Public Organization and Management
Dr. Vaneet Kashyap
Department of Humanities and Social Sciences
Indian Institute of Technology Tirupati

Lecture - 08
Approaches to the Field of Management – III

Hello dear learners, let's continue our discussion on the classical approaches. Let's look at the criticism of the classical school. Now we have discussed about the classical approaches contributions from the various management thinkers. All these approaches largely considered organization as people as closed system. We talk about scientific management, the administrative school in terms of bureaucracy, largely they have considered them as closed systems. The criticism of the school.

Also, the management principles which are propounded by various management thinkers, Henry Fayol, James Mooney, Luther Gulick, not universally applicable because of complex business situations. And I have discussed about this at length in my previous session. Complex situation demands a different kind of the intervention from the management. Sometime this application of these principles is not universal.

Weber's bureaucracy takes away individual creativity and flexibility required to respond to difficult situations. So we cannot always say that okay because we are abide by rules we could not think of the creative and imagine creative solutions. So it is important. So in terms of difficult situations, everything cannot be following the rules and process spacing. Sometimes that kind of managerial discretion is always required.

But according to Weber's view, it is taking it away from the managers. No importance given to the organizational behaviour concept, especially we talk about the psychological aspects. which are linking with the satisfaction of the workers in the organization, such as motivation, leadership, informal relations, etc. And also the approaches focuses too much focus on productivity to enhance the organizational efficiency. Now to overcome this, there were contributions from Neo classical school of thought is basically is the transitional phase from classical to the behavioral theory schools emphasized on human relations and in this we will talk about the contributions by behavioral theories which stresses upon the individual attitudes and behaviours on and on group processes emphasis on individual group and attitudes and behaviour and group processes.

We will discuss about the contribution by these contributors from Mary Parker Follett to Chris Argyris. Mary Parker Follett's contribution in terms of group influences at the workplace. Elton Mayo's contribution to the Hawthorne's experiments which is effect of human motivation on productivity and output, Abraham Maslow's Need hierarchy theory

of human motivation, Douglas McGregor Theory X and Theory Y and Chris Argyris human potential at workplace. First we will talk about the contributions by Mary Parker Follett. The contributions of Mary Parker Follett contributed to our understanding of authority and leadership responsibility, need to coordinate effort and the conflict resolution.

Mary Parker Follett is the pioneer in the behavioral approach to management. She emphasized the importance of human element and functioning of group in the workplace and thus led to the conception of the principle - group principle. And the main idea of this principle was to integrate the individual differences in the individuals to take them to the whole into the group. The idea is she was of the view that the groups and individuals come into existence simultaneously and it is only through the group membership that the individuals realizes their true self. So, without the group there is no influence how will individual come to know about their true self.

So, idea is that the discussions that are happening in the group they are going to influence each other, there will be cooperation, it will lead or it will influence the people in the group to realize their true self and also to realize their creative powers, now because the group influences each the group members individuals of the group and it also influences group behaviour there is also the potential for group conflicts. Now from the group principle we say that the it is important for the individuals to you know they get realization of their true self by their membership in the groups. But because they get influenced from the group and group behavior it can ultimately lead to group conflicts. Now, confronting to these group conflicts can lead to various kind of outcomes. So, when there will be conflict, there will be confrontation, right? Conflict will always lead to confrontation.

Now, what will lead is, conflict will lead to these following outcomes. One outcome will be that the parties in the conflict, either one party will be voluntarily submitting to other party, victory of one party over the other, there could be compromise third outcome and finally the integration as the outcome what about solving this conflict if this is the condition how you should and which out of this four option will one party take the loose stand and the other party win will one party compromise? Now the option number 1 and 2 submission from one party and winning by one party is not acceptable because there could be some kind of force and coercion that happened during interaction because of which one party you know submission to the other party another party won. Compromise on the other hand is only going to delay or postpone rather than resolving the conflict. Now what Mary Parker Follett emphasized is the importance of integration for solving the conflicts right which has led to the principle of integrative unity. It says that the emphasis should be on integration in such a way that finding a solution to this problem which satisfy both the parties without the compromise and domination.

