The Development of Management Practices over Time

Zuzu Mercy Ayibapreye

PhD student in Business policy at the Niger Delta University.

Abstract:

This study provided a history of management by comparing and contrasting periods prior to the Industrial Revolution, periods during and after the Industrial Revolution, classical and contemporary management theories. The concepts such as regulatory, analytical, cognitive, and relations offers a wide range of management approaches ranging from item to new hire. Technology, diversity, and globalization have all influenced the evolution of traditional management theory in the modern marketplace. To maintain a competitive edge in a rising work culture, learning firms are adopting these tendencies. Inside a learning organization, governance falls into a variety of categories, ranging from bureaucratic to human relations, and from technological to global. These administrative concepts are used by executives in learning firms to optimize their core strengths of collaboration, interaction, consciousness, responsibility, rational thought, and expertise.

Keywords: Management, Concept, Practices, Industry, Business, Methods, Workforce.

Introduction

Management is no exception to the rule that almost everything has a past. The concept of management is not new; human beings are born with the ability to manage. Throughout history, early management concepts have been used to help society grow. Beautiful constructions can be seen from the Stone Age to the present day — could monuments and cities exist without management? No. To finish large projects, management actions were usually required. Strong management systems were required as a result of the Industrial Revolution, as well as the rise of factories and mass manufacturing. To speed up production, reduced costs, and increase profitability, better and more efficient manufacturing techniques were needed. As a result, theorists have created a variety of concepts since the late 1800s.

Pre-Industrial Revolution Periods and during and After Industrial Revolution Periods are the two key periods addressed in the historical development of management concept. Notion (Nwachukwu, 1988).

Periods Prior to the Industrial Revolution

Despite the notion that management as a defined body of knowledge is a relatively new field of study, management practice is as old as human society. As a result, management has existed from the dawn of time. It's important to remember that man has always chosen what to do and how to accomplish it. In the pre-industrial era, that is, before the industrial revolution, which occurred in Europe between 1750 and 1850, human society engaged in crafts and took care of itself.

By making a variety of crafts at home, human civilization practiced crafts and cared for its micro-organizational units, known as families. Therefore, as a response, the producing system was designed by arm. In addition to their basic occupations of foraging, gathering, and agriculture, they also engage in a variety of other activities and any surpluses were traded with neighbors for other commodities. The man was able to manage his family during this time. As a result, management began in antiquity. Looking back over the years, it's clear that management has morphed, strengthened, and become more intricate. The evidence for the movement is as follows:

❖ Egypt, the Birthplace of Human civilization
As early as 1300 B.C., the Ancient Egyptians learned the necessity of organization and control in their administrative structures. The output of management was their success in the architecture of temples and monuments.

❖ China
The Chinese used a system that included practical advice for proper public administration, such as admonitions option to select truthful, altruistic, and competent public officers to manage their resources during the pre-industrial revolution period.

❖ Babylon
The Suspended Greenery of Babylon were one of the ancient world's seven marvels. Before any historical record was established, someone had to have organized and instructed others to carry out that objective.

❖ Empire of the Romans
The intricacy of the management job led to a massive evolution of management techniques in what was then known as the world's greatest dominating nation. Good management was far more vital to the Roman in times of peace than in conflict situations. However, good management appealed to the Rome military's success. In their hierarchy of authority, they also used the Scalar chain principle.

❖ Greece
Plato and Aristotle, two ancient Greek philosophers, established certain concepts that are still prominent in contemporary management. Socrates defined management as a distinct and unique skill. The Athenian democracy was built on great leadership, with its tribunals, confederation legislatures, famous judicial system, and council commanders.

❖ Combat Service
Massive armies have their own set of issues. Connectivity, and improvement of employees, command properties, and logistic support are examples of these. Even mercenary armies require high morale, a synergistic relationship amongst individual and group aims, and competent leadership abilities.

❖ The Catholicism

Over the millenniums, the Catholic Church has shown to be the most successful formal structure in Western civilization. It has generated emulation-worthy examples in applied management, including such hierarchical major enterprise, proportional sequence in responsibility, concepts of responsibility, and representatives.

❖ Holy bible Visuals

Numerous managerial concepts can be found in the Bible. The command was written in the Book of Exodus. Moses' leadership characteristics as described in the Book of Exodus. For instance, we discover in Exodus Chapter 18 verses 13 to 17 that Jethro functioned as a business consultant to Moses, prattling on themes that are analogous in breadth to present administration, education, responsibility delegation, and concern. The Shrouded Expertise narratives in Matthew Chapter 25, verses 14 to 30, highlight the importance of managers producing outcomes and providing outstanding dues of them.

