

**Sociological Examination of Social Structure
of A Typical Nigeria Large Scale Organization.
A Study Of Julius Berger Plc.**

IGUODALA-COLE IMUETINYAN HOPE

PHD201406475

Introduction

Sociology is the study of society. It involves the critical analysis of the different types of social memberships, connections & institutions that constitute society across place & time. Simply put, Sociology entails human social interaction and the rules and processes that bind and separate people not only as individuals, but as members of associations, groups and institutions.

Sociology allows us to study individual behaviour in a broader context, to take into consideration how societal forces might impact upon individuals, as well as the ways in which individuals construct the world around them, and how they manage to resist existing power relationships in order to achieve social change. In this light, sociology represents 'a transformation of consciousness' (Berger 1963: 21). Industrialization on the other hand, is one of the most important processes changing the world today. It has the potential of doing both great good and great evil.

We must understand what effect our jobs and our work would have on other people's lives. Through this research, we seek a better understanding of what exactly industrialization is, and how it has contributed to building today's world. This would give us an insight into how industrialization has

affected our joys and our sorrows, our daily lives and our daily work. We would try to understand how the basic structures of Nigeria and world society have been changed by it. A special focal point would be the benefits as well as the problems raised by industrialization. We would examine the different paths of industrialization available to us and the implications of each.

Investigations of topics that would eventually be labeled industrial sociology began in the early part of the twentieth century. In-depth studies of occupations such as prostitutes, teachers, salespeople, physicians, waitresses, and ministers were conducted in the 1920s at the University of Chicago (Taylor, 1968).

Organizations are, generally speaking, those stable elements of social life designed and created for the purpose of goal achievement. As empirical units of analysis and as a theoretical framework, they are a central component of sociology. Organizations serve as primary structures within which people work, through which business is conducted, and about which states establish regulatory policy: they affect the daily lives of individuals and the broader communities in which we live, and they intersect and integrate with the institutions of labor, politics, and economics.

Discussion of organizations pervades the foundations of sociological inquiry—Karl Marx in addressing labor inequality, Max Weber in considering bureaucracy, and Émile Durkheim and Adam Smith in their takes on the division of labor all address issues of organizations as elemental conditions of social life, and in so doing, introduce ideas that now stand as part of the bedrock of sociology. By the latter half of the 20th century, organizational sociology was an identifiable subfield with a set of theories, empirical evidence, and an aggregate community of scholars writing on the topic.

Looking inside organizations, sociologists now understand that organizational operations can affect the

effectiveness and happiness of laborers; that systems of stratification within organizations are components of the social landscape of power and inequality; and that leadership and management are a "visible hand" that shapes industrial enterprise. Viewing organizations as unique entities, sociologists have come to see them both as abstract sets of rules and regulations that govern relationships of individuals and groups and as specific establishments with sets of actors and internal sub-organs that enable day-to-day operation, which vary along dimensions of formality, longevity, and economic auspices, and which succeed or fail depending on a host of environmental, ecological, and institutional factors.

From a broader external perspective, organizations are actors on the economic and political stage: organizations exist together in an environment of resources which may be regulated in terms of access and use but may also be shaped by the political initiatives of organizations in efforts to create advantages. Organizations compete and cooperate in this environment and are tied together within networks and hierarchies of personal, demographic, and legal relationships. The political units that govern these national and international relationships are, themselves, organizations, thus opening the door to an organizational theory and assessment of the state and government. Altogether, the topic of organizations and its related theories permeate sociology as a field.

However, the sub-discipline of industrial sociology is generally considered to have begun with the famous Western Electric research program conducted at the Hawthorne Works in Chicago (Whyte, 1968). These studies conducted during much of the Great Depression, were designed to understand the factors involved in worker productivity (Simpson 1989). When the studies ended, the researchers claimed to have determined that the social environment—the work group of the worker and the way workers were treated by management

had a powerful effect on worker performance (Roethlisberger and Dickson, 1939).

Although disagreement now exists about whether their results actually support their claims (Carey, 1967; Franke and Kaul, 1978; Jones 1992), there is little doubt that their conclusions captured the imagination of social scientists interested in worker productivity and culminated in substantial research projects dealing with work, workers, and the workplace. That research activity eventually became known as industrial sociology and represented, for a time, one of the most vibrant sociology sub-disciplines (Miller, 1984). (For examples of the research being conducted during this time, see Chinoy, 1955; Walker, 1950; Walker and Guest, 1952; Walker, Guest, and Turner, 1956.)

Guest provides an example of the importance of this research when he describes the results of one of his projects in 1948. He and his team launched a two-phase project on a community whose U.S. Steel plant was to be shut down. The first phase was to be a study of the plant and the community before the shutdown and the second was to be a study of the community after the shutdown. After the first phase was completed, the results were published in the book *Steeltown*.

