People's Democratic Republic of Algeria

Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research

Ziane Achour University of Djelfa

Faculty of Social and Human Sciences

Institute of Sociology and Demography

Pedagogical Publication on:

FOREIGN LANGUAGE1

Lectures and lessons addressed to students in 2nd year

Master's Organization and Work

Dr DRIFEL SAADA

2025/2026

Index

Introduction

The sociology of organization and work is one of the specialized branches of modern and contemporary sociology. It has attracted the attention of sociologists within the framework of their interest in studying work as a human activity that exists across all economic, social, cultural, and political organizations. Accordingly, the presence of work—particularly in the modern era—has become closely associated with bureaucratic organizations, the study of which has drawn the interest of many thinkers and researchers, especially in light of the growing and increasing complexity of organizational problems.
As a result, numerous studies and theories have emerged that have enriched the research field of the sociology of organizations by addressing organizational behavior within work institutions, its determinants, the effects of the internal and external environment, organizational culture, and the management of organizational conflict. All of this aims to enable organizations to achieve high levels of quality throughout all stages of the production process, thereby allowing them to adapt and align with changes in the external environment.

This course handout examines the phenomenon of work and organization by studying the various dimensions of organizational structure and by highlighting a number of organizational variables that influence performance levels. It also provides, without doubt, an overview of several theoretical frameworks and sociological contributions that have addressed organizational work as a social phenomenon.
Accordingly, it aims to introduce students to the sociology of organization and work, its main themes, and its relationship with the field of industrial sociology. It also seeks to clarify the origins of the differences in terminology between the sociology of work, industrial sociology, and organizational sociology. In addition, the handout explains to students the relationship between the emergence of bureaucratic forms of organization and the development of the industrialization process in modern society, in order to enable them to understand the nature of work relations within organizations as an extension of the social relations that exist in society.

Introduction to the sociology of organization and work.

In general, the sociology of organizations highlights the relationships of interdependence that exist within an organization, both at the level of individual–individual and individual–group interactions, insofar as these relationships contribute to the production of goods and services (that is, to collective action oriented toward defined organizational objectives).

According to Michel Foudriat [1], the concept of organization refers to the existence of rules intended to make the coordination of a diverse set of resources—human, financial, material, and informational—formally possible, with the aim of producing a material good or delivering a service. From this perspective, the object of organizational analysis encompasses a wide range of entities, including industrial firms, social service institutions, healthcare organizations, schools and universities, local and territorial authorities, political parties, trade unions, and similar structured collective actors.

Moreover, the organizational phenomenon is closely linked to the historical evolution and the dynamics of modernization of Western societies, particularly in technological, industrial, and socio-economic terms. This linkage became especially pronounced in the period following the Second World War, which marked a decisive expansion of bureaucratic, managerial, and rationalized forms of organization.

In France, the involvement of sociology in the world of work has undergone a shift in terminology and analytical focus: initially framed as industrial sociology, it later evolved into the sociology of work, notably through the contributions of Georges Friedmann and Pierre Naville, whose analyses were strongly influenced by Marxist theoretical perspectives (especially regarding labor, alienation, and power relations). Over time, the object of study of this discipline further expanded to include other work collectives and organizational settings, such as offices, service organizations, schools, universities, hospitals, as well as various institutions and public administrations[2].

The central issue of the sociology of organizations lies in its attempt to account for behaviors and relationships—whether formal or informal—by examining them in relation to prescriptive rules (that is, the formal norms and regulations that structure organizational action while leaving room for informal practices).

Philippe Bernoux argues that, within an organization, regardless of its nature, behaviors are shaped by a logic of continuous adjustment between the

[1] Foudriat M. Sociologie des organisations, Paris, Pearson éducation, 2015, p81.

[2] Friedmann G. Le travail en miettes: Spécialisation et loisirs, Paris, Gallimard, 1964, p73.

individual—his or her temperament, needs, and aspirations—and the group. In this sense, organizational behavior cannot be understood as a purely individual phenomenon, but rather as the outcome of ongoing interactions between personal dispositions and collective constraints[3].
Furthermore, Bernoux emphasizes that the sociological analysis of organizations must necessarily take into account the norms produced by the group itself, since these norms play a structuring role in guiding and regulating actors' practices. To this must be added the impact of environmental factors, such as national culture and other societal institutions, which interact—directly or indirectly—with organizations and contribute to shaping their modes of functioning. Individual behaviors are also linked to personal characteristics, including gender, age, level of education, and social background, which introduce differentiated positions and resources within organizational settings.
In his work Sociology of Organizations, Philippe Bernoux highlights three systems of sociological explanation, namely[4]:

- The individual determinism perspective explains behavior by reference to variables characterizing the individual's environment, or even the individual him- or herself (such as personal traits, social background, or psychological dispositions), thereby emphasizing causal factors located at the micro level of analysis.
- The totalitarian realism perspective conceives behavior as the product of social structures characterizing society as a whole. From this viewpoint, behavior is explained through the norms, constraints, and means imposed by society on individuals, leaving limited room for individual autonomy or strategic choice.
- The interactionist perspective holds that social behaviors result from actors who act intentionally in pursuit of goals they have themselves defined, by applying strategies designed to achieve those goals. This approach emphasizes that behaviors do not stem from strict determinisms, but rather from the strategic intentionality of actors operating within given constraints. According to this perspective, the interactionist approach is superior to the others, since the weight of the environment and social structures is sufficiently integrated into the actor's logic, allowing the analysis to focus on goals, strategies, and actors' rationales in order to explain social behaviors (particularly within organizational contexts).