❖ The Cameralist

In the 16th and 18th centuries, a number of ideologues and thinkers resolved in Germany and Australia. They believed that a country's prominence was correlated to the amount of materialistic things, riches, and effective management. They, again got keen. They also agreed in the uniformity of concepts such as expertise, workforce, junior education, and management minimalism.

It is vital to recognize that management organization inquiry is super old. Multiple tries were made over the past countless centuries to explain concepts and approaches of management and operation as we know them now, as exemplified by the examples above.

Periods During and After the Industrial Revolution

The industrial revolution refers to enormous modifications of commerce and production technologies. It was a time when the traditional system of production was phased out in preference of the usage of machinery. It took place in Europe around the 18th century. The industrial revolution ushered in the advent the factory system of manufacturing.

The following attributes differentiate the factory system from the pre-industrial revolution artisan mode of production:

❖ Workforce, natural resources, equipment, and equipment are all restricted to a single building or a group of buildings that are strictly used for fabrication. However, under the artisan system, fabrication was done at the artisan workers' homes.

❖ Workforce, natural resources, generation, and performance were all centralized under the factory system. However, there was no such convergence under the artisan approach.

❖ As the factory system progressed, a key separation between the employers and workers surfaced. The boss, however, was more of a showpiece in original stages of artisan administration.

As a consequence, the industrial revolution played a significant role in the increasing growth of the factory system. It provided sufficient machinery and power for mass amount. These specialty machines carry execute tasks in a priority format. To fund the automated industries, which moved production control to acquire the equipment and contend with the businessman, a good portion of money was essential. As a measure, the Industrial Revolution stretched beyond Europe and North America to other countries of the globe, culminating in economic and industrial growth, expanded technology and commerce, and new breakthroughs in trade and travel. Skyrockets in grain amount, tremendous

assortment and percentage of manufactured products, and the complicatedness of the invention procedure were all brought about by the manufacturer model

Managers in the 18th and 19th centuries tended to be authoritarian, tough, and auto. To control corporations, they utilized elaboration of action and "rule of thumb" techniques. Although there were professionals in the fabrication process on hand, they lacked management training. The sheer size of commercial entities has increased dramatically. As a result, new management problems occurred. As a result, people began to develop new ideas about organizational management. As a result, a set of organizational ideas started to emerge.

Within this context, the work of Frederick Winslow Taylor, the Father of Scientific Management, Henri Fayol, the Father of Administrative Theory, and Max Weber, the Originator of Bureaucracy, stood out clearly. These three streams were given the names Classical Concepts of Organization accounts. Other management theories arose from the Classical Theories of Organization and Management.

The Scientific Methodology

Frederick Winslow was a writer who lived in the nineteenth century., Taylor proposed the scientific idea in 1911, which pushed for speed by gradually boosting task completion productivity using analytical, technical, and integrals. The purpose of a scientific theory was to reduce carbon emissions, optimize processes and methods, and promote a more impartial transportation of resources. The aim was to assist organizations, workers, and humanity overall. Taylor set a benchmark.

Staff members too were also credited or rebuked on basis of merit. For firms with production lines and other quantitative, systematized processes, this strategy appeared to perform brilliantly. Taylor's scientific management theory was developed from the standpoint of engineering technology, which generated work organization similar to that of Henry Ford's production line. Optimization experts with stopwatches engaged in a period department at Ford Motor Company to evaluate the industrial process and remove unnecessary motion. This study made some progress. However, Ford executives came up with a game-changing concept that embodied the paradigmatic manifestation of scientific management. Rather than transporting workers to work, this new model helped bring this same work to the employees. Teams of workers would go to work sites and build a car in a timely order. Furthermore, this new era fell to pieces the labor activity into its minutest detail. In 1913, the production line was first used.

It was a visual cue that traveled slowly along a portion of the car while immobile operators performed the same activity over and over again, adding an element to it. Massive advances in worker productivity were made. The creation of a car, which formerly required over 12 hours per car, was lowered to just over 90 minutes by regularizing and simplifying the work process and its minute sharing of chore. Of course, there were many who objected to this method, claiming that workers were not permitted to exhibit their identity in the job. Opponents further contended that this strategy offered the administration more control. Taylor's goals, on the other hand, were excellent in that he correlated productivity and output to monetary benefit, so that more productive workers could make more income. His priorities had included making the environment safer so that workers experienced minimal workplace hazards. Lot Taylor's ideas are still used in today's management practices. The auto detailer, reimbursement, perks, and active customer emphasis are just a few of the recent advances.