A year later, he contacted the head of public relations for U.S. Steel and asked why the mill had not yet closed. The director was surprised that Guest had not heard what had happened. Apparently, the head of engineering for U.S. Steel had read the report, realized the importance of the skill in the mill's workforce, and convinced top management to upgrade the mill to keep it in operation. The director concluded by saying, "You won't have a ghost town to study, but I'm sure that if you went back for a visit the Chamber of Commerce would parade you down Main Street as heroes. Everyone knows the story" (Guest 1987:8).

The Splintering

During the 1960s, industrial sociology began to splinter. As sociologists recognized the potential value of the information available from a study of the workplace, they carved out specialty areas of study. Some began to study industrial organizations instead of the workers within those organizations; others focused on non-industrial organizations (e.g., government, education, and welfare organizations); still others focused on the characteristics of the labor force (e.g., the unequal distribution of wages among various occupations). At the same time, others chose to leave sociology and to affiliate with business schools.

Miller (1984) argues that industrial sociology research began to spread outside of sociology when business schools abandoned their "trade school" image in the late 1950s and created new sociology-based courses with labels such as Business and Society, Personnel and Organizational Behavior, Management and Labor Relations, and Dynamics of the Labor Force. Through the appointment of sociologists to academic positions in business schools, sociological expertise was transferred to other disciplines (Miller, 1984). This splintering is at least partially responsible for the current status of industrial sociology as a very important but under-appreciated sub-discipline within sociology.

In sociology, organization is understood as planned, coordinated and purposeful action of human beings to construct or compile a common tangible or intangible product. This action is usually framed by formal membership and formal institutional rules. Sociology distinguishes the term organization into planned formal and unplanned informal (i.e. spontaneously formed) organizations. Sociology analyzes organizations in the first line from an institutional perspective. In this sense, organization is a permanent arrangement of elements. These elements and their actions are determined by

rules so that a certain task can be fulfilled through a system of coordinated division of labor.

An organization is defined by the elements that are part of it (who belongs to the organization and who does not?), its communication (which elements communicate and how do they communicate?), its autonomy (which changes are executed autonomously by the organization or its elements?) and its rules of action compared to outside events (what causes an organization to act as a collective actor?). By coordinated and planned cooperation of the elements, the organization is able to solve tasks that lie beyond the abilities of the single elements. The price paid by the elements is the limitation of the degrees of freedom of the elements.

Advantages of organizations are enhancement (more of the same), addition (combination of different features), and extension. Disadvantages can be inertness (through coordination) and loss of interaction.

Hierarchies of Organizational Structure

A hierarchy exemplifies an arrangement with a leader who leads leaders. This arrangement is often associated with bureaucracy. Hierarchies were satirized in *The Peter Principle* (1969), a book that introduced hierarchiology and the saying that "in a hierarchy every employee tends to rise to his level of incompetence". An extremely rigid, in terms of responsibilities, type of organization is exemplified by *Führerprinzip* Committees or juries. These consist of a group of peers who decide as a group, perhaps by voting. The difference between a jury and a committee is that the members of the committee are usually assigned to perform or lead further actions after the group comes to a decision, whereas members of a jury come to a decision at once. In common law countries legal juries render decisions of guilt, liability and quantify damages; juries are also used in athletic contests,

book awards and similar activities. Sometimes a selection committee functions like a jury. In the Middle Ages juries in continental Europe were used to determine the law according to consensus amongst local notables.

Committees are often the most reliable way to make decisions. Condorcet's jury theorem proved that if the average member votes better than a roll of dice, then adding more members increases the number of majorities that can come to a correct vote (however correctness is defined). The problem is that if the average member is worse than a roll of dice, the committee's decisions grow worse, not better: Staffing is crucial. Parliamentary procedure, such as Robert's Rules of Order, helps prevent committees from engaging in lengthy discussions without reaching decisions.

Staff Organization or Cross-Functional Team.

A staff helps an expert get all his work done. To this end, a "chief of staff" decides whether an assignment is routine or not. If it is routine, he assigns it to a staff member, who is a sort of junior expert. The chief of staff schedules the routine problems, and checks that they are completed. If a problem is not routine, the chief of staff notices. He passes it to the expert, who solves the problem, and educates the staff - converting the problem into a routine problem. In a "cross functional team", like an executive committee, the boss has to be a non-expert, because so many kinds of expertise are required.

Types of Organization:

Cyclical structure

A theory put forth by renowned scholar Stephen John has asserted that throughout the cyclical nature of one's life organizational patterns are key to success. Through various social and political constraints within society one must realize that organizational skills are paramount to success. Stephen John suggests that emphasis needs to be put on areas such as

individual/ group processes, functionality, and overall structures of institutions in order to maintain a proper organization. Furthermore, the individual's overall organizational skills are pre-determined by the processes undertaken.

