

# Serving the interests of employees commerce essay



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

## Contents

- \*\*\*\*\*

This is to attest that the work I am submitting is my own. All external mentions and beginnings are clearly acknowledged and identified within the contents. I am cognizant of the University of Warwick ordinances referring plagiarism and collusion.

No significant portion ( s ) of the work submitted here has besides been submitted by me in other appraisals for commissioned class of survey, and I acknowledge that if this has been done an appropriate decrease in the grade I might otherwise hold received will be made.

Efficiency, effectivity and profitableness became the most favourable footings depicting successful organisational attempts since early years of organized enterprises. Along with the beginning of Enlightenment, industrial revolution and the outgrowth of capitalist economic organisations these footings became the mainstream benchmarks for measuring profit-oriented organisations and their economic public presentation. Today their significances is elevated to new highs through globalisation and effects the planetary exchanges and the stock markets exert on our civilization.

Since organisation ( s ) can be defined as “ a consciously coordinated societal unit, composed of two or more people, that maps on a comparatively uninterrupted footing to accomplish a common end or a set of ends ” ( Willmott pg 27 ) it should be safe to presume that organisations truly serve the best involvements of all its members whether they are the principals, stockholders, directors or employees. After all they form the same

<https://assignbuster.com/serving-the-interests-of-employees-commerce-essay/>

societal group and portion a common vision and intent. Sadly, this appears to be far from the truth when analyzing bulk of profit-oriented organisations through intelligence studies, instance surveies, employee sentiment or personal experiences.

This essay will analyze the grounds for the implicit in struggles of precedences and involvements bing between the organisational leaders ( principals and directors ) and followings ( employees ) using Organizational Behavior theories and analytical models of insecurity, individuality, power, inequality, cognition and freedom. It will show that the net income oriented organisations, by definition, can non truly serve involvement of employees. Predominating category battle ( as defined by Marx ) between the members who socially construct organisations will go on for every bit long as efficiency, effectivity and profitableness remain cardinal benchmarks of organisational public presentation and the primary grounds for creative activity of capitalist economic organisations.

The essay will specify what an organisation is, what its intent is, and who the members are. It will so use classical theories of Marx and Maslov and the construct of instrumental reason to research the nucleus, implicit in grounds for struggles of involvements and differences of precedences bing between organisational members. It will analyze the relationship between leaders and followings within the organisational construction every bit good as the influence of single demands and personal docket on societal building of organisations and struggles emerging from these dealings. The constructs of bureaucratic and hierarchal constructions ( Weber ) will be introduced every bit good as development of systems of control from scientific direction <https://assignbuster.com/serving-the-interests-of-employees-commerce-essay/>

( Smith, Taylor ) to human relationship theoretical account ( Herzberg, McGregor, du Guy ) to explicate how the systems of control and development evolved over time to going even more intrusive by tapping into the psychological sphere of employees ( through creative activity of corporate civilization, institutionalization and hegemony. )

## **Organizations and their intent**

It is of import to get down by saying that there are many types of organisations in being, some of which are focused on results other than net income devising, such as non-for-profit, authorities, military or societal organisations. These organisations will be outside of the range of this essay as it will concentrate chiefly on profit-oriented, “ capitalist economic organisations ” ( Willmott 305 ) to clearly exemplify struggles and difference of precedences being within them since these organisations are the primary driving force of modern, advanced capitalist economic systems and the most common organisational entities in being.

A mainstream, definition of organisation was already presented earlier. It clearly states the intent of an organisation as “ accomplishment of common end or set of ends. ” ( Willmott pg 27 ) This definition serves good to loosely depict organisations whether they are profit or non-for-profit oriented. To specify “ capitalist economic organisations ” we need to add that they are created chiefly for the intent of wealth accretion and should be further defined with the modernist definition as “ good designed and managed [ a^! ] systems of determination and action driven by norms of reason, efficiency and effectivity for declared intents ” ( Hatch and Cunliffe pg14 )

## **Insecurity, inequality and freedom**

Possibly the most cardinal is the struggle of economic inequality when discoursing organisations. It is profoundly engrained into cardinal facet of free capitalist economy itself. After all the demand for wealth accretion propels the full system frontward. Inequality and competition moreover dictate labour rewards and work regulations. When employee accepts a occupation offer from an employer he gives up certain picks and rights and accepts the 1s imposed by the employer ( or organisation ) . ( GREY 50 ) In the procedure he besides submits clip, experience and cognition to the organisation in exchange for an in agreement amount of money.

Capitalist economic organisations are created by proprietors of capital who combine their capital and resources with labour transforming it into instruments of production of marketable trade goods. ( Willmott 305 ) with a clear intent of obtaining a return on their investing. Knowing that “ In broad capitalist economy, the proprietors of the concern organisation ( the ‘ shareholders ’ ) and its accountants and enactors ( direction ) are, loosely talking, concerned to maximise net income at the minimal cost. “ ( Willmott pg 145-6 ) it can be assumed that the rights and regulations they impose serve to stand for organisation ‘ s best involvement and are by and large designed to work employee ‘ s clip, experience and cognition as oppose to stand foring his best involvements.

This ultimately creates feelings of insecurity and disaffection or “ disenfranchising of worker from the merchandise of their work attempts. ” ( HATCH 29 ) because “ labour is defined as cost of production, instead than every bit agencies to accomplish a corporate intent ” ( Hatch 29 ) . Thus <https://assignbuster.com/serving-the-interests-of-employees-commerce-essay/>

struggle of involvements and difference of precedences arise between the employer and the employed. The proprietors of capitalist economic organisations will ever seek to obtain a higher return on their invested capital by looking for ways to cut down the cost of labour, chiefly by planing systems of control and pull stringsing the work force to accomplish this end. " In capitalist economy, the planning, division and coordination of work are intended to guarantee control of the workers in a procedure that is estranging and exploratory. [ a^; ] in order to acquire the maximal application at a minimal cost. " ( Willmott pg 145 )

This exploitative, frequently dehumanising procedure is apparent particularly when analysing early positions on labour direction techniques as presented by Smith and Taylor. In 1776, about 250 old ages ago, Adam Smith theorized in his groundbreaking and still influential today An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations that the division of labour is chiefly responsible for increased production while rewards are dictated by the competition among labourers. ( XXX XX ) It is difficult to find whether his work set the tone of operations ( a self-fulfilling prognostication ) for future coevalss of capitalist economic organisations or if he about made an early observations into the nature of such wealth roll uping entities, but his theories clearly removed the involvement of employees from the docket of the organisational leaders by accepting the position of the employees as simply supplying the natural power necessary to travel the organisation frontward in the most effectual manner. ( YYY 23 )

This impression is farther reinforced by Frederic Taylor and debut of Scientific Management in 1880s in which occupations were intentionally <https://assignbuster.com/serving-the-interests-of-employees-commerce-essay/>

mechanized and de-skilled ( WILLMOTT 310 ) partly to maximise the efficiency of work but besides to make inexpensive, disposable labour which could replace complex accomplishments with simple undertakings that about anyone could execute with small preparation. In other words workers were seen simply as an “ extremity to the machine ” ( WILLMOTT 311 ) . Some argue that Taylor paid no attending to complex issues of motive ( WILLMOTT 309 ) while others believe the scientific direction was designed exactly to get the better of such issues and eliminate them. ( Grey 46-47 ) . Regardless, following Smith and Taylor theories it was by and large accepted that wage addition would counterbalance for repetitive, narrowly drawn undertakings ( WILLMOTT 309 ) while favourism and absolutism were primary agencies and widely used solutions for increasing motive and procuring employee productiveness ( Willmot 310 )

Surely, working labour and maximising net income with scientific direction methods offered maximal efficiency, effectivity and profitableness at that clip without much concern for human rights. It is possibly because human rights did n't germinate every bit rapidly as the capitalist economic organisations did developing new schemes for forming and pull offing labour. Capitalists could acquire away with inhumane intervention of employees as there was seemingly no fright of workers rebellion that could potentially endanger the operations. One of account for it is that the demands of early developing economic systems, and hence their members, autumn within the lowest degrees of Maslow ' s Hierarchy of Needs. And as Maslow bests puts it himself “ Motivation: it is about carry throughing human demands ” ( Willmott 45 ) . Therefore every bit long as demands were nominal and

pressure ( dictated by the poorness ) the regard and self-actualization ( including “ regard by others ” ) which stand higher within the pyramid of demands could be temporarily ignored.