The Administrative Methodology

Henri Fayol, who established his theory of management in 1916, was the originator of the Administrative Approach. It is questionable whether Fayol was a thinker with brilliant ideas or a world class manager, as he was inspired by Taylor's release of The Principles of Scientific Management in 1911.

Fayol, like Taylor, was an engineer who worked as a mine manager in France. Management, according to Fayol, is present at the top of our lives and society, encompassing household, job, and politics. All of the work needed for survival our lives, he claimed, could be divided into five categories: planning, organizing, commanding, coordinating, and controlling. Individuals could become good managers, he felt, if they learned and applied proper management principles.

❖ Anticipating and predicting what will be required in the tomorrow is alluded to as planning.

❖ Obtaining all valuable tools, both in terms of raw materials and personnel, is part of the organizing process.

❖ Commanding ensures that all services are done are completed on time.

❖ Coordination is a mechanism to ensure that all activities are implemented.

❖ Coordination refers to the mechanics of guaranteeing that all jobs are completed on time and that everyone involved was operating as a cohesive unit. Controlling entails adhering to and following all standards and policies.

Fayol also devised fourteen management principles, which are as follows:

❖ Work division: Work division is the method of allocating and completing tasks to a team of employees in order to enhance efficiency. Work division, also known as division of labor, is the method of splitting down a job into numerous tasks that make up entirely. This implies that with every work, a variety of operations must take place in order for the job to be finished.

❖ Authority and Responsibility: Authority is the ability to issue an order and command compliance, while responsibility is the result of authority. It is impossible to have authority without being liable for one's behavior.

❖ Discipline: Employees must follow and regard the organization's rules. Great governance produces good regulation.

❖ Unified command: Only one superior or on behalf of the superior should issue an order to each worker.

❖ Directional unity: Every group of activities of an organization with the same goal should be guided by a single manager using only a single plan to achieve a single collective objective.

❖ Subordination: No single employee's or group of employees' interests should supersede over the overall organizational goals.

❖ Remuneration: All employees must be justly compensated for their efforts.

❖ Centralization: The degree to which coworkers are participated in decision-making is referred to as centralization.

❖ Scaler chain: The scalar chain is the line of authority that runs from top down to the lowest ranks. This sequence should be followed in order to facilitate communication.

❖ Order: This principle is concerned with the coherent form of men, automated systems, components, etc. there should be a specific place for every worker.

❖ Equity: Managers should treat their subordinates with generosity and impartiality.

❖ Employee tenure stability: Staff turnover is unsatisfactory. Management should guarantee that human scheduling is coordinated and that substitutes are ready to fill absences.

❖ Employees with initiative are those who are given the freedom to come up with new ideas.

❖ Team spirit: Championing collaboration within the organization will enhance cohesiveness.

The Bureaucratic Methodology

The basic structure and chain of command that differentiates the degree of authority inside an organization is best defined as bureaucracy. Max Weber emphasized the organization of organizations into bureaucracies and the creation of clearly defined roles and administration. For all regimented jobs, he argued that organizations should compose concise established procedures. In the late 1800s, Weber chastised businesses that conducted their activities with relatives. Weber believed that this unofficial structure of managers and employees impeded a firm's future prospects since control was concentrated of a few individuals who had the sufficient expertise. Employees, he believed, were devoted to their employers.

Employees, he believed, were devoted to their superiors rather than the company. Weber fought for bureaucracy, a more structured and strong corporate framework. This quasi perspective of businesses was based on a standard framework in which suitable management methods comprised norms, legal lawful authority, and competence. Each organization, according to Weber, is a bureaucracy with goals that must be reached at the sacrifice of individuality and personal contribution. Companies were able to run more efficiently as a result of his methods. Requiring all managers and employees to follow a rigorous set of norms, on the other hand, hampered workers' inventiveness and ability to learn new things.

The Methodology of Human Relations

In the early twentieth century, Elton Mayo, a professor emeritus knew the value of human touch and specific employment conditions. Information gathering in labour climate and social elements were carried out at the Western Electric company's Hawthorne factory, led by Mayo. The Hawthorne Studies were born out of this. The goal of the trials was to figure out how diverse workplace settings affected employee performance. Variations in the room's brightness, various modes' lunch breaks, mandated work schedules, mealtime availability, office frictional heating, and other ecological office adjustments were all included in the explore. The findings were unexpected: production was increased throughout every level of the research! Because of the established adjustments, workers feel that management appreciated them as humans. It conveyed that they were valued. Employees in the test groups also created connections with other people, identified themselves as members of a group, and believed they had the freedom to make workplace judgment. Productivity remained resilient even when employees returned to their previous working schedules and circumstances.