Matrix Organization

This organizational type assigns each worker two bosses in two different hierarchies. One hierarchy is "functional" and assures that each type of expert in the organization is well-trained, and measured by a boss who is super-expert in the same field. The other direction is "executive" and tries to get projects completed using the experts. Projects might be organized by regions, customer types, or some other plan.

Ecologies

This organization has intense competition. Bad parts of the organization starve. Good ones get more work. Everybody is paid for what they actually do, and runs a tiny business that has to show a profit, or they are fired. Companies who utilize this organization type reflect a rather one-sided view of what goes on in ecology. It is also the case that a natural ecosystem has a natural border - eco regions do not in general compete with one another in any way, but are very autonomous. The pharmaceutical company GlaxoSmithKline talks about functioning as this type of organization in this external article from The Guardian.

"Chaordic" organizations.

The Chaordic model of organizing human endeavors emerged in the 1990s, based on a blending of chaos and order (hence "chaordic"), comes out of the work of Dee Hock and the creation of the VISA financial network. Blending democracy,

complex system, consensus decision making, co-operation and competition, the chaordic approach attempts to encourage organizations to evolve from the increasingly nonviable hierarchical, command-and-control models.

Hybrid organizations

A hybrid organization is a body that operates in both the public sector and the private sector, simultaneously fulfilling public duties and developing commercial market activities. As a result the hybrid organization becomes a mixture of both a part of government and a private corporation.

Leadership In Organizations;

Leadership in formal organizations

An organization that is established as an instrument or means for achieving defined objectives has been referred to as a formal organization. Its design specifies how goals are subdivided and reflected in subdivisions of the organization. Divisions, departments, sections, positions, jobs, and tasks make up this work structure. Thus, the formal organization is expected to behave impersonally in regard to relationships with clients or with its members. According to Weber's definition, entry and subsequent advancement is by merit or seniority.

Each employee receives a salary and enjoys a degree of tenure that safeguards him from the arbitrary influence of superiors or of powerful clients. The higher his position in the hierarchy, the greater his presumed expertise in adjudicating problems that may arise in the course of the work carried out at lower levels of the organization. It is this bureaucratic structure that forms the basis for the appointment of heads or chiefs of administrative subdivisions in the organization and endows them with the authority attached to their position.

Leadership in informal organizations

In contrast to the appointed head or chief of an administrative unit, a leader emerges within the context of the informal organization that underlies the formal structure. The informal organization expresses the personal objectives and goals of the individual membership. Their objectives and goals may or may not coincide with those of the formal organization. The informal organization represents an extension of the social structures that generally characterize human life – the spontaneous emergence of groups and organizations as ends in themselves.

In prehistoric times, man was preoccupied with his personal security, maintenance, protection, and survival. Now man spends a major portion of his waking hours working for organizations. His need to identify with a community that provides security, protection, maintenance, and a feeling of belonging continues unchanged from prehistoric times. This need is met by the informal organization and its emergent, or unofficial, leaders. Leaders emerge from within the structure of the informal organization. Their personal qualities, the demands of the situation, or a combination of these and other factors attract followers who accept their leadership within one or several overlay structures.

Instead of the authority of position held by an appointed head or chief, the emergent leader wields influence or power. Influence is the ability of a person to gain cooperation from others by means of persuasion or control over rewards. Power is a stronger form of influence because it reflects a person's ability to enforce action through the control of a means of punishment.

Leader in Organizations

An individual who is appointed to a managerial position has the right to command and enforce obedience by

virtue of the authority of his position. However, he must possess adequate personal attributes to match his authority, because authority is only potentially available to him. In the absence of sufficient personal competence, a manager may be confronted by an emergent leader who can challenge his role in the organization and reduce it to that of a figurehead. Only authority of position has the backing of formal sanctions. It follows that whoever wields personal influence and power can legitimize this only by gaining a formal position in the hierarchy, with commensurate authority.

Review of Related Literature and Theoretical Framework

Sociologists analyze social phenomena at different levels and from different perspectives. From concrete interpretations to sweeping generalizations of society and social behavior, sociologists study everything from specific events (the micro level of analysis of small social patterns) to the "big picture" (the macro level of analysis of large social patterns).(Cole, 2014)

Sociologists today employ three primary theoretical perspectives:

- 1) the symbolic interactionism perspective,
- 2) the functionalist perspective, and
- 3) the conflict perspective.

These perspectives offer sociologists theoretical paradigms for explaining how society influences people, and vice versa. Each perspective uniquely conceptualizes society, social forces, and human behavior. However, the study adopts the Holistic approach to explain Sociological examination of social structure of a typical Nigeria Large Scale Organization. This paper also examines the Max Weber's theory of bureaucracy and its application to the Nigerian public/private institutions. Through this perspective, the paper identifies the discontents and problems associated with

Weberian model of bureaucracy in Nigeria, and argued that these dark sides is associated with lack of democracy in the decision making processes of organizations. In this regards, there was no room for democratic input in decision making processes, and employees were bound to carry out a policy once it had been hierarchically imposed.

