

# Organizational behavior at philips



Managing an organization can be challenging especially when the manager does not understand the organization and the people within the organization. Setting an innovative organizational behavior can help enhance the management and enhance the organizational relations. Understanding the organization involves understanding the members of the organization as the employees and other stakeholders that are important in the organization. Various theories have been used to justify the concept of organizational management. In this paper, we will analyze the organizational behavior based on the management approaches as illustrated by the two main school of thoughts; scientific management and human relations.

Most businesses nowadays are established with the aim of making a profit. Economic globalization across the world has ensured the tremendous emergence of business institutions in almost every part of the world (Alvesson & Spicer 2012). The main aim of each of the businesses is to make a profit. Some of the businesses concentrate on making the profit even at the expense of the employees and other stakeholders interests. Most employers fail to consider the significance of employees in the organization. Most business owners believe that employees are just tools they can use to get to where they want; in this case making the highest profit as they can (Paarlberg & Lavigna 2010). There are two main schools of thoughts in an organizational behavior management that an employer can adopt in an organization.

First, the scientific management approach that was designed by Frederick Taylor in 20th Century is the first school of thought that an employer can decide to adopt in the management of the organization (Nelson 1980). As an

organizational leader, one is faced with tough situations that require critical decision-making. Taylors ideas advocate for directive and control of the organization, a responsibility that the theory leaves for the top leadership tank in the organization, the manager. Taylors ideas claimed that the manager is the overall person in the organization whose responsibility is to see that the employees work towards achieving a greater productivity that could only be achieved through a directive (Nelson 1980). The scientific management approach claims that productivity cannot be achieved without the manager being available or present in the organization to see that everyone is working. The approach believed that without the presence of the authority around the workers, they cannot work with great motivation and the productivity can reduce.

Based on Philips case, if we take the scientific management approach we can say that Philip as the overall person in charge of the organization had a chance of improving the productivity of the organization. Claiming that there is nothing more to do is not enough and is unacceptable by the proponents of the scientific management school of thought who believes that the manager is charge and full control of the organizational operations. Philips had a lot of opportunities to improve the productivity of the organization if only he could take responsibility as the person in charge as explained by Taylors scientific management approach of organizational management. Taylors approach explains that the organizational productivity can only be enhanced or realized through the responsibility of the organizational leaders (Nelson 1980). The approach claims that the leaders must embrace the

authority that they have been given to enhance the productivity because they can do it.

Taylor's idea about the organizational management approaches claimed that most organizational leaders focus more on the productivity and forget the most important aspect of organizational management which is the means to achieving the productivity (Jaffee 2001). Lack of consideration of the processes of achieving the greater productivity can lead to the failure of most organizations because they fail to consider the significant aspect of management and emphasizes on the insignificant aspects. Taylor's approach argued that workers in an organization cannot manage themselves unless the authority symbol was there to motivate them to work (Sergiovanni & Starrat 1988). However, this motivation is what he defines as the extrinsic motivation. The extrinsic motivations are the external factors that motivate someone to work. According to the scientific management school of thought, the manager's role in the organization is to direct the manner in which workers carry on with their duties so as to enhance productivity. Taylor claims that there is nothing he can do to improve the productivity can be rejected by scientific management school of thought because there are a lot that he could do if he wants to improve the productivity of the organization.

Based on the scientific management principles Taylor's organization could be enhanced. For example, replacing the skilled labor with the unskilled labor can be the best strategy as suggested by Taylor's ideas towards improving the organizational productivity (Nelson 1980). According to the pioneer of this approach, Frederic Taylor most employers or organizational managers look for answers at the wrong places while they leave the right

places around them. According to the approach, improving the productivity of the organization can only be possible through proper and appropriate decision making that can impact the organization positively (Nelson 1980). The decision making can be seen through various organizational activities; for example, when choosing employees during the recruitment or promotion period. The scientific management approach claimed that most employees focus on the skills of the employees which are not important when it comes to increasing the productivity of the organization (Hersey & Blanchard 1969). This is the wrong place to seek answers to the question of increasing productivity based on the Taylors approach. The theory advocates for choosing employees or workers based on their strengths and speed at which they work instead of looking for their skills. The approach advocates that it is better to choose unskilled worker instead of skilled workers as long as he/she has the speed and strength to compete the workload set for him/her. The scientific management approach does not advocate for workers empowerment like the other approach, Human relation approach. The scientific management approach emphasizes on the techniques and efficiency of workers as the strategy towards improving the productivity.

The other approach that the organizational leaders can adopt in the management of the organization is the human relation approach that was proposed by the human relations school of thought. The human relations approach is entirely different from the previous scientific management approach pioneered by Taylor. The human relations approach was established from the Hawthorns studies that aimed at investigating the diversity of working conditions in the organization (Jaffee 2001). The human

relation approach advocates for workers or employees empowerment. The studies that led to the emergence of the human relations approach involved experiments in the Hawthorn factory where the name was depicted from. According to the proponents of this approach, the relationship of people within the organization can influence the productivity of the organization (Schlenker 1980). However, the approach focused more on the significance of the employer-employee relationship and how it influences the productivity of the organization.

The question of whether it is money that motivates people to come to work every morning or not is never a major issue of concern to many employers. Most organizational leaders do not care about the reasons behind their employees routine of coming to work every day (Boland et al., 2008). When a person is hired or employed, he/she knows that it is his/her responsibility to wake up every morning and go to work without anyone necessarily reminding them. The studies carried out by the employees during the Hawthorns experiment indicated that people do not come to work every day because of money that they are paid. Improving the productivity of the organization depends majorly on the relationship between the employers and the employees (Schlenker 1980). According to the human relations approach, having a good relationship with the organization with the employees can help the business owner or the employer improve the productivity because there will be a mutual understanding between the employer and the employees. This approach identifies the organizational relationships as significant to the development and success of the organization (Schlenker 1980).

Most of the businesses fail not because they do not have the appropriate personnel or machines but because they lack appropriate strategies that can enhance good relation within the organization (Paarlberg & Lavigna 2010). Without good relation, the success of the organization can be affected greatly. According to the human relations approach, the organizational leaders have the responsibility to ensure that there is a good relation between the members of the organization (Kahn 1958). However, what most of the modern businesses lack are the strategies to promote the good relations in the organization. Human relations approach suggests several ways to improve the organizational relations in the organization (Schlenker 1980). Motivation is one the main strategies towards improving the good relation within the organization. Most organizations regard their employees as a separate entity from the organization. Workers are people driven by the desire and wants that they want to achieve. The human relation approach uses the Maslow hierarchy of needs to explain the concept of human relation towards work. The human desires and needs can also motivate people to go to work.

In the hierarchy of Maslows pyramid, various issues can motivate people to go to work and improve their efficiency at work. The needs in the order include physiological, safety, love and belonging, esteem and finally self-actualization at the top of the pyramid. The order of the needs will motivate the worker to go to work. When a persons needs are still at the physiological and the safety levels, the person is motivated to work hard and improve to the next level (Hodgetts & Hedgar 1990). All these needs are achieved through work. Such a person will wake up every morning and realizes that

he/she needs to reach to the next level in the hierarchy, and he/she finds himself/herself at work without anyone reminding him/her that he/she has to go to work. What human relation approach is trying to depict is that people go to work not only because they are paid but because they are motivated by the personal needs or desires. However, we cannot rule out the possibility of money involved in this case.

Money is as important as any other thing. Money is the reason behind everything because it is the means of achieving the desired goals or needs explained in the Maslows hierarchy of needs. For example, a person must have money so as to be able to buy food and a house that covers the physiological and safety levels respectively. Again, one must have money so as to be able to gain the sense of belongingness in the society and gain the self-esteem. Therefore, money is behind everything that motivates people to go to work every day.

This is the concept that Phillips failed to understand when he claimed that there is nothing he can do to improve the productivity of the organization. However, it is not entirely the personal needs or desires that can motivate workers to go to work every day. According to the human relations approach, the organizational leaders or employers can also help motivate workers to go to work. Motivating an employee by either increasing the salary for good work done or promoting an employee to a higher rank level for working hard is one way to motivate employees towards improving the organizational productivity (Paarlberg & Lavigna 2010). Just as we have said that most organizations fail not because they lack proper equipment or techniques to carry on the organizational operations but because they lack strategies to

<https://assignbuster.com/organizational-behavior-at-philips/>



increase productivity. Empowering an employee can greatly influence the organizational productivity. As explained by the human relations school of thought, workers do not need to be forced or given directions to do something great to the organization. However, employees or workers must be empowered. Employees must be made to feel that they belong to the organization. Therefore, Philips case can be analyzed as a lack to adopt either the scientific management approach or the human relation approach. All Philips has to do is to ensure that employees are empowered so that they can feel the sense of belongingness in the organization so as to get the personal desired motivational needs that are represented by Maslows hierarchy of needs.

In conclusion, managing the organization can be challenging but with the right strategies, it can be the simple thing. Good management does not mean that the manager has to be physically available so as to motivate workers to work effectively. Workers can work on their own without necessarily feeling the presence of the employer or the person in charge around. However, the presence of the person in charge around employees when they work can be annoying and intimidating to the workers, and they can lose the esteem to work. Therefore, it is good to promote the motivation and empowerment by adopting the human relations approach as it is the best approach that can ensure organizational productivity. Philips will have approached the human relations approach if he wants to improve the organizational productivity.

## Bibliography

<https://assignbuster.com/organizational-behavior-at-philips/>

Alvesson, M. and Spicer, A., 2012. Critical leadership studies: The case for critical performativity. *Human Relations* , 65 (3), pp. 367-390.

Boland Jr, R. J., Collopy, F., Lyytinen, K. and Yoo, Y., 2008. Managing as designing: lessons for organization leaders from the design practice of Frank O. Gehry. *Design Issues* , 24 (1), pp. 10-25.

Gaither, N. and Frazier, G., 1999. *Production and operations management* . Thomson South-Western.

Hersey, P. and Blanchard, K. H., 1969. *Management of organizational behavior* (pp. 34-5). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hodgetts, R. M. and Hegar, K. W., 1990. *Modern human relations at work* . Hinsdale, IL: Dryden Press.

Jaffee, D., 2001. *Organization theory: Tension and change* . McGraw-Hill Humanities Social.

Kahn, R. L., 1958. Human relations on the shop floor. *Human relations and modern management* , pp. 43-74.

Nelson, D., 1980. *Frederick W. Taylor and the rise of scientific management* . Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Paarlberg, L. E. and Lavigna, B., 2010. Transformational leadership and public service motivation: Driving individual and organizational performance. *Public administration review* , 70 (5), pp. 710-718.

Schlenker, B. R., 1980. Impression management: The self-concept, social identity, and interpersonal relations.

Sergiovanni, T. J. and Starratt, R. J., 1988. *Supervision: human perspectives* . McGraw-Hill College.