In general terms, it should be noted that the sociology of organizations can be regarded as a social science that studies specific entities known as organizations, while also applying the theoretical frameworks and methodological tools of sociology to the analysis of these entities.
Accordingly, the term organization has several complementary meanings[5]:

[3] Bernoux P. Sociologie des organisations, Paris, Éditions du Seuil, 2004, p108.
[4] Ibid, p123.

A grouping of individuals who coordinate their activities in order to achieve common objectives; in this sense, the organization is understood as a response to the problems of collective action—namely its coordination, stabilization, and long-term development.
The various ways in which groups structure and mobilize the resources at their disposal in order to attain their goals, emphasizing the organizational arrangements, rules, and mechanisms that make coordinated action possible.
Organized action itself, or the process through which groupings and organizational structures are produced and reproduced over time, highlighting the dynamic and processual nature of organization rather than viewing it as a fixed entity.

According to Amitai Etzioni, there are at least three main characteristics that distinguish organizations from other human groups.
First, organizations are characterized by divisions of labor, power, responsibilities, communication, and information. These divisions are deliberately designed and structured to achieve specific and predefined goals, reflecting the rational and instrumental nature of organizations as purposive social systems[6].
Second, organizations are characterized by the existence of one or more decision-making centers that coordinate, control, and direct the collective efforts of members toward organizational objectives. These centers are also responsible for continuously evaluating organizational performance and for restructuring organizational arrangements when necessary, in order to improve efficiency and effectiveness[7].
Third, organizations are characterized by the replacement and mobility of personnel. Individuals who fail to meet organizational expectations may be removed and replaced, while others may be reassigned, transferred, or promoted according to organizational needs. This principle emphasizes that organizations endure beyond their individual members, a notion captured by the expression: the organization persists, individuals pass[8].
According to Chris Argyris, the essential activities of an organization can be grouped into three fundamental categories.
The first category concerns goal attainment, encompassing all activities related to the production function, which are directly linked to achieving organizational objectives[9].

---

[5] Scott W. R. Organizations: Rational, Natural, and Open Systems, NJ: Prentice Hall, 5th ed, 2003, p68.
[6] Etzion., A. Modern organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.1964, p37.
[7] Etzion., A. Ibid, p52.
[8] Etzioni, A. A comparative analysis of complex organizations. New York, Free Press, 1975, p61.
[9] Argyris, C. Personality and organization: The conflict between system and the individual, New York, Harper & Row, 1957, p107.

The second category involves the maintenance of the internal structure, including activities associated with support and maintenance functions, such as human resource management, maintenance services, and administrative support, which ensure organizational stability and continuity[10].

The third category relates to adaptation to the external environment or the modification of that environment, corresponding to the innovation function. This includes activities such as research and development, marketing, and advertising, which enable organizations to respond effectively to environmental change and secure long-term viability.

The main characteristics of organizations can be summarized as follows.

First, an organization is constituted through the association of individuals or human groups who interact and coordinate their actions within a structured social framework emphasizing the collective and relational dimension of organizational life[11].

Second, an organization is defined by the explicit affirmation of the existence of goals or objectives. These objectives provide direction, coherence, and legitimacy to organizational activities and serve as a reference point for evaluating performance highlighting the purposive and goal-oriented nature of organizations.

Third, an organization is characterized by the deliberate and intentional nature of the structures established to achieve these objectives. Such structures—including formal roles, rules, procedures, and hierarchies—are consciously designed to coordinate action and regulate behavior. In this sense, these definitions refer primarily to the formal organization rather than the informal one, since they focus on officially established arrangements rather than spontaneous or unofficial social relations that may also emerge within organizations[12] .

The Relationship between the Sociology of Work and the Sociology of Organizations

1. Sociology of Work

According to Georges Friedmann, the Sociology of Work focuses on the study of human interactions—both individual and collective—that arise in the context of work, as well as on the influence of work organization and technological change on mentalities and on society as a whole emphasizing the broader social implications of productive activity beyond the workplace[13].

[10] Ibid, p113.

[11] Scott W. R. Organizations: Rational, Natural, and Open Systems, Opcit, p85.

[12] Weber M. Tarjamat Mohammed Al-Subai'i, Al-Iqtisad wa Al-Mujtama', Al-Qahira, Markaz Dirasat Al-Wahda Al-'Arabiyya, 2017, p. 205.

[13] Friedmann G. Problèmes humains du machinisme industriel. Paris, Gallimard, 1950, p68.

In his major works, particularly Human Problems of Industrial Mechanization and Work in Fragments, Friedmann formulates a clear and systematic critique of the rationalization of work inspired by F. W. Taylor. He argues that Taylorist principles, centered on efficiency, standardization, and task fragmentation, generate significant social and human costs within industrial organizations[14].

From this perspective, Friedmann pays special attention to the social consequences of automation, which tends to eliminate the skilled worker in favor of the specialized or semi-skilled worker. According to Friedmann, the fragmentation (parcelization) of work leads to several negative outcomes, including monotony, physical and mental fatigue, psychological stress, and increasingly limited opportunities for professional advancement. These effects, he contends, contribute to worker alienation and weaken the individual's relationship to both work and the organization.

Moreover, the era of industrialization and technological development has profoundly transformed the organization of work over time. In this regard, Alain Touraine distinguishes three major phases in the historical evolution of work organization, each reflecting a specific relationship between workers, technology, and organizational control[15]:

Phase A corresponds to the traditional system of work, characterized by the relative autonomy of the worker. Workshop organization is limited mainly to the distribution of tasks among workers who are capable of organizing their own work. In this system, work is entrusted to the worker, who remains master of the methods and processes through which tasks are carried out, thereby retaining control over both the pace and the execution of work (a model associated with craft-based production and skilled labor).