The paper however envisions that strengthening democratic values in the management of public/private service will help to tackle the moribund challenges associated with weak institutional mechanisms, corruption, wastefulness and inefficiency, and usher capacity building and strong institutional framework that will enhance the ability of Nigerian institutions to achieve its developmental goals and handle the problems associated with modern governance of large scale, diversity, and technical complexities in a sustainable way.

Structural-Functionalism is a sociological theory that originally attempted to explain social institutions as collective means to meet individual biological needs (originally just functionalism). Later it came to focus on the ways social institutions meet social needs (structural-functionalism). Structural-functionalism draws its inspiration primarily from the ideas of Emile Durkheim. Durkheim was concerned with the question of how societies maintain internal stability and survive over time.

He sought to explain social cohesion and stability through the concept of solidarity. In more "primitive" societies it was mechanical solidarity, everyone performing similar tasks, that held society together. Durkheim proposed that such societies tend to be segmentary, being composed of equivalent parts that are held together by shared values, common symbols, or systems of exchanges. In modern, complex societies members perform very different tasks, resulting in a strong interdependence between individuals.

Based on the metaphor of an organism in which many parts function together to sustain the whole, Durkheim argued that modern complex societies are held together by organic solidarity.

The central concern of structural-functionalism is a continuation of the Durkheimian task of explaining the apparent stability and internal cohesion of societies that are necessary to ensure their continued existence over time. Many functionalists argue that social institutions are functionally integrated to form a stable system and that a change in one institution will precipitate a change in other institutions. Societies are seen as coherent, bounded and fundamentally relational constructs that function like organisms, with their various parts (social institutions) working together to maintain and reproduce them.

The various parts of society are assumed to work in an unconscious, quasi-automatic fashion towards the maintenance of the overall social equilibrium. All social and cultural phenomena are therefore seen as being functional in the sense of working together to achieve this state and are effectively deemed to have a life of their own. These components are then primarily analysed in terms of the function they play. In other words, to understand a component of society, one can ask the question, "What is the function of this institution?" A function, in this sense, is the contribution made by a phenomenon to a larger system of which the phenomenon is a part.

Thus, one can ask of education, "What is the function of education for society?" The answer is actually quite complex and requires a detailed analysis of the history of education, but one obvious answer is that education prepares individuals to enter the workforce. By delineating the functions of elements of society, of the social structure, we can better understand social life. Durkheim's strong sociological perspective of society was continued by Radcliffe-Brown. Following August

Comte, Radcliffe-Brown believed that the social constituted a separate level of reality distinct from both the biological and the inorganic (here non-living). Explanations of social phenomena therefore had to be constructed within this social level, with individuals merely being transient occupants of comparatively stable social roles. Thus, in structural-functional thought, individuals are not significant in and of themselves but only in terms of their social status: their position in patterns of social relations. The social structure is therefore a network of statuses connected by associated roles. Structural-functionalism was the dominant perspective of sociology between World War II and the Vietnam War.

Limitations

Structural-functionalism has been criticized for being unable to account for social change because it focuses so intently on social order and equilibrium in society. For instance, in the late 19th Century, higher education transitioned from a training center for clergy and the elite to a center for the conduct of science and the general education of the masses. In other words, education did not always serve the function of preparing individuals for the labor force (with the exception of the ministry and the elite). As structural-functionalism thinks about elements of social life in relation to their present function and not their past functions, structural-functionalism has a difficult time explaining why a function of some element of society might change or how such change occurs.

However, structural-functionalism could, in fact, offer an explanation in this case. Also occurring in the 19th Century (though begun in the 18th) was the industrial revolution. The industrial revolution, facilitated by capitalism, was increasingly demanding technological advances to increase profit. Technological advances and advanced industry both required more educated workforces. Thus, as one aspect of society changed - the economy and production - it required a

comparable change in the educational system, bringing social life back into equilibrium.

Another philosophical problem with the structural-functional approach is the ontological argument that society does not have needs as a human being does; and even if society does have needs they need not be met. The idea that society has needs like humans do is not a tenable position because society is only alive in the sense that it is made up of living individuals. Thus, society cannot have wants and/or needs like humans do. What's more, just because a society has some element in it at the present that does not mean that it must necessarily have that element. For instance, in the United Kingdom, religious service attendance has declined precipitously over the last 100 years. Today, less than 1 in 10 British attend religious service in a given week. Thus, while one might argue that religion has certain functions in British society, it is becoming apparent that it is not necessary for British society to function.

Max Weber's Conception of Bureaucracy

Bureaucracy is derived from the two words 'bureau' (refer not only to a writing desk, but to an office where officials worked) and 'kratia or krato' which means 'power' or 'rule'. Bureaucracy thus basically means office power or office rule, the rule of the officialdom. The term bureaucracy came into use in the early 18th century in Western Europe as a workplace where officials worked. Bureaucracy was first popularised in academic discourse following the seminal writing of Friedrich Hegel's book *Philosophy of Right* (1821).