Now to do this what is required? How integration will take place? It is easier said than done how we should do it? For this what is required is the confronting parties they have to rethink their relationship and share information openly with each other as much as possible and they have to be very very creative in terms of examining the differences from multiple perspective. We usually say this, consider yourself in the shoes of others from where they are speaking when the conflict has initiated. So are we understanding that perspective? So when we look at the problem from the multiple angles and perspective, perhaps it may try to broaden your horizon in terms of looking at the issue at the hand. See difficulties confronting parties, it should not be your problem or my problem. It should be considered as our problem.

It also will then try to help people integrating and finding out the solution to the problem. Now what is required? Transparent conversation about differences, desires and needs. Now for conflict resolution to be constructive and of course role of managers for bringing the constructive change in the organization what is required that in creating the win-win solution for both the parties understanding, discussion and respect, three important factors for constructive conflict resolution - understanding, discussion, transparent discussion in terms of the differences desire and needs and finally showing respect for each other very very important. I'll tell you with the help of an example you have seen that in the most of the you know the automobile sectors lot of management and labor related issues will happen. Strikes happening.

Manager expecting something from workers. The managers also say that the genuine request from the workers are not there. Their requests are not genuine. They are asking for too much from the organization. On the other hand, workers are asking for something which management is not providing, right? So, there is some kind of conflict always going on between the union representation and the management representation.

Now according to this integrative aspect of looking into solving the solution to this problem, what is happening is, labor and management, they have to recognize their interrelationship with the broader set of parties outside their organizational context. which are the customers, suppliers and of course society in general. Let's say if the fights are taking place between the management and the labor, it is going to enhance the productivity of the company. right and the productivity of the company is going to suffer the production will be lesser production will be lesser it will ultimately have an impact on the supply of the product in the market and then it will ultimately impact the revenues and profits of the organization so the recognition of this particular thing the relationship outside the world if the manager management and the labor think about in that particular way what will happen it will wider their perspective And then it will lead to thinking of both the parties working together in a coordinated manner. That is what is the idea of Mary Parker Follett.

But integration as a principle will be ineffective without thinking about authority, responsibility and power. Now, while contributing to this idea, Follett developed the concept of power with instead of power over. Now, if she realizes that the relationship between the bosses and the subordinates and these terms itself, one is the boss and one is subordinate, one is superior, one is junior, it leads to the barrier to recognize common interest because the hierarchical jargon is being used. Now to do this, to overcome this, she found, she emphasized that we need to shift obedience to the law of situation. What does that mean? Authority should not be given to people depending upon their position and people should take the authority depending upon the demands of the situation.

Now in the demand which requires knowledgeable and expert knowledge, people to be taking up authority. Now depending upon these demands which are influencing people to take the lead, the one who will possess the most knowledge and expertise in that area should take the lead. It means to say that the orders, there is no order giving and order taking. Both managers and the subordinates should take orders from the situation which becomes the law of situation. It is very very also important for the effective good working relationship with others.

Because the idea is to working with someone not working under someone. Right. So that's the idea of power with not power over. So when this kind of situation prevail what will happen? The people will have idea that together we are trying to make situation good for the organization. And for that what is required? Co-action. She is of the view that both management and the workers should not exercise power over each other. No one should be dominant over each other. If that will happen, co-action will never take place. The problem will be of the co-action in the organization. So, what was required? Co-action that I just discussed about is, now Follett advocated for co-action as a principle of interaction between individual within the organization.

Now, unlike the traditional power dynamic of power over where one particular party, let's say the management exert control over the other party, let's say subordinates. But the co-action here, it emphasizes on the joint decision making. It promotes more egalitarian approach to authority where individuals work together as equals rather than hierarchical structure. Now, concluding the contributions of Mary Parker Follett, she emphasized upon the development of power collectively to foster cooperative concept and working as team. Moving on, very interesting contributions we are going to discuss now of Hawthorne studies.

The number of studies conducted will together called as Hawthorne studies and conducted between 1924 and 1932. They are perhaps the most influential investigation in the history of organizational research. Hawthorne Works of Western Electric Company is the supply arm of AT&T, conducting manufacturing work, telephones and switchboard. These studies which spanned eight years, number of studies conducted, to reveal the

patterns of employee behavior, reveal the patterns of employee behavior in terms of their functioning in the organization and their productivity as outcome. Together these studies are referred to as Hawthorne Studies, important contribution to the human relation movement.

The focus is on here human relations. That's why it's also called as human relation movement approach. During the time of studies, when these studies were conducted, Hawthorne employed 40,000 employees in multiple trade and profession. And Hawthorne by the way was very much known for its most enlightened HRM policies and generous employee benefits. The reason was very very simple because Hawthorne was the sole supplier of telephones to AT&T. Pressure to meet production schedule was intense. So for that you need manpower. And to attract manpower you have to have good HRM policy and employee benefits. Now, you have seen the context and situation how the Hawthorne study, the we will say platform or we will say the context is set in terms of number of employees, what kind of practices they were following and what was the need. What kind of studies were conducted? Illumination Studies between 1924 and 1927, Relay Assembly Test-room study 1927 to 1932, 'The interviewing program' 1925 and 1932 and Bank-wiring Observation Room Study 1931 to 1932.

Now we are going to look into the details of these studies because very very interesting in terms of the contribution to the human relation movement. Illumination studies between 1924 and 1927. These studies were funded by General Electric Company and were conducted by the group of MIT researchers led by Dugald C Jackson, C Jackson with the colleagues. What was the aim? Aim of the study was to investigate the relationship between the variations in the light intensity at workplace and workers productivity. Now, how the experiments were planned? The experiments were planned with two selected groups of coil winding operators.

What was done? One group was classified as the variable group with the variation in the light in the test room and the other control group no modification in the light so that the comparison can be made between the two in terms of their productivity. What were the findings? The findings was irrespective of the level of illumination. Illumination means intensity of light lesser or more. If the light is more, is the productivity increasing or if light is less, is the productivity decreasing or vice versa. Illumination being dark, bright or dim. Outputs generally increased. Now two broad conclusions were made. They were illumination only one of the factors to affect productivity and there was no cause and effect relationship that existed between illumination and productivity. And in 1927 illumination studies abandoned. The results were not very conclusive of these studies.

Relay assembly test room between 1927 to 1932 planned in 1927. The group of researchers, they planned second study to investigate the puzzling results of elimination studies because there were no conclusions, conclusive evidence about the cause and effect relationship. So they planned another group of studies. Now the goal of this particular studies were to check the effect of working conditions on productivity. How they planned this? Participants which were selected were five relay assemblers, all women and one operator.

And the person who was investigating or making the observation about what is happening during the experiment was Homer Hibarger. He was responsible for recording the events in the room and creating friendly atmosphere for the workers who are working in the room. Assemblers shifted from regular department to a special test room with controlled working conditions. Which we have to talk about because they are talking about working conditions. They were given those kinds of working conditions in the test room.

So, they were shifted from their regular department to a special test room. Which working conditions were varying? These people who were selected, they were allowed to talk. They can leave their workbenches. There were incentive plans which were tied to their group performance. There was no supervisor. The person who was in the room was only observing and there was also inclusion of rest period during that time. And also, whenever the change is to be implemented to make some kind of changes in the environment of the room, these worker was always consulted and their options were considered. Again, surprising findings, productivity rose irrespective of what changes were introduced.

At that time, an MIT professor named Claire Turner was brought in as the consultant. And according to this consultant, Professor Turner, the linkage of the productivity in case of the increased, you know, the linked productivity was attributed to, first of all, small group because it was a small group, there was cohesion, the productivity increased, type of supervision, because we talked about the no supervision aspect is there, earnings, incentive linked to their group performance. There was novelty in the experiments. Girl's interest in the experiment because they were getting the attention and the attention received by the participants in the test room. Now conditions, what was the conclusion of this program, this particular study was the special social position and social treatment received by the participant, it was linked to their productivity, a phenomena which was labelled as Hawthorne effect. Because it was conducted in Hawthorne and the Hawthorne effect was that because the social position given to these people special position because they were being treated in that way and their social treatment is such that they received in that particular environment it was linked to the productivity and it is actually labelled as Hawthorne effect.

Then also came the interview phase which was actually simultaneously going on along with the illumination studies at the time of illumination studies. What happened was the team was trying to find out the employee relations in the organization and they were trying to talk to these people to find out how are they feeling in terms of their work environment. So the question they were asking was the direct interviewing method, like are they happy, were they happy with their job, Were they happy with their environment? Were they happy with the supervisor? Were they happy with the incentive plan and so on? The answers to these questions were actually into yes or no, which did not lead to any specific information with respect to what is happening with the workers. Two different kind of interviews happened, direct and non-directive. Charles Snow, along with Homer Hibarger, started interviewing workers during illumination studies by asking questions which had only yes or no as answers.

So, resulted in limited information. I have just explained. The questions were like, Were you happy? Were you, you know, satisfied with the working condition? So, answers were yes to no. So, it resulted into the limited information. So, there were more insights which were required. Then, there is the involvement of Elton Mayo. So, involvement of Elton Mayo in the Hawthorne experiment actually came very late in 1929, even before the experiments already started. Elton Mayo focused on understanding the total situation and suggested a non-directive method of interviewing workers. Total situation means what is happening with the workers overall. You know, it is also to do with what is happening to their general lives. Now, in this case, according to this non-directive method, what was happened is workers were asked, the managers were asked to talk to the workers at length and in this case, workers were allowed to express their feelings more openly.

Now, what is the result? This led to employees feeling better about their working conditions, even if the conditions remain the same. Now, what happened is, outcome of this is, the supervisor training in terms of how they will talk to the people in terms of understanding their feelings and try to find out what is happening with the people, focused on listening to and understanding employees and personal concerns. New supervisor which were to be selected, they should be more people oriented, more concerned about the feelings of other, less aloof and skilled in handling social and personal situation. Remember we talked about the total situation here. more human style of management, better employee morale and output, fewer pessimistic reveries.

I want to talk about this particular concept, very interesting. When we talked about the concept of total solution, total situation analysis and Mayo's you know the indication for conducting non-directive interviews in terms of understanding what is happening with the lives of people, people were mentioning about certain things you know in terms of for example one of the employee mentioned that not employee was not happy with the low wages that the person was receiving but later on when they checked that it was not the case of low wages the employee was actually struggling with the medical bills in medical

bills that the person has to pay to some kind of problems in the family though it is not the case of the organizational problem but because the situation led them to think that way that the organization is the organizational problems are there, this is the case of pessimistic revenues so in this case what is happening is this human style of management human relation style of management it is required that we have better employee morale and output with the fewer pessimistic reveries. When we talk to the people at length, we'll try to find out what is happening in their general lives and possibly can do something about it. The last set of studies which were conducted were the Bank-Wiring observation room. In this study what happened is, participants who were selected, they were 14 men, 9 wire men, 3 solder men and 2 inspectors. They were actually assembling the terminal bank of telephone exchanges. Now, something very interesting is there about this particular group which was selected. This group, they have their own conception of a fair day's work. They were not very much inclined towards the monetary incentive, right? They have their own fair day's work norm that the group was in agreement that no one should produce above the level. And if any member of the group is going to go above that level or maybe even also below that level, they will be questioned, right? There will be, there also been ridicule by taking names.

There was a sarcasm which is being used against them. And there also a practice of binging. Binging means only, you know, tapping very hard to the worker depending upon just telling them that you have actually deviated from the norm. So, people who were actually indulging in the behavior against the norm, they were ridiculed. Now, group neither encourages too much of a work nor too little. They say only fair day's work should be done. This was something very, very interesting in the group experiment. Group norms, important to workers than money. There is importance of informal relation and hence the importance of informal organization. The relationship that the employees form in the organization when they are working in the group. It actually surprised the Hawthorne researchers that why it was happening.

Now why it was happening, why informal organizations were there in the organization and it is completely inevitable. In today's organization also you will see that there will be informal organization. Like people coming together depending upon with whom their wavelength actually matches they form the group. So there are informal kind of norms also will prevail in the group settings. Now what happen is if you look at the organizational point of view, they focus on logic of efficiency like more work outcomes.

But if you look at the people, there is a logic of sentiments because the people, these workers will feel that these managers have been given authority, what they do is only instruct us with the work, give us the orders and they want more work from us is more of an exploitative kind of an issue. So there was a classic conflict, clash of thought between the two. So, conclusion was managers to view organization as social system where informal organizations are inevitable, it cannot be ignored. We need to balance the logic

of efficiency and logic of sentiments, taking care of the output as well as taking care of the people's sentiment. Now, to achieve this balance, manager should strive to achieve equilibrium between organizational technical requirement, of course, in terms of outcome and what employees want from them.

It is important to realize here the contributions of the social relations in the organizations. These were the components of the studies conducted during the Hawthorne experiments and have contributed to our understanding of the issues with respect to the social relations, the attention being given to the workers in order to enhance their productivity.