The Hawthorne Studies demonstrated that fulfilling employees' basic needs can improve the workforce and boost productivity. The Hawthorne Studies transformed the function of management in the same way as the Scientific Approach did. The scientific movement emphasized necessary functions and considered managers as enslavers, whereas the Human Relations Approach emphasized team cohesion, collaboration, and harmony.

Managers' responsibilities in this new phase included providing assistance and concern for the welfare and well-being of their employees. As the Human Relations Theory of management grew during the early twentieth century, it became increasingly clear that one's job was about more than just generating money and living paycheck to paycheck. People have essential needs, which were satisfied in the workplace too. Abraham Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs Theory, which dealt with drive and self-improvement, was first proposed in 1943. Herzberg's experiments to promote enthusiasm led in his motivation-hygiene theory of employee satisfaction, which was accompanied by other humanist

theorists. McGregor established his X and Y Theories. Theory X was a pessimistic theory that said that managers should expect that employees are untrustworthy.

McGregor announced his X and Y Theories. Hypothesis X was a pessimistic theory that claimed that managers should think their employees are lethargic and use menaces to drive them. Workers were classified according to their ability and desire to work really hard in Theory Y. This idea holds that people can be characterized by one of these polarities, which is a strategy that today's modern managers are wary of.

An Approach to Management Systems Based on Modern Methodology

Systems Theory

The goal of the Systems Theory of management was to tread a fine line between the emotionless Scientific Approach and the individualized Human Relations Approach.

The study of the characteristics and composition of systems on the basis of relationships is recognized as systems theory.

Ludwig von Bertalanffy, Anatol Rapoport, Kenneth E. Boulding, William Ross Ashby, Margaret Mead, Gregory Bateson, and others established it as a science in the 1950s. Systems theory is a cross-disciplinary topic of inquiry. It combines ontology, philosophy of science, physics, biology, and engineering theoretical theories and rules. The idea of a systems approach was first proposed by biologist Ludwig von Bertalanffy as portion of his General Systems Theory, which he used to analyze the connection between organisms and ecosystems. Bertalanffy sought to find out the association amongst organizations and their surroundings. To achieve so, he looked into the connections between personnel, buyers, and the firm's produce. This passage from his collection of writings named General finest exemplifies his theories.

This quotation from his collection of publications titled General System Theory: Foundations, Development, and Applications best exemplifies his ideas. "We can say with confidence that this model of equipment units working in one-way causation has proven unsatisfactory in modern science. As a result, concepts like completeness, thorough, physiological, aesthetic, and others have appeared in many branches of inquiry, all implying that, in the end, we must think in terms of systems of elements in reciprocal interaction" (Bertalanffy, 1968, p. 45). He was implying that each component must be examined separately. In furthermore, the outcome of the contacts, as well as the totality that is generated as a result of those interactions, must be investigated. In particular, the Systems Approach considers

The Systems Approach further considers the interplay seen between social and technical areas of business. To guarantee the effectiveness of the larger system, the Systems Process focuses on all constituents, or semi, to work in harmony and coordination.

Contingency Standpoint

Burns and Stalker, Joan Woodward, Jay Lorsch, Paul Lawrence, and Fred Fiedler were among the managers, advisors, and scholars who developed the Contingency Standpoint of organization in the 1960s. They attempted to adapt methods and techniques to actual conditions. The Viewpoint draws on the Systems Approach while also acknowledging that an organization's success can be influenced by a variety of events. In this style, other ideas that claim to be defining management method are evaluated with suspicion.

The premise is that there is no one-size-fits-all approach to managment. The Contingency viewpoint acknowledges that every business circumstance is unique. Any event has its own set of issues,

obstacles, and macro and micro environmental concerns to contend with. Advances in technology, population changes, and other contextual variables, or eventualities, to consider include:

- ❖ Ethnic considerations

- ❖ Changes in the population,

- ❖ The economic situations

- ❖ Labor-related activities &

- ❖ The government and the law

If management is adaptable, it can adjust to all of these elements and take appropriate action. Surprisingly, investigations indicate that organizations functioning in unpredictable circumstances are more efficient with an agile strategic framework, but businesses operating in a more secure environment are more efficient with a more conventional and controlled managerial style of operations. Each issue should be explored in order to ascertain how to apply noteworthy management methods effectively in order to choose optimum appropriate monitoring tactics.