Hegel argued that Bureaucracy is a form of public administration that serves as a link between the state and the civil society. Hegel noted that there is a distinction between the monarch's decisions and their execution and application, or in general between his decisions and the continued execution or maintenance of past decisions, existing laws, regulations, organisations for the securing of common ends, and so forth.

This task of subsuming the particular under the universal is comprised in the executive power, which also includes the powers of the judiciary and the police. The latter have a more immediate bearing on the particular concerns of civil society and they make the universal interest authoritative over its particular aims.

Particular interests which are common to everyone fall within civil society and lie outside the absolutely universal interest of the state proper. The administration of these is in the hands of Corporations, commercial and professional as well as municipal, and their officials, directors managers, and the like. It is the business of these officials to manage the private property and interests of these particular spheres and, from that point of view, their authority rests on the confidence of their commonalties and professional equals.

On the other hand, however, these circles of particular interests must be subordinated to the higher interests of the state, and hence the filling of positions of responsibility in Corporations, etc., will generally be effected by a mixture of popular election by those interested with appointment and ratification by higher authority. The maintenance of the state's universal interest, and of legality, in this sphere of particular rights, and the work of bringing these rights back to the universal, require to be superintended by holders of the executive power, by (a) the executive civil servants and (b) the higher advisory officials (who are organised into committees). These converge in their supreme heads that are in direct contact with the monarch

To Hegel, Civil society comprises the professional groups and private corporations that represent various particular interests while state represent the general interest, and that in between the two, bureaucracy is the medium through which the interest of the particular and that of general can be facilitated (Mouzelis1967:15). However, Hegelian

analysis of bureaucracy received a devastating critique from Karl Marx who argued that Hegel's analysis failed to link bureaucracy to the class relations and power structure of the society.

Though Marx did not single out bureaucracy but he commented on the subject in course of reviewing Hegel's works. Marxian analysis of bureaucracy stems from his theory of class, capitalism and communism. Marx argued that the 'dichotomy and opposition between the particular interest of the corporations and the common interest of the state as Hegel affirmed is meaningless, as the state does not represent the general interest but the particular interest of the dominant class, itself a part of the civil society'.

Marx posited that Hegel comes into contradiction with himself when he 'proceeds from the separation of the state and civil society, the separation of the particular interests and the absolutely universal; and indeed the claim that bureaucracy is founded on this separation'. Marx argued that: The bureaucracy is merely the formalism of a content which lies outside the bureaucracy itself. The Corporations are the materialism of the bureaucracy, and the bureaucracy is the spiritualism of the Corporations.

The Corporation is the bureaucracy of civil society, and the bureaucracy is the Corporation of the state. In actuality, the bureaucracy as civil society of the state is opposed to the state of civil society, the Corporations. Where the bureaucracy is to become a new principle, where the universal interest of the state begins to become explicitly a singular and thereby a real interest, it struggles against the Corporations as every consequence struggles against the existence of its premises. On the other hand once the real life of the state awakes and civil society frees itself from the Corporations out of its inherent rational impulse, the bureaucracy seeks to restore them; for as soon as the state of civil society falls so too does the civil society of the state.

The spiritualism vanishes with its opposite materialism. The consequence struggles for the existence of its premises as soon as a new principle struggles not against the existence of the premises but against the principle of their existence. The same mind that creates the Corporation in society creates the bureaucracy in the state. Thus as soon as the corporation mind is attacked so too is the mind of the bureaucracy; and whereas the bureaucracy earlier fought the existence of the Corporations in order to create room for its own existence, now it seeks vigorously to sustain the existence of the Corporations in order to save the Corporation mind, which is its own mind.

The bureaucracy is the state formalism of civil society. It is the state's consciousness, the state's will, the state's power, as a Corporation. Being the state's consciousness, will, and power as a Corporation, the bureaucracy is thus a particular, closed society within the state. The bureaucracy wills the Corporation as an imaginary power. To be sure, the individual Corporation also has this will for its particular interest in opposition to the bureaucracy, but it wills the bureaucracy against the other Corporation, against the other particular interest. The bureaucracy as the completed Corporation therefore wins the day over the Corporation which is like incomplete bureaucracy.

To Marx, 'the existence of bureaucracy is linked with the division of society into classes, and constitutes a very specific and particular social group. In other words, bureaucracy is the state itself, which is an instrument by which one dominant class exercises its domination over other social classes. In this regard, the future and the interests of bureaucracy are closely linked to those of dominant class and the state. The justification and existence of bureaucracy was needed to consolidate and perpetuate class division and domination between the exploiters and exploited in the society' (Mouzelis 1967:15).

