# A Review of the Role of Management as an Integrating Activity using Henry Fayol Fourteen Principles.

## Professor George Tasie, Ph.D
Department of Business and Management, Kurdistan Business School
University of Kurdistan Hewler, Erbil.

The role of management is so vital in unifying an effective organisation, but it is often misunderstood by the employee, who can feel the manager is either not doing enough to help them or interfering too much, (Hammer & Champy, 1994). The fine line between employee approval and disapproval is one that requires skill to traverse. Certainly many experts have proposed theories concerning the role of managers, but this paper would suggest one of the greatest influencers was Henri Fayol, who proposed 14 principles of management that are still widely used today, (Wren, et al 2002).

According to Fayol, a manager should have the authority to correctly set out the division of an employees' work. I agree work needs to be ordered so that it may be planned and budgeted. An employee who has been working in the same job for sometimes will usually have the experience to deal with issues arising from their daily work, and the research conducted by Thibault & Kelley (1959) within the social exchange theory, show that for daily tasks to succeed the power shift from manger to employee should be encouraged. In this context, therefore, once a manager has planned work and set the boundaries of such work the employee can manage themselves. This also shows that even though a manager has authority, it does not mean s/he should be authoritative to the point of being autocratic which can polarise a workforce rather than unifying it, (Porter, 1980).

Part of the social exchange theory shows we place a personal connection to the work we do and according to Gross, (2005, p. 411) an employee will look at the work/remuneration exchange in terms of psychological profit, which equals the reward minus the amount of work undertaken, and Fayol looks at remuneration as a factor in providing responsible management. Certainly, without direction an organisation will lack focus. An analysis of IBM Credit was conducted to find out why the organisation was failing to make profits. Stephen Israel, a senior vice president at the time was asked about the role of management and the organisational structure. He said the organisational structure was there but never utilised and the employees were *"Just a bunch of people doing work"*, (Hammer & Champy, 1994, p. 79). If management takes this view of their employees then how can they be properly managed? How can Fayol's unity of direction with proper objectives be set in place or minimise instability of tenure leading to a high turnover of personnel?

Furthermore, Hammer & Champy, (1994, p78) describe the role of a manager as to "glue", the work of the employee to the needs of the organisation through the unity of command. However I see organisational layers reducing as related departments are being merged into divisions, requiring fewer managerial skills to guide and maintain the status quo, followed by the rise of the inspirational motivating approach of a leader, a person with the skills to bring followers onboard to an organisational vision. Thus the role of an employee moves from one of control

through discipline and the unity of command to one of empowerment. Likewise the role of the manager moves from enforcer to enrichment and esprit de corps.

If management is an integrating activity as described in Mullins (2006, p. 195), what are they integrating? It appears to me that as technology invades more and more areas of the workplace the traditional role of integrating processes and functions diminishes. Instead, one could argue that with the adoption of a progressive human relations theory, managers spend more time managing people rather than traditional functions. Therefore if the role of the manager is to integrate, does that include the feelings, emotions and ideas of subordinates? In Robert Heller's book titled *"Only work for one bastard",* Heller, (1982, p. 82) he describes how employees in the late 70s, would work for an uncaring boss, rather than go to another job and risk someone worse. I believe the management style as described by Heller is becoming a dying dinosaur of managing people, however would not go as far as Cloke and Goldsmith in saying managers per se are a dying breed and have somewhat lost purpose within a modern organisation, (Cloke & Goldsmith, 2002). Following on the discussions above, Valentine, et al, (1982), notes that every employee takes on the role of managing their own work, time and resources.

Fayol believed in a firm but fair approach to management through the use of equity; does this mean that the employee expects friendship from a country club style of manager to come hand in hand with fairness through the psychological contract? Everyone wants to feel wanted and appreciated. Gross conducted a study on the affects of McGregor's Theory Y and X on the psychology of the individual and found that when an individual or an employee felt appreciated they were willing to do more, (Gross, 2005). Even if the manager takes a friendly approach to management, an employee should still be aware of the boundaries of work. Once the workplace power shift moves from manager to employee then it is difficult to regain control again, and leads credibility to keeping the scalar chain of command, (Valentine, 1982). I would also agree with Fayol's subordination of individuals interests, where the interests of the individual should not take precedence over those of the team or the organisation, (Mullins 2005).

If an organisations' management team are responsible for its equilibrium and smooth running of the activities, the questions to ask then will be, is this achievable through decision making based on balanced centralisation? According to the leadership grid the team manager being both concerned for the employee and their productivity leans well to this balanced approach, (Mullins 2005). However, caution must underline the style and role of the manager so that they do not take on the paternalistic/maternalistic approach, which provides rewards for loyalty but punishment for disloyalty. Who decides what disloyalty is? To challenge a poor managerial decision may lead to unfavourable consequences thereby bringing segregation rather than unification, conversely to blindly follow a decision you know to be wrong is equally as bad.

Gross looked into the importance of employees showing initiative and found a relevance and correlation to employee satisfaction, (Gross, 2005) and Fayol also considered it an important principle. Hammer and Champy go as far as saying there can only be an executive change to management when *"storekeepers become leaders",* (Hammer & Champy, 1994, p79).

The works of Rensis Likert formed the fourfold system approach to management, (Likert, 1961). System 1 is the exploitative authoritative manager who can be viewed as the micro manager, who dictates actions and expects full compliance. If we view self actualisation and personal growth as an employee goal, then this method should not be adopted for general everyday activities as it can bring disharmony. System 2 of the benevolent authoritative manager, allows for rewards but lacks communication and team work and as previously

discussed both skills are required by a modern leader. System 3 is the consultative manager who uses rewards and teamwork to drive tasks to completions with a good range of communication and employee trust. This is in agreement to Hammer and Champy, who state that trust is the pivotal point of successful team management, (Hammer & Champy, 1994, p. 81). Finally system 4 is the participative group which involves a high amount of trust for and within the team, along with communication and employee responsibility.

By that fact itself, one could argue that traditionally managers and executives were seen as separate and distant from the organisational operations, however a flatter management structure can allow managers to come closer to the customer and their employees, (Hammer & Champy, 1994). Therefore, if an employee gets some satisfaction from self-management (Conley, 2007), what management system should an effective manager implement to promote this? According to the 10 pillars of leadership, collaboration between manager and employee is a vital ingredient; It also describes effective management as only possible through the use of teamwork, (Heller, 1982). To let the employees to try to reach a level of self actualisation as stated by Maslow, on their own is unrealistic, (Conley, 2007). Gross indicates a person functions more efficiently once they have a consistency of work and the opportunity for achievement, (Gross, 2005, p.129). To buttress the foregoing argument, Murray concurred with Freud by noting that an individual in the context of the workplace is able to easily express themselves when they are able to freely associate with their colleagues, (quoted in Elliot & Church, 1997). This leads me to the conclusion that the role of a manager is to communicate ideas and philosophies, empower individuals which creates effective self-managed participative teams where each individual manages their time and takes pride in the quality of their work through a structured consultative approach. When managers behave in this manner, we can comfortably claim that management is an integrating activity.

## Bibliography

*Cloke, K & Goldsmith, J. (2002). The end of management; and the rise of organisational* democracy, ***San Francesco: Jossey-Bass***

***Conley, C, (2007). Peak: How great companies get their mojo from maslow, San Francesco: Jossey-Bass***

Elliot, A, J & Church, M, A. *A hierarchical model of approach and avoidance achievement motivation:* Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol 72(1), Jan 1997, 218-232.

Gross, R. (2005). *Psychology The Science of Mind and Behaviour.* (4th ed.). London: Hodder and Stoughton .

Hammer, M & Champy, J. (1994). *Reengineering the corporation A manifesto for business revolution.* (2nd ed.). London: Nicholas Brealey Publishing .

Heller, R. (1982). *The business of success.* London: Sidgwick and Jackson.

Likert, R, (1961). New Patterns of Management: McGraw-Hill

Mullins, L.J. (2005). *MANAGEMENT AND ORGANISATIONAL BEHAVIOUR.* (7th ed.). London: Prentice Hall.

Porter, M.E. (1980). *Competitive Strategy.* New York: The Free Press.

Thibault, J.W & Kelley, H.H. (1959) *The Social Psychology of Groups.* New York: Wiley

Valentine, E.R. (1982). *Conceptual Issues in Psychology.* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Wren, D, A, Bedeian, A,G, Breeze, J,D, (2002) *"The foundations of HenriFayol's administrative theory",* Management Decision, Vol. 40 Iss: 9, pp.906 - 918