Phase B marks a significant transformation, in which the specialized worker replaces the skilled worker in the production process. At this stage, the nature and content of industrial work no longer depend primarily on the worker's expertise but rather on the choices made by technicians and engineers responsible for task allocation and work design. This phase reflects the increasing influence of scientific management and technical rationalization, which reduce worker autonomy and reinforce hierarchical control over labor.

Phase C is characterized by the rise of automation, which tends to eliminate direct manufacturing labor. Execution tasks are progressively reduced to monitoring and control activities, requiring a certain level of education and abstract knowledge rather than manual or muscular effort. In this sense, automation has, to some extent, freed the worker from repetitive manual labor, while simultaneously redefining the worker's role within the organizational and technological system (highlighting a shift toward cognitive and supervisory forms of work)[16].

---

[14] Ibid, p82.

[15] Touraine A. L'évolution du travail ouvrier aux usines Renault, Paris, CNRS, 1955, pp 96-108.

[16] Touraine, A. (1969). La société post-industrielle, Paris, Denoël, 1969, pp 82-87.

2. Sociology of Organizations

The analysis of individuals' behaviors in work situations necessarily requires questioning the organizational framework within which these behaviors occur. Here, the main object of study is to examine how individuals organize themselves to act collectively. As Michel Crozier asserts, the organization is a response to the problem of collective action[17].This means that it is essential not only to consider the actors' behaviors but also all the relational systems and power dynamics through which they interact. This perspective corresponds to the strategic analysis approach in the sociology of organizations, which views organizations as arenas of negotiation, uncertainty, and power where actors develop strategies to cope with constraints and pursue their interests. Thus, organizations are not simply neutral structures but dynamic social systems shaped by interactions, rules, informal networks, and zones of uncertainty.

Major Theoretical Currents in Organizational Analysis:

A. Mechanistic Approaches[18]

These approaches emphasize organizational rationalization, efficiency, and operational functioning. Organizations are perceived as machines requiring precise adjustments and optimal procedures, a perspective rooted in Scientific Management (OST – Organisation Scientifique du Travail) developed by Frederick Taylor. The central idea is that productivity can be maximized through standardization, hierarchy, and strict control of tasks. Although this approach improved efficiency, critics argue that it neglected the human and social dimensions of work, potentially leading to alienation and rigidity.

B. Human-Relations Approaches[19]

These perspectives focus on the influence of human relations on organizational functioning. The organization is considered a social group in which psychological and psychosocial factors play a key role in shaping individual behavior. Inspired notably by Elton Mayo and the Hawthorne Studies, this approach highlights the importance of motivation, communication, job satisfaction, and informal relationships. It suggests that productivity is not

[17] Crozier M, Friedberg E. L'Acteur et le Système: Les contraintes de l'action collective. Paris, le seui, 1977, p75.

[18] Morgan G. Images of organization, CA, Sage publications, (updated edition), 2006, pp 11-26

[19] Hall D J. Organizations: Structure, Processes, and Outcomes, NJ, Prentice Hall, (8th ed), 2002, pp 45- 47.

merely a technical matter but also deeply influenced by social climate, leadership style, and worker recognition.

C. Approaches Emphasizing Complex Interactive Systems[20]

These approaches consider organizations as complex systems that cannot be understood independently of their environment and the interactions generated by it. They emphasize organizational structures, feedback mechanisms, adaptability, and systemic interdependencies. This represents a new vision of rationality and managerial roles, where leaders must manage uncertainty, complexity, and continuous change rather than merely impose rigid control. Thus, organizations appear as evolving systems shaped by constant interaction with social, technological, and economic environments.

D. Economic Approaches to the Firm[21]

Organizational theories also developed alongside economic theories, although the firm was not initially a central object of economic analysis. The emergence of the firm in economic theory occurred when economists began to explain its existence through contractual relationships among economic agents, as seen in Transaction Cost Theory and Agency Theory. These approaches focus on understanding why firms exist, how they evolve, and how contractual relations, incentives, and governance structures shape their functioning and development.

Organizational Structure: A Concept Closely Related to Organization

Organizational structure refers to the description of the components of an organization, the definition of functions, and the set of rules and procedures that regulate individuals' actions within the workplace. In this sense, the structure represents the framework that organizes tasks, responsibilities, and authority, shaping how work is coordinated and controlled. It is widely acknowledged in organizational sociology that the structure of an organization is strongly linked to its efficiency, performance, and capacity to manage uncertainty. Therefore, structure is not merely a static framework, but rather a fundamental element that determines how actors interact, how decisions are made, and how power is distributed within the organization.

A – Definition of Organizational Structure (D.J. Hall & M.A. Saias):

According to D. J. Hall and M. A. Saias, Structure is not only an ordered network of roles, functions, resources, and activities; it is also made of ideas, beliefs, and values that energize the system, representing the result of both its history and its current functioning. Structure is also a political process that

[20] Morgan G. Images of organization, OPCIT, pp 39-42.
[21] Coase R H. The nature of the firm, Economica on JSTOR, vol4, 16 nov 1937, pp 386- 392.

defines power relations and dependencies with respect to the external environment[22].
This definition highlights that structure goes beyond its formal and technical dimension. It includes cultural, symbolic, and political aspects that shape how actors perceive their organization and how they behave within it. In this sense, organizational structure is simultaneously: a formal system of coordination and control, a historical product shaped by past decisions and organizational evolution, and a political arena where power relations, influence, and dependency are continuously negotiated.
Traditionally, organizational structure is often identified through the organization chart, which represents the different departments, specifies their functions, and shows how they are connected. The organization chart is a formal representation that describes the organization as it is officially designed; however, sociological analyses show that behind this formal structure, there often exists an informal system that also influences real functioning.

Types of Organizational Charts[23]:

A – Vertical (Hierarchical) Organization Chart

This type is characterized by multiple hierarchical levels and is most commonly found in large firms and bureaucratic organizations. Authority flows from the top down, responsibility is clearly distributed, and control mechanisms are well formalized. While such structures may enhance stability, specialization, and predictability, they may also generate rigidity, slower decision-making, and reduced flexibility in rapidly changing environments.

B – Horizontal (Flat) Organization Chart

This structure contains fewer intermediate hierarchical levels and is typically associated with smaller organizations or modern firms seeking flexibility, autonomy, and innovation. It encourages participation, communication, and collaboration, allowing actors greater decision-making space. However, while horizontal structures promote adaptability, they may sometimes face challenges related to coordination and control when organizations grow in size and complexity.

[22] Hall D J and Saias, M A. Strategy Follows Structure, Strategic Management Journal, vol1, Wiley online library, 1980, p153.
[23] Daft R. Organization Theory and Design, NY, Cengage Learning, 2016, pp 176-185.

The Roles of Organizational Structure

1. The Economic Role

The economic role of organizational structure refers to the rationalization and optimization of time, human resources, and financial resources through the division of labor, the clear definition of tasks, and the coordination of agents' activities. By specifying who does what and under which conditions, organizational structure contributes to reducing uncertainty and duplication of effort, thereby enhancing efficiency, skill specialization, and productivity.
From a sociological perspective, this role echoes the classical analyses of organizations as instruments of rational coordination aimed at achieving collective goals with minimal cost [24]. The structuring of tasks allows organizations to transform individual competences into collective performance, while ensuring control over resources and outcomes. In this sense, structure functions as a mechanism that aligns individual work with organizational objectives, reinforcing economic performance and operational effectiveness.

2. The Cognitive Role

The cognitive role of organizational structure relates to the management of actors' bounded rationality by providing predefined frameworks of action, often described as scripts or scenarios of response. These scripts enable organizational members to act without constantly questioning who is responsible for what and how tasks should be carried out.
Drawing on Herbert Simon's concept of bounded rationality, organizational structures reduce cognitive overload by simplifying decision-making processes and offering standardized solutions to recurrent problems [25]. In this way, structure serves as a cognitive support system that guides behavior, stabilizes expectations, and facilitates coordination among actors. Rather than constraining action mechanically, structure provides shared reference points that make collective action possible in complex organizational environments.

3. The Political Role

The political role of organizational structure is based on the control and regulation of the margins of maneuver available to actors within organizations.

[24] Mintzberg H. Structure in Fives: Designing Effective Organizations, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall. 1983, p29.

[25] Simon H A. Administrative Behavior, New York, Free Press, 4th ed, 1997, p90.

By defining formal rules, positions, and channels of interaction, structure establishes schemes of action that shape power relations and influence strategies among organizational members.
This perspective is strongly associated with Michel Crozier's strategic analysis, which conceptualizes the organization as a political arena characterized by power games arising from interdependent relationships[26]. According to this approach, structure does not eliminate power but organizes it by institutionalizing zones of uncertainty that actors seek to control. Consequently, organizational structure becomes a strategic resource through which actors negotiate, resist, and exercise influence, revealing the inherently political nature of organizational life.

The Components of Organizational Structure

The components of organizational structure primarily refer to the division of labor, which constitutes a fundamental mechanism through which organizations organize work, distribute responsibilities, and ensure coordinated action among their members.

1. Task Specialization

Task specialization refers to the segmentation of organizational activities into distinct job positions, according to two complementary dimensions: horizontal and vertical.

a. Horizontal specialization

Horizontal specialization involves the decomposition of the work process into multiple tasks, each corresponding to a specific job position. This dimension reflects the breadth of the job, that is, the number and variety of tasks assigned to a worker. High horizontal specialization typically leads to narrowly defined jobs, increasing efficiency and productivity through repetition and expertise, but it may also generate monotony and reduce autonomy[27] .

b. Vertical specialization

Vertical specialization refers to the separation between execution tasks and control or supervisory tasks. It reflects the degree of authority, responsibility, and control an individual has over their own work, often described as the depth of the job. A high degree of vertical specialization limits workers' autonomy and decision-making power, reinforcing hierarchical control, while lower vertical

[26] Crozier M and Friedberg E. Actors and Systems: The Politics of Collective Action, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1980, p62.

[27] Mintzberg H. Structure in Fives: Designing Effective Organization, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1983, p29.

specialization allows greater participation and self-regulation. This distinction is central to analyses of bureaucratic and Taylorist forms of organization[28].

2. Formalization

Formalization refers to the degree to which tasks, roles, and missions of each work unit are explicitly defined and codified through rules, procedures, and written documents. It reflects the extent to which coordination is organized across multiple hierarchical levels through standardized norms and routines.

From a sociological standpoint, formalization aims to reduce ambiguity, ensure predictability, and stabilize organizational behavior. However, excessive formalization may also generate rigidity and encourage the development of informal practices as actors seek to preserve autonomy and flexibility[29]. Thus, formalization plays an ambivalent role, simultaneously facilitating coordination and producing organizational constraints.

3. Coordination

Coordination refers to the modes and mechanisms through which interdependencies between work units are managed. It ensures the coherence of activities and the integration of specialized tasks into a unified organizational process. Coordination mechanisms may include meetings, liaison roles between units, and project teams, particularly in the case of launching new projects or managing complex activities.

According to organizational theory, coordination is essential in contexts characterized by task interdependence and uncertainty. Mintzberg identifies several coordination mechanisms, such as mutual adjustment and standardization, highlighting that effective coordination depends on the nature of tasks and the organizational environment. In this sense, coordination is not merely technical but also social, relying on communication, negotiation, and shared understanding among actors.

A Sociological Perspective on Organization: The Individual–Organization Relationship

From a sociological standpoint, the relationship between the individual and the organization is fundamentally structured around two core analytical concepts: power and organizational involvement (or commitment). This relationship is not neutral; rather, it is embedded in systems of regulation, control, negotiation, and meaning that shape both individual behavior and organizational functioning. Sociology of organizations emphasizes that individuals are never passive actors;

[28] Weber M. Tarjamat Mohammed Al-Subai'i, Al-Iqtisad wa Al-Mujtama', OPCIT, p185.

[29] Hall D J. Organizations: Structure, Processes, and Outcomes, OPCIT, p84.

they interact with organizational constraints through strategies, adaptations, and sometimes resistance, depending on the forms of power exercised within the organization

A. Power

Beyond its polysemic character, power refers to the capacity to influence, shape, and orient the behavior of others within an organizational context. In sociological terms, power does not reside solely in hierarchical authority but is also embedded in rules, resources, expertise, and control over zones of uncertainty. Power is therefore relational and contextual, emerging from interactions between actors rather than being merely imposed from above [30].
Building on classical and contemporary organizational theories, power within organizations can take several distinct but complementary forms:

A.1. Coercive Power

Coercive power refers to the use or threat of sanctions, punishment, or constraint in order to ensure compliance. This form of power relies on fear and external control, reinforcing mechanisms of domination and alienation, as individuals conform primarily to avoid negative consequences rather than through genuine commitment. Such configurations are particularly evident in total institutions, such as prisons, military camps, or certain closed disciplinary organizations, where individual autonomy is severely restricted[31].
From a sociological perspective, coercive power tends to generate low levels of organizational involvement and may produce resistance, withdrawal, or symbolic compliance rather than meaningful engagement with organizational goals[32].

A.2. Remunerative Power

Remunerative power is based on reward mechanisms, whereby individuals are encouraged to adopt expected behaviors through material or symbolic incentives. These rewards may take multiple forms, including financial compensation, verbal recognition, symbolic appreciation, career advancement, or access to social benefits. This form of power is central to bureaucratic and managerial organizations, where performance is linked to incentive systems[33].

While remunerative power is generally more effective than coercion in stabilizing organizational behavior, sociology of work highlights its limitations:

---

[30] Weber M. Economy and Society, OPCIT, p53.
[31] Goffman E. Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates.,New York: Anchor Books, 1961, p 4.
[32] Etzioni A.. A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations, New York: Free Press,1961,pp12-22.
[33] Weber M. Economy and Society, OPCIT, p156.

compliance motivated by rewards remains conditional and instrumental, potentially weakening long-term commitment if rewards are perceived as insufficient or unfair[34] .

A.3. Normative Power

Normative power refers to the individual's internalized attachment to organizational values, norms, and culture. Rather than relying on external sanctions or rewards, this form of power operates through socialization processes that foster a sense of belonging, identification, and moral obligation toward the organization. Individuals comply because they believe in the legitimacy of organizational goals and perceive them as consistent with their own values.

In sociological terms, normative power is closely linked to organizational culture and symbolic systems, which shape meanings and guide behavior from within. This form of power tends to produce the highest level of involvement and stability, as control becomes internal rather than external, reducing overt conflict and strengthening collective cohesion[35].

[34] Blau P M. Exchange and Power in Social Life, New York, Wiley, 1964, p 118.

[35] Schein E H. Organizational Culture and Leadership, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 4th ed, 2010,p18.

The Nature of Individual Involvement in Organizations

The nature of an individual's involvement in an organization is largely determined by the dominant form of power that characterizes each organizational system. From a sociological perspective, involvement is not a purely psychological attitude, but rather a socially constructed relationship shaped by mechanisms of control, reward, and normative integration. Different configurations of power generate distinct modes of involvement, which influence employees' behaviors, attitudes, and degrees of attachment to the organization.

1. Alienated Involvement

Alienated involvement derives primarily from the coercive form of power. In this configuration, individuals remain within the organization mainly due to constraint or necessity rather than choice. Sociologically, this form of involvement is characterized by withdrawal behaviors, emotional distancing, low identification with organizational goals, and high levels of absenteeism and turnover. Compliance is externally imposed and often accompanied by feelings of frustration and loss of autonomy, which reinforce processes of alienation[36].
This type of involvement is commonly observed in highly authoritarian or disciplinary organizations, where control mechanisms dominate over participatory or integrative practices, limiting actors' capacity to develop meaningful engagement with their work[37] .

2. Calculative Involvement

Calculative involvement is associated with the remunerative form of power. Here, the individual's relationship with the organization is based on a rational assessment of material and symbolic rewards received in exchange for effort and compliance. Involvement is therefore instrumental and conditional, depending on the perceived balance between contributions and benefits, such as salary, job security, career opportunities, and social advantages .
From the sociology of work, this form of involvement reflects a contractual logic in which commitment persists as long as the organization meets individual expectations. While it may ensure short- to medium-term stability, it remains fragile and subject to renegotiation when rewards decline or alternative opportunities arise[38] .

3. Moral Involvement.

[36] Etzioni A. A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations, OPCIT, pp 5-9.

[37] Goffman E. Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates, OPCIT, p15.

[38] Weber M. Economy and Society, OPCIT, p959.

Moral involvement is directly linked to the normative form of power. It is characterized by a strong adherence to organizational values, norms, and culture, resulting in a high level of identification and emotional attachment. Individuals internalize organizational objectives and perceive them as legitimate and meaningful, which leads to voluntary cooperation and sustained engagement[39] . Sociologically, this form of involvement represents the highest level of integration, as control becomes internalized through socialization processes rather than imposed externally. Moral involvement enhances organizational cohesion and reduces overt conflict, although it may also mask power asymmetries by naturalizing dominant norms and values[40] .

Analytical Significance of the Model

This theoretical configuration provides a coherent sociological framework for understanding and interpreting the meaning of individual–organization relationships. By linking forms of involvement to corresponding forms of power, it enables a logical, rational, and above all sociological interpretation of organizational dynamics, highlighting how structures of power shape individual behavior, commitment, and social integration within organizations[41].

A Sociological Perspective on the Organization–Environment Relationship

From a sociological perspective, the relationship between organizations and their environment refers to the contribution, role, and functions that organizations perform within society. Organizations are not isolated entities; rather, they are embedded in broader social, cultural, political, and economic systems. Consequently, sociology of organizations conceptualizes organizations as open systems that continuously interact with other social subsystems, exchanging resources, norms, values, and information with their environment[42]. This analytical framework highlights how organizations participate in the reproduction, regulation, integration, and transformation of society through differentiated institutional roles.

1. Organizations for the Maintenance of Cultural Patterns

Organizations that maintain cultural patterns play a central role in the reproduction of values, norms, and symbolic systems that ensure social cohesion. Through processes of socialization, education, and cultural transmission, these organizations contribute to shaping shared representations

[39] Etwioni A. OPCIT, p22.
[40] Schein E H. Organizational Culture and Leader ship, OPCIT, p27.
[41] Etzioni A. A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations, OPCIT, p5.
[42] Scott W R. Organizations: Rational, Natural, and Open Systems. Upper Saddle River, Prentice Hall, 5th ed, 2003, p 29.

and collective identities. They function as key mechanisms for the continuity of social order by instilling dominant cultural models across generations[43].
This category includes educational and training institutions, research organizations, as well as cultural, artistic, and religious organizations. From a sociological standpoint, these organizations act as levers of cultural reproduction, while also serving as potential spaces for cultural change and reinterpretation, depending on power relations and historical contexts[44].

2. Integrative Organizations

Integrative organizations are responsible for defining rights, duties, and obligations within society and for ensuring social control. Their primary function is to regulate behavior through the enforcement of norms translated into formal rules and laws. Institutions such as the police, judicial system, and legal apparatus exemplify this type of organization.
By enforcing normative conformity, integrative organizations aim to promote the inclusion of individuals into the collective order, thereby maintaining social stability. Sociology emphasizes, however, that social control is never neutral; it reflects power relations and dominant interests, which may generate tensions between regulation and individual autonomy[45].

3. Political Organizations

Political organizations are primarily oriented toward enhancing societal performance and state sovereignty through the allocation and regulation of collective resources. These organizations, mainly state institutions, play a decisive role in decision-making processes, public policy formulation, and the distribution of material and symbolic resources.
From a sociological perspective, political organizations enable society to establish systems of defense, security, and public services, thereby ensuring collective survival and coordination. Their legitimacy relies on their capacity to balance authority, efficiency, and social consent, while managing conflicts arising from competing social interests[46].

Production organizations consist primarily of economic enterprises responsible for the production and distribution of goods and services. They constitute the

[43] Parsons T. Suggestions for a Sociological Approach to the Theory of Organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1956, p 63.
[44] Bourdieu P and Passeron J C. Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture, London, Sage,1977, p 31.
[45] Foucault M. Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison, New York, Pantheon Books,1977, p 194.
[46] Weber M. Economy and Society. OPCIT, p54.

economic subsystem of society and are oriented toward the efficient management of resources, productivity, and competitiveness.
Sociologically, these organizations perform an adaptive function, as they must constantly adjust to technological changes, market dynamics, and environmental constraints. Their survival depends on their capacity to innovate, reorganize work, and respond to external pressures, illustrating the permanent interdependence between organizations and their environment[47].

[47] Mintzberg H. Structure in Fives: Designing Effective Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, 1983, p. 9.

Elements of sociology of work and organization

I. From Bureaucracy to Organizations

A. Bureaucratic Organization as a Rational Organization

Max Weber is widely regarded as the founding figure of the sociology of organizations, insofar as his reflection on power led him to a systematic analysis of the modes of functioning of human organizations.
In Economy and Society, Weber proposes a relational definition of power, which he defines as the probability that an actor within a social relationship will be able to carry out his or her own will despite resistance. This definition emphasizes the relational and structural nature of power, rather than viewing it as a purely individual attribute.
Weber distinguishes three ideal types of domination (legitimate authority), each of which constitutes a specific mode of organizing social and organizational life[48]:
- Traditional domination, which is based on belief in the sanctity and legitimacy of long-established traditions and customs. Authority, in this case, is exercised by individuals who inherit power according to customary rules, as observed in patriarchal or feudal systems.
- Charismatic domination, which rests on belief in the exceptional qualities, heroism, or exemplary character of an individual leader. Authority here is personal and unstable, as it depends on continued recognition by followers and often emerges in periods of crisis or social change.
- Rational-legal domination, which is grounded in belief in the legality, rationality, and efficiency of formally enacted rules and procedures. Authority is attached to offices rather than individuals, and it finds its most complete expression in bureaucratic organization, characterized by hierarchy, specialization, written rules, and impersonality.
From Weber's perspective, bureaucracy represents the most rational and technically efficient form of organization in modern societies, as it ensures predictability, calculability, and coordination of collective action through formalized rules and procedures.
In modern societies, Max Weber observes that the dominant mode of authority is rational-legal domination, which corresponds to a specific organizational form that he designates as bureaucracy. This form of domination is grounded in the

[48] Weber Max. Economy and Society : An outline of interpretive sociology, University of California Press, 1979, p148.

belief in the legitimacy, rationality, and effectiveness of formally established rules and procedures, rather than in personal authority or traditional customs.
According to Weber, the expansion of bureaucracy results from a broader process of societal rationalization, whereby social action becomes increasingly oriented toward calculation, efficiency, predictability, and control. Bureaucracy, in this sense, is not merely an administrative technique but a central institutional expression of modernity. It structures the organization of public administrations, private enterprises, political parties, associations, and other complex organizations, reflecting the growing dominance of instrumental rationality in modern social life.
Remaining faithful to his methodological approach based on the construction of ideal types, Weber analyzes large modern organizations—whether public or private—by identifying a set of common structural characteristics. These features do not claim to provide a direct description of empirical reality; rather, they serve as analytical tools that make it possible to grasp the internal logic, power relations, and modes of coordination that characterize bureaucratic organization in modern societies[49]:

- Within bureaucratic organization, members are recruited on the basis of their technical competence and professional qualifications, according to procedures that rely on the possession of formal diplomas and/or competitive examinations open to all. This mode of recruitment reflects the principle of meritocracy and ensures that access to organizational positions is governed by impersonal and rational criteria rather than by personal ties or arbitrary decisions.
- Relations within the organizational structure are defined primarily as relations between offices and functions, rather than as interpersonal relationships between individuals. Authority is thus attached to positions, not to persons, reinforcing the impersonal character of bureaucratic domination and limiting the influence of personal interests or subjective considerations in organizational decision-making.
- Functions within the organization are highly specialized, with clearly delimited responsibilities and competences. Such specialization contributes to efficiency and technical expertise, while simultaneously reinforcing the fragmentation of tasks that characterizes rationalized forms of organization.
- Organizational relations are governed by formal, codified, and predictable rules and obligations, which regulate behavior and interactions within the organization. These formal norms ensure regularity, continuity, and calculability of action, thereby reducing uncertainty and arbitrariness in the exercise of authority.

[49] Scott W R. Organiations : Rational, Natural, and open systems, New Jersey, Printice Hall, 5th ed, 2003, p74.

It is the impersonal nature of social relations and the abstract character of formal rules that ensure compliance with norms and provide bureaucracy with its rational-legal foundation. By detaching authority from individuals and anchoring it in formally codified procedures, bureaucracy derives its legitimacy not from personal power or tradition, but from the perceived effectiveness, predictability, and objectivity of its rules.

Bureaucracy is therefore considered a legitimate form of organization insofar as it enhances efficiency and introduces written and formalized rules that regulate behavior and significantly limit arbitrariness in interpersonal relations. In this sense, bureaucratic organization represents a central mechanism through which modern societies seek to rationalize power relations and ensure fairness and regularity in the exercise of authority.

B. Robert K. Merton's Critique of Bureaucracy[50]

During the twentieth century, several sociologists focused on the dysfunctions inherent in bureaucratic organizations. These analyses are framed in terms of unintended consequences (or perverse effects), whereby the normal and rule-bound functioning of the bureaucratic apparatus leads to outcomes that are not originally intended and are often highly counterproductive.

In Merton's perspective, bureaucratic efficiency—initially grounded in rational rules, formal procedures, and impersonality—may paradoxically generate rigidity, excessive conformity to rules (goal displacement), and a decline in adaptability. As a result, means (rules and procedures) tend to become ends in themselves, undermining the very objectives that bureaucracy is supposed to achieve, such as efficiency, effectiveness, and rational coordination. This critical approach highlights how bureaucratic rationality can transform into organizational irrationality when rules are applied mechanically rather than instrumentally.

During the 1950s, Gouldner, Merton, and Selznick highlighted the underlying causes of the dysfunctions inherent in the bureaucratic model. They argued that the requirement for each hierarchical level to be controlled by the immediately superior level significantly increases the risk of rigid behaviors at every level of the organization, as actors seek to protect themselves from criticism and sanctions.

Robert K. Merton, who situates his analysis within the structural-functional tradition of American sociology, closely examines the limitations of bureaucracy, preferring the term organization to that of bureaucracy, which he considers overly restrictive and normatively charged.

Merton identifies a number of dysfunctions, most notably the development of a "bureaucratic personality." In this context, employees within bureaucratic

[50] Robert K. Merton. Bureaucratic Structure and Personality. University of North Carolina Press, Social Forces, vol18, n4, 1940, PP 560-562.

organizations no longer aim primarily to respond to the needs of clients or users; instead, they focus on navigating and complying with rules, procedures, and formal instructions. Social relations thus become increasingly impersonal, and rules are applied literally and mechanically. Consequently, these rules are transformed into ends in themselves rather than means, a phenomenon known as goal displacement, which undermines organizational efficiency and rationality.

These dysfunctions generate unintended or perverse effects, particularly through the systematic requirement that each hierarchical level be monitored by the level immediately above it. This constant supervision further reinforces rigid behaviors, as organizational members adopt defensive attitudes to shield themselves from criticism and potential sanctions. As a result, bureaucratic control mechanisms—initially designed to ensure efficiency and predictability—paradoxically contribute to organizational inflexibility and reduced responsiveness.

Behaviors within bureaucratic organizations may also be characterized by "ritualism," that is, patterns of conduct in which adherence to established procedures and formal protocols is prioritized over the actual objectives being pursued. In such cases, compliance with rules becomes a dominant value, while the substantive goals of the organization are relegated to a secondary position.