Therefore, Marx believes that bureaucracy is the instrument of the capitalist class, and with the proletarian revolution and classless society, the state and its bureaucracy will wither away and become redundant. However, Marx analysis of Bureaucracy was faulted by Max Weber who posited that bureaucracy is an inescapable feature of the modern society. To Weber, the objective reason for the advance of bureaucratic organization has always been its purely technical superiority over any other form of organization (Weber,1946).

Weber studied work organisations in Ancient Egypt and Rome in comparison with the emergence of large scale organisations that came in the wake of the development of capitalism in Germany at the turn of the 20th century, and concluded that modern bureaucracy differs from previous forms, and worked so much better than traditional ones. Weber posited that all these new large-scale organizations were similar as each possesses a bureaucracy. Max Weber was concerned about how large scale organisations can be effectively and efficiently managed, and affirmed that bureaucracy is an impersonal decision-making process which avoid personal bias (ibid).

Weber's purpose, however, was to define the essential features of new organizations and to indicate why these organizations worked so much better than traditional ones on the basis of tripartite classification of authority structure. Weber argues that human civilization evolved from primitive and mystical to the rational and complex stages and relationships, and such societal evolutions is facilitated by three types of authority that he identifies as traditional, charismatic and legal-rational Authority (Fry, 1989). According to Weber, previous form of bureaucracy in traditional societies such as Ancient Egypt and Rome were founded on the basis of charismatic and traditional forms of authority. Thus, argued that modern bureaucracy is a

particular type of administrative structure developed through rational-legal authority.

Weber was posed to locate the authority structure in a bureaucratic organisation, and claimed that authority is needed to advance and achieve the objective of an organization. He was of the opinion that most bureaucratic organisations such as church and state of armies, political parties, economic enterprises, organizations to promote all kinds of causes, private associations, clubs, and many others were developed along the line of rational-legal authority: where belief in the legitimacy of the pattern of normative rules and authority of officials was subject to published rules and codes of practice (Stillman2000: 51).

Therefore, bureaucracy is the most efficient and rational form of managing organization, capable of attaining the highest degree of efficiency and is in this sense formally that most rational known Traditional authority which predominates in pre-modern societies is based on belief in the sanctity of tradition, hereditary and customs. It is not codified in impersonal rules but inheres in particular persons who may either inherit it or be invested with it by a higher authority.

Charismatic authority, finally, rests on the appeal of leaders who claim allegiance because of their perceived extraordinary characteristics of an individual virtuosity, whether ethical, heroic, or religious. Legal-rational authority is empowered by a formalistic belief in the content of the law (legal) or natural law (rationality). Obedience is not given to a specific individual leader - whether traditional or charismatic - but a set of uniform principles, and laid-down rules and regulations means of carrying out imperative control over human beings (Weber 1946: 337). Weber emphasized that bureaucratic organizations were an attempt to subdue human affairs to the rule of reason-to make it possible to conduct the business of the organization 'according to calculable rules'.

For people who developed modern organizations, the purpose was to find rational solutions to the new problems of size. Weber examined bureaucracy to a great degree and derived an idealistic view that at its best. A few basic purposes of ideal bureaucracy according to Weber are as follows: division of labour, hierarchal order and authority, written documents, well-trained staff and experts, full working capacity of the officials, and application of impersonal rules (Hummel, 1998: 307).

In Weber's essay on bureaucracy, Weber stated the following principal characteristics of bureaucracy:

- 1) The officials are personally free and subject to authority only with respect to their impersonal official obligations.
- 2) They are organized in a clearly defined hierarchy of office.
- 3) Each office has a clearly defined sphere of competence in the legal sense
- 4) The office is filled by a free, contractual relationship. Thus in principle there is free selection
- 5) Candidates are selected on the basis of technical qualification. In the most rational case, this is tested by examination or guaranteed by diplomas certifying technical training or both. They are appointed not elected.
- 6) They are remunerated by fixed salaries in money, for the most part with right to pension. The salary scale is primarily graded according to rank in hierarchy
- 7) The office is treated as the sole or at least the primary occupation of the incumbents
- 8) It constitute a career, there is a system of "promotion" according to the seniority or to achievements or both. Promotion is dependent on the judgments of superiors

- 9) The officials work entirely separate from ownership of the means of administration and without appropriation of his position
- 10) He is subject to strict and systematic discipline and control in the conduct of office.

The ten features mentioned above constitute Max Weber's renowned ideal type democracy. Following the above listed features, there are some elements that exist in bureaucratic organizations that can be deduced;

- * Division of labor
- * Hierarchy
- * Rules
- * Records
- * Impersonality
- * Rationality
- * Neutrality

Bureaucratic administrative organization is highly superior to any other form of organization in stability, in stringency of its discipline and in its reliability according to Weber. He also claimed that a highly developed bureaucracy has advantages of "precision, speed, unambiguity, knowledge of files, continuity, discretion, unity, strict subordination, reduction of frictions and of materials and personal cost. Bureaucracy provides an ordered hierarchy that takes the advantage of specialization. Under bureaucracy, employees usually have career opportunities and job security is guaranteed. However, Weber was of the opinion that not every formal association will possess all of the characteristics of the ideal bureaucracy. The ideal bureaucracy is developed as a yardstick to determine and compare whether a particular organisation is bureaucratized or not (Hall 1963: 33). These ingredients of bureaucracy may not, always, help organizations to reach its ideal work or the most efficient performance. Weber therefore, argues that organisations can attain these features of ideal bureaucracy, especially if authority is highly centralized.

The ideal-type of bureaucracy, according to Weber, possesses rationally discussible grounds for every administrative act whose control based on knowledge, clearly defined spheres of competence, and operates according to intellectually analyzable rules (Fry 1989: 32). Therefore, Weberian bureaucracy is rational because of its precision, speed, consistency, availability of records, continuity, possibility of secrecy, unity, rigorous coordination, and minimization of interpersonal friction, personal costs, and material costs.

Max Weber was credited for providing the thorough and systematic social scientific analysis of bureaucracy as his idea became spread easily and moves into the vacuum left by the disappearance of administration based on traditional or charismatic authority, and finally became the model for the organisation of civil service, management theories and public administration that cut across all the facet of contemporary societies and private organisations. However, Weber was cynical and cautious that the advantages of bureaucracy in the management of industrial organisations could also turn out to be its shortcomings.

He averred that bureaucracy put us in an 'iron cage', which limits individual human freedom and potential instead of a 'technological utopia' that should set us free (Weber, 1946: 432). Weber posited that there will be an evolution of an iron cage, which will be a technically ordered, rigid and dehumanized society when bureaucracies concentrate large amounts of power in a small number of people and are generally unregulated (Kendall et al. 2000: 190). To Weber, bureaucracy tends to generate oligarchy (where few officials are the political and economic power) because those who control these organizations control the quality of our lives as well undermine human freedom and democracy in the long run, and therefore constitute an inescapable fate (Weber 1979:1403).

Following the review of bureaucracy, Weber's work has received thorough criticisms from scholars especially in social sciences who have axe to grind with his ideal bureaucracy when juxtaposed with grim Carl Friedrich's 1949 paper on some observations on Weber's Analysis of Bureaucracy. Pp. 29 Democratic Deficit: The Dark Side of Weberian Bureaucracy in Nigeria reality of the contemporary working of the bureaucratic organisations. Some of these criticisms will be espoused in the section below.

History of Julius Berger Nigeria PLC.

Julius Berger Nigeria Plc is a Nigerian construction company, headquartered in Abuja FCT, with additional permanent locations in Lagos and Uyo. The company is represented across Nigeria in structural engineering and infrastructure works, and in southern Nigeria through domestic and international oil and gas industry projects. It is known for constructing most of Nigeria's infrastructures, major expressways, and even some residential buildings for the Chevron Nigeria headquarters in Lagos.

The company has been listed on the Nigerian Stock Exchange since 1991. Before this, its parent company was Bilfinger Berger. Bilfinger Berger is still the largest shareholder in the company. The construction business of Julius Berger Nigeria is the heart of the Julius Berger Group. With 18,000 employees from close to 40 nations and clients from both Nigeria and the global oil and gas industry, JB is a leading construction company and the largest private employer in Nigeria.

In 1950, Julius Berger, the founding father of the company met Keith Thomas and incorporated his construction company in Germany.

In August 1965, the company undertook its first construction project in Nigeria - the construction of the Eko Bridge in Lagos. In 1991 the company was floated on the

Nigerian Stock Exchange as "Julius Berger Nigeria Plc". In 2001 the company moved to its new head office in Abuja. In 2010 Business World Magazine listed Julius Berger Nigeria Plc as Nigeria's leading construction company. In 2012 Watertown Energy Ltd., a company of the NESTOIL group acquired 10% of Julius Berger Nigeria Plc's shares, previously owned by Bilfinger Berger GmbH, raising the company's Nigerian shareholding to 60.1%.

Major Projects

The company built the Eko Bridge completed in 1968, the Third Mainland Bridge completed in 1990 and the Abuja Stadium completed in 2003. Tin Can Island Port, commissioned in 1977. Lagos Inner Ring Road, completed in 1979. Ajaokuta Steel Plant, completed in 1990. Itakpe - Ajaokuta Ore Railway, completed in 1990. Abuja International Airport phase II, completed in 1997. Central Bank of Nigeria Head Office, completed in 2002. Uyo infrastructure and road works, ongoing since 2008. First discharge drain built utilizing pipe-jacking technology in Nigeria, completed in 2011. National Assembly phase III, completed in 2011. Multiple projects, Escravos GTL plant in southern Nigeria, commissioned in 2012. Bonny Liquefied Natural Gas facility, multiple ongoing works since 1996. Challawa Gorge Dam Karaye, completed in 1992.