It must be understood that capitalist economic organisations are instrumental reason entities for increasing net incomes and roll uping wealth. “ An instrumentally rational organisation or a individual is concerned chiefly, if non entirely, with the most efficient agencies to accomplish specific terminals or aims. [ a^! ] One might propose, for illustration, that private companies are preoccupied with the best agencies to increase net incomes ” ( WILLMOTT 30 ) . For that ground employee demands and involvements are of minimum concern for every bit long as organisations are able to acquire away with it, that is, until employee rebellions through “ sabotage, hapless quality of work, high staff turnover, or absenteeism ” ( GREY 49 ) or otherwise interfere with the chief organisational nonsubjective - the wealth accretion.

Marx captured the implicit in struggle of precedences within capitalist economy in his 1876 work Das Kapital. He proposes that due to the bing market competition, organisation ( s ) “ profitableness depends upon the organisation and control of work activity. [ a^! ] Since labour is a big constituent of the costs of production, capitalists pressure labourers to work more expeditiously ( or at least more cheaply ) , which is achieved by continuously enforcing new signifiers of managerial control on work procedure ” ( Hatch 29 ) while directors are “ bucked up to handle labour like any other natural stuff, that is, to work it for its economic value ” ( HATCH 29 )

)  
<https://assignbuster.com/serving-the-interests-of-employees-commerce-essay/>



Degrading human work to the degree of natural resource has its bounds nevertheless. It lowers employee motive and emotional well-being rapidly. Workers subjected to scientific direction experienced it as “ foreign and degrading as they removed individualism and minimized the range for exerting discretion and creativeness ” ( Willmott 310 ) and perceived this signifier of control as “ politically and socially dissentious arm that posed a menace to their sense of individuality, solidarity and involvements ” ( Willmott 310 )

To advance their ain involvements and precedences in as organized, instrumentally rational manner as the capitalists did, workers started organizing labour brotherhoods ( first of them, Knights of Labor was formed merely four old ages after Marx plants were published ( Wikipedia ) ) . Labor brotherhoods docket was to propagate thoughts such as “ work to govern ” and other, frequently riotous signifiers of sabotage and tactics aimed to “ interrupt the organisation in chase of brotherhood purpose ” ( Grey 29 ) .

Again the implicit in grounds for these actions were foreseen by Marx. He proposed that “ since net income is generated by combination of labour and capital, each side of course, can reasonably claim that the excess should belong to them. ” ( HATCH 29 ) and each side feel strongly entitled to their ain rights which creates struggles of precedences and involvements bing between the organisational leaders ( principals and directors ) and followings ( employees. )

It could be argued that any farther promotions in organisational theory and creative activity of different direction manners ( such as Human Relations

Theory ) is nil more than merely an luxuriant tactical move on the portion of proprietors and directors to look more humane in their applications of power and control ( Grey 47 ) . The alteration from scientific direction is besides facilitated by the necessity of germinating society ( rise on Maslow ' s pyramid of demands ) and germinating human rights motions.

This statement is easy supported by detecting that even though scientific direction method is frowned upon and considered crude and inhumane by today ' s criterions ( ZZZZZ ZZ ) , it is still a prevailing signifier of labour control in many countries of the universe ( particularly the developing states such as China, Malaysia, Turkey, India, etc. ) favored by many international organisations ( most famously Foxconn ) where working conditions and direction manner did n't germinate much beyond 1900s. This is because it did n't hold to. The economic inequality is so tremendous in those states, while human right are invariably subverted by political governments and socio-economic conditions that scientific direction continues to be most efficient, effectual and profitable signifier of labour control.

## **Power, IDENTITY AND KNOWLEDGE WITHIN ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE**

The earlier definition of an organisation addresses largely the " formal " facets of organisations. What fails to be addressed, and which has every bit profound consequence on organisational struggles are the " informal " facets of organisations which deal with power, individuality and control of cognition. This, of class, refers to the " Iceberg " position of the organisations where frequently easy discernible and available things are merely a tip of an

iceberg, with deeper issues and struggles hidden underneath a seeable surface.

This is because organisations are every bit complex as people ( members ) who form and participate in them. They should not be perceived merely as man-made " systems of determination and action " because all organisations are based on human interaction. They are socially constructed and hence subjected to conflicting single precedences, demands, motives, bias, anxiousness, emotional contexts and political relations. In another words " Conflict is an inevitable facet of forming " ( Hatch 279 ) . Such struggles, in add-on to antecedently described Marxist category battle consequences in uninterrupted power drama across all organisational degrees ( vertically and laterally ) and within all organisational groups and subcultures further doing the gulf between members and primary organisational ends ( efficiency, effectiveness and profitableness. )

Even though it could be argued that these issues are more of a reversal to the inquiry whether organisations can truly function the involvements of employees ( in this instance employees are frequently preoccupied with their ain docket more than with organisational ends ) but it must be understood that organisational construction and environment are easing these struggles. Additionally, such struggles negatively affect involvements of all the members within organisations, non merely the struggle of the direction versus the employees.

To look beyond the modernist position and to include these " informal " facets of organisational civilization and struggles into the analysis a symbolic

interpretivists perspective on organisations should be taken which perceives organisations as socially constructed worlds, “ continually constructed and reconstructed by their members through symbolically mediated interaction ” ( Hatch and Cunliffe pg14 ) , putting extra accent on emotions and experiences as relevant factors of their rating ( Hatch pg15 )

Conflicts of power, individuality and cognition resonates through all degrees of organisational bureaucratism partly due to bossy direction and the usage of disciplinary power. Since direction was introduced by capitalist proprietors who were looking for ways to command their workers efficiency it was up to directors to make up one’s mind “ when, where and how labour was to be deployed, in an attempt to better its dependability and productiveness. ” ( WILLMOTT 306 )

Since direction represent and enforces ( by disciplinary power ) the political orientations and involvement of the proprietors, in what Marx defines as “ power as domination ” ( HATCH 265 ) they are perceived as autocratic, elitist group within organisations in footings of wage, position and map. ( WILLMOTT 299 ) They besides exercise legitimate power within organisations which is embedded within organisational construction and hierarchy and keep organisations together by usage of authorization as observed by Weber ( Hatch 251 ) . This surely implies struggle between directors and workers. But directors besides aim to maximise their ain power relation to other members within the organisation ( Hatch 255 ) . They do this by developing personal webs, commanding and falsifying information, advancing loyal subsidiaries and commanding determination doing standards. ( Hatch 256 )

<https://assignbuster.com/serving-the-interests-of-employees-commerce-essay/>

Pfeffer argued that “ persons or sections derive power from the ability to supply something that organisation demands, for illustration, a high degree of public presentation, an unreplaceable accomplishment, an ability to work out critical jobs or obtain scarce resources ” ( Hatch 257 ) . This is because power is rational and span exterior of boundaries of formal hierarchy. Beginnings of power can be found in “ personal features ( a magnetic personality ) , expertness ( accomplishments, cognition, or information needed by others ) , coercion ( the menace or usage of force ) , control of scarce and critical stuff resources ( budgets, natural stuffs, engineering, physical infinite ) , ability to use normative countenances ( informal regulations and outlooks set up by cultural premises and values ) and chance ( entree to powerful individuals ) ” ( Hatch 254 )

They arise between different persons, groups and subcultures and and it occurs when activities of one

“ Struggle between two or more groups in an organisation [ a^! ] centered on some province or status that favors one group over others and occurs when the activities of one group are perceived as interfering with the results or attempts of other groups ” ( Hatch 279 ) surely exist within organisations.

Robert Dahl defines power as “ A has power over B to widen that he can acquire B to make something that B would non otherwise make ” ( Hatch 254 )

it makes sense to comprehend this group as standing for different involvements and implementing different precedences so employees would.

Marx defined

\*\*\*\*\*

Organizational Control, struggle and power

and other theories ( like McGregor ' s theory Ten )

Since different ontologies or positions of organisational theory ( Modern, Symbolic Interpretivism or Postmodern ) can be used to analyse organisation ( s ) depending on what facet of organisation ( s ) is in focal point and depending on the context, this essay will accept a " concept position " ( Willmott 28 ) of organisation ( s ) . " In making so, we acknowledge the significance of organisation ( s ) to be multiple and contested " ( Willmott 28 )

More late, merely about a decennary or so ago ( bestcompanies to work for was established in 2003 ) , employee satisfaction and ' Workplace Engagement ' were footings that eventually entered a mainstream vocabulary and gained some wider acknowledgment.

Rudy home 312 492 7839

Judith 773-415-9004

Last some significance will be given to organisations that attempt to minimise the struggle by seeking to authorise employees and offering socio-economic inducements as agencies be giving to the demands of their

<https://assignbuster.com/serving-the-interests-of-employees-commerce-essay/>

employees and size up whether such actions are echt or aimed to make more luxuriant and evolved signifier of control organisations exert on their employees.

What about UNITARISM