Theorem of Chaos

The assumption of Chaos Theory, which was first acknowledged in the 1980s, is that any structure can persist without any stricter sense or certainty. Henri Poincaré was a French mathematician and pioneer chaos theorist who lived in the nineteenth century.
"It's plausible that mild discrepancies will surface," he says in his remark. It's possible that little changes in the input variables lead to big differences in the final result. A minor blunder in the first will result in a major blunder in the second. "Forecasting becomes difficult," observed Poincaré (1908). This demonstrates the fluid nature of events and institutions. Power is created, but no definite strategy or expectation of repercussions is in place. One of the most known examples is the flowing spigot, which distributes in a dense grid.

This is alluded to as bizarre behavior. It's hard to predict when the drops will descend, in which angle they'll appear, or how much of an effect each fall will have.
The Butterfly Effect is another illustration, which is detailed further down. The hypothesis of Poincaré stayed unknown until the 1960s, when meteorologist

Until researcher Edward Lorenz uncovered the Butterfly Effect in the 1960s, Poincaré's theory went undiscovered. His experiment was based on the idea that the fluttering of a butterfly's wings in one region of the planet could have a serious influence on the climate in another. In those other phrases, a minor action taken in one location can have a serious influence on circumstances somewhere. Consequently, an unnoticeable tweak in a system could have a tremendous impact on the system benefit of the entire. Numerous researchers and intellectuals analyzed Chaos Theory in the years that followed, eventually concluding that it was genuine and that it could be widely utilized to organizational context. Strategies may be used after it was understood that chaos was part of the natural cycle of existence.

By acknowledging that chaos is a natural component of life, solutions could be developed to predict and profit from the resulting disorder.
Allowing subgroups to organize and evolve on their own is one way for businesses to use Chaos Theory. Trends will emerge, allowing management to determine the much more effective ways to

build the business. Healthy connections form amongst employees, and those ties will be in constant flux, as good managers recognize.

Conclusion

- ❖ There have been early kinds of management practices spanning history.
- ❖ As a result of the Industrial Revolution, there was a requirement for new management styles.
- ❖ Frederick Winslow Taylor's Scientific Approach to Management concentrated on the precision of movement, arguing that a well-designed job would drive a staff to be more prolific.
- ❖ Fayol's Administrative Approach outlined five functions for carrying out all of humanity's tasks. Fayol also formulated fourteen management concepts.
- ❖ Max Weber proposed the Bureaucratic Approach, which emphasized on hierarchical structures and unambiguous control designations.
- ❖ Elton Mayo's Human Relations Theory demonstrated that fulfilling workers' basic needs would improve the workplace and have a favorable effect on the productivity.
- ❖ The Systems Approach examines all aspects of an organization to determine how they integrate and constitute a relatively broad system.
- ❖ The Contingency Approach acknowledges that every business scenario is unique, with a broad range of environmental elements that could influence results.
- ❖ Every entity can survive without even a proper guidance or regularity according to chaos theory.

References

1) Adler, P.S. (Ed). (2011). *Marxist philosophy and organization studies: Marxist contributions to the understanding of some important organizational forms*. Bingley: Emerald Group.
2) Bertalanffy, L.V. (1968). *General System Theory: Foundations, Development, Applications.* New York: George Braziller.
3) Boulding, K.L. (1959). *General systems theory: The skeleton of science. Management science,* 2(3), 197-208.
4) Burns, T., & Stalker, G. (1961). *The Management of Innovation.* London: Tavistock.
5) Ezigbo, C. A. (2011). *Advanced Management Theory & Applications*. Enugu: Immaculate Publications Ltd.
6) Fayol, H. (1949). *General and Industrial Management.* London: Pitman.
7) Fiedler, F. E. (Ed). (1967). *A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness.* New York: McGraw-Hill.
8) Heinz, W. Mark, V. C., & Harold K. (2011). *Management: A Global and Entrepreneurial Perspective.* New Delhi: Tata McGraw Hill education.
9) Jones, G. (2014). *Contemporary Management*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
10) Lawrence, P., & Lorsch, J. (1967). *Organizations and Environment: Managing Differentiation and Integration.* Homewood: Irwin.
11) Norbert, M. I. (1999). *Management and Organizational Theory and Practice.* Enugu: Vouggasin Ltd.
12) Nwachukwu, C.C. (1988). *Management: Theory and Practice.* Onitsha: Africanna Publishers Limited.
13) Poincaré, H. (1908). *Science and Method.* New York: Dover Publications.
14) Stoner, F., & Edward, R. (1992). *Management.* New Delhi: Prentice Hall Ltd.
15) Taylor, F.W. (1911). *The Principles of Scientific Management.* New York: Harper.
16) Woodward, J. (1965). *Industrial Organization: Theory and Practice*. London: University Press.
17) Wren, D. (1987). *The Evolution of Management Thought.* 3rd Ed: New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc.