be technically superior as well as poses the right

to give orders. Parsons thinks that, this it is not always possible to ensure that the higher-level authority will be matched by equivalent professional skills.

Alvin Gouldner and others have raised the problem of compliance with the rules by members of an organisation not so much because of informal processes arising within an administrative structure but to conditions outside the organisation which orient the behaviour of the member's vis-à-vis the rules. This criticism highlights the influence of environmental factors on the behaviour of the officials, which was neglected by Weberian model.

Bendix, the biographer of Weber argued against the belief that it is possible to adhere to a rule without the influence of the general social and political values. Rudolf questioned the very conception of Weber's model that administration was a rational machine and officials were mere technical functionaries.

Critics like Peter Blau questioned applicability of Weberian model to different places and times. Efficient administration is possible only when an individual is allowed to identify with the purpose of the organisation and to adopt his behaviour to the changing circumstances. Weber's bureaucracy and its assumptions about the human behaviour may not be valid in non-western environment. Joseph La Palombara believed that the developing societies may find Russian or Chinese model of administration more effective than Weberian model.

Some scholars like H.C. Creel questioned the very idea that rational bureaucracy is a modern phenomenon. He pointed that almost all characteristics of Weberian model existed in China by 200 B.C.

Simon and Barnard have proved that administrative efficiency would be reduced if we follow Weber's structural approach. It is possible to increase the efficiency in the organisations through informal relations than formal practices.

Critics questioned Weber's claim of internal consistency of bureaucracy and its ability to attain maximum efficiency. Gouldner who tested Weber's ideal type empirically found that it has internal contradictions such as tensions between the claims of expertise and claims of obedience based on discipline.

Simon and March who have included Weber in the classical thinkers like Gulick and Urwick felt that he too neglected the human behaviour in an organisation. Maximum efficiency in the organisation cannot be achieved by emphasising on mere structure of bureaucracy without regard to its behaviour.

Weber was criticised for his neglect of power that a bureaucrat assumes. Phillip Selznick and others felt that a bureaucrat is increasingly pre-occupied with his own social position neglecting the very goals of the organisation.

Weber's model is also not relevant in the context of development administration. Strict adherence to rules results in delay and inefficiency in the administration. Adherence to hierarchy leads to authoritarianism in the organisation. Weber's insistence on records results in too much of formalism in the administration.

---

### **5.11 MAX WEBER'S BUREAUCRACY: RELEVANCE**

---

In spite of criticism from the several scholars, the ideas of Weber on bureaucracy continue to be relevant to understand the present administrative system. So far we have not been able to evolve an alternative model to Weber's bureaucracy. Weber is right in saying that when we are accustomed to the bureaucracy we cannot think of any other alternative. It is highly useful for managing large-scale organisations. His ideas on selection of officials based on qualifications, utility of written documents in administration, hierarchy etc., can be seen in any administration of the present day. The monocratic bureaucracy proposed by Weber is superior to all other forms of organisations in achieving the prescribed objectives. To overcome some of the problems of the bureaucracy, we can only bring reforms in it, but cannot replace it with any other organisation. Whether it is capitalist society or a socialist society, irrespective of the nature of economy, we find the bureaucracy playing a very important role. The people who talk about the de-bureaucratisation of the society have not been able to find a viable alternative to the bureaucracy. Even in the present context of liberalisation and privatisation, which emphasises on a minimalist state, cannot escape the necessity of bureaucracy to perform some of the functions of the state. We cannot think of the implementation of all the welfare and developmental programmes without the help of bureaucracy. The voluntary organisations and other forms of people's organisations can only supplement the bureaucracy, but they can not substitute the bureaucracy. In the context of developing countries, people look to the bureaucracy for their day-to-day requirements. Hence, the bureaucracy of Weberian type continues to find its relevance even today.

---

### **5.12 SUMMARY**

---

Weber can be considered as one of the eminent thinkers of twentieth century. Though he has written extensively on various subjects, his contribution to the theory of bureaucracy is highly valued. Today we can see it in practice in all the societies of the world. Weber being proved correct when he said that the societies once governed by the bureaucracy can never get rid of it. His ideas on authority, rationality of bureaucracy continues to be relevant for the present day society. Most of the time, those who criticise the Weberian model are not actually criticising Weber, but the

present day bureaucracy, which reflect the changes that are taking place in the contemporary period. Bureaucracy might need certain reforms to make it more relevant to the society.

---

### 5.13 KEY CONCEPTS

---

**Amateur Administration:** It emphasises on involving non-professionals and interested individuals in the activities of the administration.

**Collegiality:** Instead of one individual, a group of persons are involved in the decision making process.

**Impersonality:** It is one of the features of Weberian bureaucracy. Here rules are objectively followed irrespective of the person.

---

### 5.14 EXERCISE

---

- (1) What do you understand about the Max Weber's concept of bureaucracy? Explain.
- (2) Do you think that the major elements of Weber's bureaucracy are basically meant for bureaucratic efficiency? Discuss.
- (3) Do you notice the existence of three types of authorities in present day Indian society? Please explain based on your experience.

---

### 5.15 REFERENCE

---

- Albrow, Martin, 1985, *Bureaucracy*, Macmillan, London, 1985.
- Ali, Shun Sun Nisa, 1977, *Eminent Administrative Thinkers*, Associated Publishing House, New Delhi.
- Bhattacharya, Mohit, 1981, *Public Administration: Structure, Process and Behaviour*, The World Press Pvt. Ltd., Kolkata.
- Braverman, Harry, 1979, *Labour and Monopoly Capital*, The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century, Social Scientist Press, Trivendrum.
- Clegg, Steward & David Dunkerley, 1980, *Organisation, Class and Control*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- Gross, Bertram M., 1964, *The Managing of Organisations*, The Administrative Struggle, The Free Press of Glencoe, Collier-Macmillan, London.
- Lakshmana, C. and A.V. Satyanarayana Rao, 2004, Max Weber, in D. Ravindra Prasad, V.S. Prasad and P. Satyanarayan (Eds), *Administrative Thinkers*, Sterling Publishers, New Delhi.
- Prasad, D. Ravindra, V.S. Prasad and P. Satyanarayan, 2004, *Administrative Thinkers* (Ed), Sterling Publishers, New Delhi.

---

## **UNIT-6 ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT: GULLICK, URWICK AND FAYOL**

---

### **Structure**

- 6.1 Objectives
- 6.2 Introduction
- 6.3 Administrative Management Approach: Important Contributors
- 6.4 The General Principles of Administration
- 6.5 Criticism
- 6.6 Administrative Management Approach: Relevance
- 6.7 Summary
- 6.8 Key Concepts
- 6.9 Exercise
- 6.10 Reference

---

### **6.1 OBJECTIVES**

---

After studying this unit, you should be able to:

- know the important contributors of administrative management approach;
- understand the general principles of administration;
- discuss the criticism of administrative management approach; and
- Explain the relevance of administrative management.

---

### **6.2 INTRODUCTION**

---

In the previous unit we have discussed about the Taylor's contribution towards the scientific management approach. In this unit we will discuss the important contributors towards administrative management. While Taylor focused on shop floor management the later writers like Gulick and Urwick have focused on the organisation as a whole. Taylor was concerned with worker and emphasized more on floor level activities to enable the management to make its workforce more productive. Taylor has not emphasized on supervisory levels and upwards. The later writers like Gulick and Urwick, who took managerial view of the administration rather than floor level administration, took this up. The rationalization on the floor (done by the scientific management) needed to be supplemented by rationalization through the whole enterprise, to run it profitably. Those who have taken up the managerial view did this. This approach is also known as 'administrative management approach'

---

### **6.3 ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT APPROACH: IMPORTANT CONTRIBUTORS**

---

The important thinkers who have contributed to this approach are Henry Fayol, Mooney, Reiley, Gulick and Urwick. Mary Parker Follet is considered to be the last person to propagate this approach. These thinkers have certain common understanding and approach towards understanding of organisations. In other words their theory is based on certain major premises. Firstly, they gave importance to the structure of the administration / organisation. They consider that without structure, organisation cannot function. For them 'structure is a device through which the human beings working in an organisation are assigned the tasks and are related to each other'. Since they have emphasized on the structure they are also known as structuralists. They believe that effectiveness of organisations depend upon the type of organisation. Structure is basic for any group effort. Structure moulds the nature of human being according to the needs of organisation. For Urwick, lack of design is illogical, cruel, wasteful and inefficient.

Secondly, they assumed that there is universality of experience. These thinkers have developed certain principles of administration, which they think are universally valid. These principles are derived from the experience of industrial organisations. Mooney observed "there is no principle in industrial organisations as such that is not to be found in all other spheres". Thirdly, they believe that the principles they have developed are scientifically valid. Since they are based on the industrial and military experience they cannot be considered to be imaginary. They are based on rigorous empirical observations. Hence they have a scientific validity. They considered that the application of such principles would ensure greater economy and efficiency in the organisation. These authors have sincerely believed that it is possible to develop a science of administration based on the experience of organisations.

#### **Henry Fayol**

Fayol was born in 1841 in France. He worked as an engineer in a mining company. By 1888 he had raised to the position of Managing Director of the company. He was one of the successful managing directors under whom the company achieved great financial success. Based on his experience he wrote a book 'General and Industrial Management' (1916). His papers on 'The Theory of Administration in the State' (1923), is considered as a major contribution to the theory of public administration.

Fayol is regarded as the founder of managerial approach. The later writers like Gulick and Urwick have been greatly influenced by this works. Fayol's major contribution is his principles of administration. They are division of work; authority; discipline; unity of command; unity of direction; subordination of individual interest to the general interests; remuneration; centralization; line of authority; order; equity; stability of

tenure; initiative and harmony. Fayol derived the managerial functions in to five elements. They are: planning, organisation, command, coordination and control.

Though he has listed out certain principles, he himself was ambiguous in his writings as to what he means by these principles. Some of them describe managerial activity; others lay down what manager should do. Though they are limited in nature, the Fayol's principles have provided basis for the development of principles of administration by the later thinkers.

### **Mooney and Reiley**

Mooney and Reiley in their book 'Onward Industry' (1931), provided a central frame work laying down the principles of management. They have attempted to provide an elaborated historical account of genesis of management and management thought. Like Fayol there appears to be some confusion the use of the term 'principle' used by the Mooney and Reiley. They appear to be a set of statements showing importance of leadership, authority and coordination. Mooney in his article included in "Papers on Science of Administration" maintained that it was 'coordination' that is the fundamental principle of any human organisation. He further writes "the term organisation and the principles that govern it are inherent in every form of concerted effort, even where there are not more than two persons involved". He takes the example of the effort of two men to move a stone and says, 'here we have coordination, the first principle of organisation'.

Mooney and Reiley also referred to the functional principle of organisation. According to them all jobs involve one of the three functions. They are determinative function (setting goals), the application function (acting purposively to achieve the goals) and the interpretative function (decision making). They argue that management must be aware of these functions to be prepared to discharge them when necessary. Thus, they have contributed to the development of managerial theory of administration.

### **Gulick and Urwick**

Luther Gulick was born in Osaka, Japan in the year 1892 and was educated in Columbia University. He served the National Defence Council during First World War He was associated with the City Research Institute at New York. He also worked as administrator of New York City during 1954-56. He also served as a professor in several universities and consultant in administration for several countries. His important writings are 'Administrative Reflection from World War-II', and 'Papers on the Science of Administration' (1937), (jointly edited by Urwick) 'Modern Management for the City of New York'.

Lyndall Urwick was born in Briton in 1891. He was educated at Oxford University. He was a Lt. Col. during the First World War in the British army, and he was

considered to be an outstanding consultant on industrial management. Some of his important publications were 'A Management of Tomorrow', 'The Making of Science of Management', 'The Elements of Administration', (1943). He also edited along with Luther Gulick 'Papers on Science of Administration' (1937).

Gulick and Urwick had a rich experience in the working of civil service and military and industrial organisations. With these two writers we see a coming together of public administration and business administration. Similar to other writers, in 'Formal Organisations' they were much influenced by Taylor and Urwick was to rationalize the work process by bringing work together in a centralized area. They have contributed to the development of classical theory of organisation, known as administrative management theory. They believed that it is possible to develop a science of administration based on principles. They felt that if the experience of administrators are processed it could be possible to develop a science of administration. Administration hitherto remained an art and there is no reason why it can't be developed into a science. They gave importance to structure of administration while almost neglecting the role of men in the organisation.

Based on this approach and their experience they evolved certain principles of organisation. The principles enunciated by Gulick are (1) division of work or specialization (2) bases of departmental organisation (3) coordination through hierarchy, (4) deliberate coordination, (5) coordination through committees, (6) decentralization, (7) unity of command, (8) line and staff, (9) delegation and (10) span of control.

Gulick also coined an acronym 'POSDCORB' indicating the seven important functional elements of administration. They are planning, organisation, staffing, direction, coordination, reporting and budgeting.

Urwick identified eight principles of administration. They are (1) the principle of objectives, (2) the principle of correspondence, (3) the principle of responsibility, (4) the scalar principle, (5) the principle of span of control, (6) the principle of specialization, (7) the principle of coordination and (8) the principle of definition.

---

## **6.4 THE GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF ADMINISTRATION**

---

Based on the principles enumerated by the above authors, here some of the important principles are explained briefly:

### **The Theory of Departmentalisation**

It is one of the important principles of administrative management. This theory addresses itself to the problem of bases on which the work may be divided in an organisation and departments are created. Luther Gulick identified four bases on

which different departments are created. These bases are (I) Purpose, (II) Process, (III) Persons (clientele) and (IV) Place (territory). They were popularly described and known as 4P's of Gulick.

**Purpose:** In the first place the work may be divided on the basis of the major purpose or function. In order to create certain departments one has to identify the major functions and goals of organisation and create departments for each of the functions. For example, the welfare department was created based on the 'purpose' of looking after the welfare of the people. Similarly there may be other departments created based on other purposes. The advantage of such department is that they are self-contained organisations and low coordination costs are involved in running the department. Such departments are more certain of attaining the goals.

The purpose-based departments however have, certain disadvantages, such as, lack of possibility of work division, failure to use update technology and there may not be enough work for specialist working in the department.

**Process or Skills:** Some departments are created based on the process or a skill involved in its functioning. For example, the department of engineering may be considered as a 'process' based department. If process is accepted as basis, then all work based on similar process or skills should be grouped together since it involves use of same knowledge, skills and processes. According to Gulick the advantage of process-based department is, it brings together in a single office a large amount of each kind of work, it is possible to make use of the most effective division of work and specialization. Secondly it makes possible maximum use of labour and machinery for mass production. The major disadvantage of this base is it results in purposeless division and growth of department.

**Persons or Clientele:** Specialisation of work according to the clientele served is the third basis of departmental organisations. For example, the 'old age welfare department' serves a particular kind of persons who need special attention. The people who work in this department acquire specialised skills over a period of time to serve that particular clientele. But the disadvantage of this department is the coordination between such organisations become difficult on account of overlapping and duplication.

**Place or Territory:** Place becomes base for some organisation such as 'district' administration or tribal area department. Here all functions performed in a given area are clubbed together and a department is created. This base is useful for intensive development of any area. The members of such departments also become area specialists. But such departments may suffer from lack of functional specialisation and growth.

The theory of departmentalisation is criticized on the basis that the bases of departments are incompatible with each other. They are very vague; there is also overlap between them. For example the department of medicine can be categorized as a process based department because it involves skills. It can also be considered as a purpose based one, because there is a purpose behind the creation of this department.

### **Single Top Executive or Unity of Direction**

This principle is based on the belief that one director or executive should head organisations. Urwick warned against the use of committees for purposes of administration. He thought, 'boards and commissions are turned out to be failures. They are inevitably slow, cumbersome wasteful and ineffective. They do not cooperate with other agencies. Well-managed administrative unit in the government are always headed by a single administrator'. Gulick who as a member of President's Committee on Administrative Management, probably felt like this in trying to work out the principle of one man administrative responsibility in place of the structure of many boards and commissions in the United States Federal Government. (Betram Gross, p.145).

### **Unity of Command**

The principle of 'unity of command' suggests that for the effective functioning of organisations the subordinates in the organisation should receive command from one superior only. Gulick agrees with Fayol who said, "a man cannot serve two masters" (Betram Gross, p.145). Although rigid adherence to this principle may have its absurdities, these are unimportant in comparison with the certainty of confusion, inefficiency and irresponsibility, which arise from the violation of the principle. However, he has provided certain exceptions to this principle in the case of field office specialist. For example it may be inevitable for an engineer in a field office working under administrative supervision of the field office manager and under technical supervision of the chief engineer in the central office. In such situation the Gulick suggest the system of 'integrated dual supervision' (Betram Gross, p.145).

### **The Principle of Staff**

The principle of staff emphasises that in the performance of organisational activities the executive needs the help of large number of officials. This staff assistance to the executive deserves special attention. The staffs are of two categories, (1) special staff and (2) general staff. The chief executive requires the help of the specialist as well as general staff. While general staff assist the chief executive in knowing, thinking and planning functions. The special staffs help the executive in carrying out the basic operations of the organisation. Drawing upon the military experience with line and staff arrangements, Gulick dealt with the problems regarding relation between general and special staff. As in military organisation, general staff may assist their supervisors in their central task of command, control and coordination. They should help to coordinate the work of specialist without themselves taking any specialised functions.

In doing so they act not on their own but as representative of their superior and within the confines of decision made by him. Thereby they relieve the top executive from the burden of day-to-day administration. They free him to concentrate upon the most important matters.

Urwick also recognized that in a civilized life, assistant who act on behalf of top executive will often be regarded as “encroaching” upon the authority of senior official (Betram Gross, p.147). To overcome this problem Gulick suggest that the assistant to be men with a “passion for anonymity” (Betram Gross, p.147).

### **The Principle of Delegation**

The principle of delegation emphasizes on the need for administrators to keep the requisite authority with them to act and delegate the rest of it to their subordinates. In the absence of such delegation the subordinates cannot discharge their responsibility. Urwick maintains that “lack of courage to delegate properly and knowledge of how to do it is one of the most general causes of failure in organisation” (Betram Gross, p.147). Urwick felt that organisations do not function efficiently if executives do not delegate the functions to their subordinates. It is also emphasized the need to delegate responsibility of executives in whom authority is vested should be absolute and that they should be personally accountable for the actions of their subordinates.

### **The Principle of Matching Responsibility with Authority**

This principle maintains that the authority and responsibility must be coterminous, coequal and defined. While Fayol emphasized the need to promote a sense of responsibility, Urwick deals with both sides of authority-responsibility relationship. It is not enough to hold people accountable for certain activities, it is also essential to delegate them the necessary authority to discharge that responsibility. The responsibilities of all persons exercising authority should be absolute within the defined terms of that authority. The persons exercising authority should be personally accountable for all actions taken by subordinates.

### **The Principle of Span Control**

The principle of span of control emphasises that a supervisor cannot control more than a certain number of subordinates. In this regard Urwick felt that “no supervisor can supervise directly the work of more than five, or at the most six subordinates whose work interlocks” (Betram Gross, p.148). This principle is based on the psychological conception of “span of attention”. When the number of subordinates increases arithmetically, there is a geometrical increase in all possible combinations of relationships, which may demand the attention of supervisor. While there is no agreement among the writers about the exact limit of span of control, Sir Ian Hamilton put the limit at three or four? Some authors put the figure at ten or twelve. Gulick identifies various factors that may influence the optimum span, particularly

the capacity of an individual executive, the nature of work performed, the stability of an organisation and geographical proximity to those who are supervised.

### **The Principle of Division of Work**

The principle of division of work suggest that in order to bring the efficiency and effectiveness in the organisation the work has to be divided and entrusted to the people who are specialised in it. In fact, Gulick felt that division of work is the basic principle of organisation and it is reason for existence of organisation. He further felt that 'every large scale or complicated enterprise requires many men to carry it forward. Whenever many men are thus working together, the best results are secured when there is a division of work among these men'. He says man-invented organisation as he failed to perform the work single handily. As a result he had to divide the work and this division of work was the cause for genesis of organisation. Individuals differ in their skills, efficiency and attitudes. A single person cannot work in two places at a time. And also he cannot perform more than one activity at a time. Because of these reasons and also in the context of growing knowledge in different areas the division of work and entrusting different types of work to different people is inevitable. Division of work results in increase in the production and efficiency in the organisation.

However a division of work has its own limitations. According to Gulick the important limitations are the volume of work, the technology, custom, physical and organic limitations. The work can't be divided if it is too less. Work can be divided only when there are people available with skills to perform it. Integrating divided parts follows division of work. Gulick says that division of work and integration are bootstraps by which mankind lifts itself in the process of civilization.

### **The Principle of Coordination**

This principle emphasizes that when work is divided and entrusted to different individuals that work has to be coordinated to achieve the organisational tasks. Without proper coordination it is not possible to achieve the task. Coordination is basically bringing together of the work done by different individuals in the organisation. Mooney particularly emphasized on the importance of this principle. He maintained that it was coordination that is fundamental principle of any human organisation. He further writes, the term organisation and the principle that govern it are interacting in every form of concerted human effort, even when there are not more than two persons involved in it. Here he takes the example of two men's effort to move a stone and says 'here we have coordination, the first principle of organisation'.

### **The Principle of Hierarchy**

Hierarchy indicates the control of the higher over the lower. In the administrative structure, hierarchy means a graded organisation of several successive levels or steps. Hierarchy is also known as scalar principle. Hierarchy places individual in

organisation in an order. Hierarchy facilitates the allocation of responsibilities to the different levels of organisation. It also facilitates easy flow of work in the organisation and also easy coordination and control. It fixes responsibilities of individuals and makes it clear who is accountable to whom.

---

## 6.5 CRITICISM

---

Many writers criticized the administrative management approach. The principles of administration enumerated under this approach have become main targets of criticism. The basic criticism is that there is little consistency in the work of any of these writers, either between them or within them. The term 'principle' is used in different ways by different authors. Sometimes it has a descriptive connotation or it expresses the relation between organisation variables: some writers have questioned the scientific validity of the principles. Normally a principle is subject to verification. But such universality is absent in these principles. They appear more in the nature of postulates of experienced men who has closely observed the working of organisations. The major attack on principles came from Herbert Simon. Herbert Simon who commented on the fact that the principles are 'little more than ambiguous and mutually contradictory proverbs'. They form neither a coherent conceptual pattern of determination nor an accurate description of concrete empirical reality (Clegg & Dunkerley, 1980, p, 102). He says that, it is fatal defect of the current principles of administration that like proverbs they occur in pairs. For almost every principle one can find an equally acceptable contradictory principle (For example while the principle of division of work is claimed as essential for the organisational efficiency the coordination principle is also claimed as essential principle to bring efficiency).

One can see a contradiction between the principle of specialization and the principle of unity of command. The specialist working in organisations are always subject to dual control of generalist and technocrats. Similarly there is a contradiction between principles of specialization and span of control. While span of control emphasizes on the limitations of supervisor and his capacity to supervise a certain number of subordinates, it has failed to arrive at a scientifically valid number of subordinate's less than one supervisor.

Simon felt that principles of administration are at best criteria for describing administrative situation. He further felt that the principles are either universal, empirically applicable neither theoretically coherent.

The administrative management approach in general is criticized for its neglect of human element in the organisation. Human being is considered insignificant in administrative processes. Gulick and Urwick have shown concern only for 'formal

organisation' neglecting informal variables, which are important for the understanding of organisations.

V.Subramanyam points out two important limitation of this approach. In the first place, there is lack of sophistication in the theory; they appear to be commonplace general knowledge propositions, which do not appeal to the intellectual curiosity of the academicians and practitioners of administration. Secondly, it has a pro-management bias where it mostly dealt with the problems of management in the organisation and not the problem of lower level in the organisation. (Cited from Prasad et. al. p.105)

---

## **6.6 ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT APPROACH: RELEVANCE**

---

In spite of the criticism the principle of administration continue to found relevant even to-day. We find working of these principles such as division of work, coordination, delegation etc. in the present day organizations. Organizations cannot function without adhering to these principles. These principles continue to be taught in the colleges and universities for the students of public administration and management. Many people have criticized the principles, but they have not developed any alternatives to these principles. They have failed to replace them with better principles. The principles of administration have provided basis for the development of later theories in administration. With some modifications on the lines of changes taking place in the organizations, these principles can find relevance in the present context also.

---

## **6.7 SUMMARY**

---

In spite of various criticisms the administrative management approach and the principles of administration have contributed significantly to the theory and practice of administration. This theory emerged historically at a point of time when the organisations were becoming complex and faced with problem of inefficiency and low production. This theory has enabled the large-scale organisations to operate effectively. It is also relevant to understand the administrative processes of the contemporary organisations. In spite of their limitations the principles continue to be practiced in the organisations. They facilitate the smooth functioning of administration. To get benefited from the principles one has to understand this theory in a proper perspective and apply it to the contemporary situation with required modifications.

---

## 6.8 KEY CONCEPTS

---

- **Authority and Responsibility:** sufficient authority is to be given to the officials to enable them to perform their functions. Authority should promote the sense of responsibility in the organization.
- **Coordination:** Bringing together of the work done by different units and individuals in order to achieve the harmonious functioning of the organization.
- **Delegation:** In the organization the authority and responsibility are delegated to the subordinates by the superiors to enable the organization to function effectively.
- **Department:** It is a sub-division or unit of the organization. According to Gulick for establishing any department there has to be some bases. He proposed four basis; they are purpose, process, persons and place.
- **Division of Work:** The work has to be divided and allocated to the individuals in the organization on the basis of their abilities and skills.
- **Hierarchy:** It is a method of arranging individuals in the organization in a graded manner for receiving orders and reporting back about execution of orders.
- **Span of Control:** It is a principle which emphasis that a superior cannot control more than a certain number of subordinates.
- **Unity of Command:** It is a principle, which envisages that for the effective functioning of organizations, subordinates should receive command or orders from one supervisor only.
- **Unity of Direction:** It envisages that a single top executive should head organizations. If more than one person it will lead to confusion in heads the organization it's functioning.

---

## 6.9 EXERCISE

---

- (1) Do you think that the principles of administrative management approach can be scientifically verified or they are mere proverbs?
- (2) Do you think that the bases of departmentalisation are still relevant in the twenty first century organisations? Discuss.
- (3) Do you think that the principles of organisations are still relevant in the context of modern day organisations? Discuss.

---

## 6.10 REFERENCE

---

- Ali, Shun Sun Nisa, 1977, Eminent Administrative Thinkers, Associated Publishing House, New Delhi.
- Bhattacharya, Mohit, 1981, Public Administration: Structure, Process and Behaviour, the World Press Pvt. Ltd., Kolkata.
- Braverman, Harry, 1979, Labour and Monopoly Capital, the Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century, Social Scientist Press, Trivendrum.
- Clegg, Steward & David Dunkerley, 1980, Organisation, Class and Control, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- Gross, Bertram M., 1964, The Managing of Organisations, The Administrative Struggle, and The Free Press of Glencoe, Collier-Macmillan., and London.
- Prasad, D. Ravindra, V.S. Prasad and P. Satyanarayan, 2004, Administrative Thinkers (Ed), Sterling Publishers, New Delhi.
- Pugh, D.S., 1985, Organisation Theory: Selected Readings (Ed), Penguin Books, Middlesex, England.

ଓଡ଼ିଶା ରାଜ୍ୟ ମୁକ୍ତ ବିଶ୍ୱବିଦ୍ୟାଳୟ, ସମ୍ବଲପୁର  
**Odisha State Open University, Sambalpur**

[www.osou.ac.in](http://www.osou.ac.in)  
e-mail: [info@osou.ac.in](mailto:info@osou.ac.in)