Corporate Culture

Julius Berger's progressive corporate culture sets forth the goals and principles that unite its employees and provides the foundation for continuous improvement in the value of services given to customers. Julius Berger's success is based on the shared commitment of the men and women who define the company leadership, on developing new technologies and on discovering creative and innovative solutions to construction challenges. Julius Berger seeks excellence in all areas of the company's business and is committed to continuous enhancement and progress.

One way the company works to achieve this goal is through the long term education and training of employees, who are the building blocks of Julius Berger's future. Strong teams are built on a shared drive for success, trust and genuine caring for one another. These teams are maintained through open communication and a transparent work environment. It is the policy of Julius Berger that there should be no discrimination in considering applications for employment. All employees are given equal opportunities to develop their experience and knowledge, and to qualify for promotion in furtherance of their careers.

Development of complex infrastructure is a key element in Julius Berger's core competence. Countless bridges and road systems across Nigeria illustrate the durable quality of Julius Berger's infrastructure works.

- Julius Berger provides professional services in the areas of engineering, construction and maintenance of various infrastructures.
- Julius Berger continues to build and expand essential traffic networks in and around its three key operational hubs: Abuja, Lagos and Uyo.
- The company is playing a major role in the realization of Abuja's master plan.
- In coastal areas Julius Berger constructs turnkey harbors, wharfs, jetties, loading installations and warehouses.
- Airports that Julius Berger builds or refurbishes conform to strict global aviation regulations.
- The company's sizeable fleet of specialized equipment enables efficient construction of large-scale projects.

Julius Berger is a Nigerian company offering integrated construction solutions and related services. The company's scope covers all areas of construction, including the pre and post phases.

Julius Berger traces its operations back to the construction of the Eko Bridge in 1965, a major infrastructure project in the megacity of Lagos. Years of steady growth followed this pioneer project, during which Julius Berger grew to become the dynamic Nigerian company it is today. Throughout this time Julius Berger has deployed progressive construction methods to ensure that innovation and quality are prioritized for the benefit of clients. The company's business is built on the strategy of having vertically integrated operations, which improve efficiency and timeliness of project execution. Additionally, subsidiaries support Julius Berger's ability to offer a complete range of construction related services. Julius Berger's head office is located in Abuja FCT, with additional permanent locations in Lagos and Uyo. The company is also represented across the nation in structural engineering and infrastructure works and in southern Nigeria through oil and gas industry projects.

Conclusion

Bureaucratic administrative organization is highly superior to any other form of organization in stability, in stringency of its discipline and in its reliability according to Weber. He also claimed that a highly developed bureaucracy has advantages of "precision, speed, unambiguity, knowledge of files, continuity, discretion, unity, strict subordination reduction of frictions and of materials and personal cost. Bureaucracy provides an ordered hierarchy that takes the advantage of specialization. Under bureaucracy, employees usually have career opportunities and job security is guaranteed.

It is also significant to note that authorities, responsibility, activities, and communication in an organization are all structured and organized by bureaucracy. It also helps to manage complexities in an organization. Bureaucracy provides rationality, stability and predictability

in doing things as it makes institutions more democratic in their operations.

In conclusion, Weber's contribution of bureaucracy is very significant and has provided a valuable check list to examine the actual bureaucratic organization and to find out to what extent they differ from the ideal one because bureaucracy is an inevitable factor in every organization today.

References

- Bruce, S. (2002). *God is Dead: Secularization in the West*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Durkheim, E. (1997). *Suicide*. Free Press.
- Durkheim, E., and Lewis, A. Coser. (1997). *The Division of Labor in Society*. Free Press.
- Hoult, Thomas, F. (1969). *Dictionary of Modern Sociology*. p. 139.
- Layton, R. (1997). *An Introduction to Theory in Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 37-38. [ISBN 0521629829](#)
- Marsden, George M. (1996). *The Soul of the American University: From Protestant Establishment to Established Nonbelief*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Putnam, Robert, D. (2001). *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. 1st ed. Simon & Schuster.
- Radcliffe-Brown, A.R. (1965). *Structure and Function in Primitive Society*. illustrated edition. Free Press. 10.
- Merton, Robert (1957). *Social Theory and Social Structure*, revised and enlarged. London: The Press of Glencoe.
- Smith, C. (2003). *The Secular Revolution: Power, Interests, and Conflict in the Secularization of American Public Life*. 1st ed. University of California Press.

External links

`<imgsrc="//en.wikibooks.org/wiki/Special:CentralAutoLogin/start?type=1x1" alt="" title="" width="1" height="1" style="border: none; position: absolute;" />`

← Sociological Methods Introduction to Sociology Society →

Retrieved from "http://en.wikibooks.org/w/index.php?title=Introduction_to_Sociology/Sociological_Theory&oldid=2755278"

"JuliusBerger web page "(PDF). Retrieved 8 June 2014.

"2006 Information and Communications for Development Global Trends and Policies". World Bank. Retrieved 5 June 2014.