These behaviors may also be marked by "routine," understood as the mere repetition of previously established situations and practices without any capacity for adaptation to new contexts or changing conditions. From a Mertonian perspective, ritualism and routine illustrate how bureaucratic rationality can degenerate into mechanical conformity, thereby reducing innovation, flexibility, and organizational learning.

Ultimately, the "rational" bureaucratic organization produces practices that divert both firms and public administrations from their original objective, namely the satisfaction of clients or users. The rigidity inherent in bureaucratic structures thus becomes a major obstacle to adaptation to change and to the provision of individualized responses to the particular cases organizations encounter[51].

Robert K. Merton conceptualizes this dynamic as the "vicious circle of bureaucratic organizations," a process through which formal rules and control mechanisms—initially designed to enhance efficiency and rational coordination—progressively generate dysfunctions that undermine organizational effectiveness. As bureaucratic rigidity intensifies, the gap between organizational goals and actual practices widens, reinforcing inefficiency and further entrenching rule-bound behavior, thereby perpetuating the cycle.

[51] Bernoux Philip. La Sociologie des organisations, Paris, édition le seuil, 3e éd, 2005, p45.

C. From the Bureaucratic Phenomenon to Strategic Analysis: Michel Crozier's Contribution

In France, Michel Crozier is the scholar who developed the sociology of organizations. Drawing on empirical research conducted at the Post Office Cheque Service and at SEITA (the French state tobacco company), he analyzed the development of the "bureaucratic phenomenon," which emerged alongside large-scale enterprises and public administrations, as well as the proliferation of the dysfunctions associated with this organizational form.

Crozier's work demonstrates that bureaucratic dysfunctions are not merely the mechanical consequences of formal rules or hierarchical structures, but rather the result of strategic interactions among actors seeking to preserve autonomy and control over zones of uncertainty within organizations. Through this empirical and analytical approach, Crozier laid the foundations of strategic analysis, emphasizing power relations, informal practices, and the capacity of actors to shape organizational functioning[52].

Crozier explains that the Taylorist model ("the one best way") is based on the assumption that there exists a single solution grounded in an allegedly absolute rationality. According to Crozier, this assumption must instead be reconsidered through the concept of limited rationality, which acknowledges the cognitive constraints of actors and the complexity of organizational situations.

While the bureaucratic model is formally grounded in the principle of rationality, its dysfunctions reveal the emergence of informal spaces of freedom and autonomy, or margins of action, that develop within organizations. Organizational actors strategically exploit these margins through processes of negotiation and through efforts to expand their power[53].

These spaces of power refer to the capacity of individuals or groups to control a critical source of uncertainty that is essential to the effective functioning of the organization. In response, organizations tend either to counterbalance these dynamics by freezing relationships through rigid structures, thereby reinforcing formal constraints, or to attempt to preserve a certain equilibrium by developing modes of work and cooperation that accommodate informal practices[54].

Crozier ultimately concludes that it is virtually impossible to design a purely rational model of management, since organizational functioning is inevitably shaped by power relations, strategic behavior, and negotiated order rather than by formal rationality alone.

---

[52] Crozier Michel, Friedberg Erhard. Actors and Systems: the politics of collective action. Chicago, University of Chicago press, 1980, p63.

[53] Mintzberg Henry. Power in and around organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: prentice-hall, 1983, p285.

[54] Al-Johary Mohamed Mahmoud, Ilm al-ijtimaa al-sinaai wa al-tandheem, Amman, Dar al-maseera, 2011, p84.

Towards a Sociology of the Firm

It was during the 1980s that a sociology of the firm emerged, at the intersection of the sociology of organizations and the sociology of work. Earlier theoretical frameworks were mobilized in order to renew analytical approaches to the enterprise, particularly by shifting the focus from formal structures to actors, power relations, and organizational dynamics. Numerous studies consequently emphasized the impact of national cultures on organizational forms and practices. The work of Michel Crozier notably demonstrates that the French bureaucratic organization—characterized by impersonality and centralization—corresponds to cultural traits specific to French society, such as the social isolation of individuals, the rigid separation of occupational categories, an avoidance of direct face-to-face confrontation, and an ambivalent attitude toward authority[55]. From this perspective, bureaucracy is not merely a technical arrangement but a socially embedded organizational form shaped by cultural norms and historically constructed patterns of interaction. Under these conditions, centralized French-style administration appears as a rational and effective model capable of responding to two contradictory requirements[56]: preserving individual autonomy while ensuring the success of collective action. This analytical orientation contributed to the development, from the 1970s onward, of a distinct field of research examining the relationships between the cultural characteristics of societies and the functioning of firms, thereby reinforcing the idea that organizational efficiency cannot be fully understood without considering cultural and institutional contexts.

A. Corporate Culture: An Analytical Axis of Organizational Functioning

✓ The Concept of Corporate Culture

From the 1970s onward, sociologists highlighted the existence of corporate cultures, understood as specific modes of regulating social relations within firms. These cultures are not merely symbolic or secondary elements but constitute structured systems of meanings, norms, and values that orient actors' behaviors and interactions within organizations. Consequently, the firm is analyzed as a central site for the production of collective identity, which in turn contributes to the construction of individual identity through processes of socialization and professional integration. In this sense, corporate culture plays a

[55] Schein Edgard. Organizational Culture and Leadership, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 4th ed, 2010, p73.
[56] Chanlat Jean-Francois. Sociologie des organisations : une perspective francaise, Paris, Eska, 1998, p69.

mediating role between organizational structures and individual action, shaping employees' perceptions of authority, cooperation, and belonging. Moreover, culture functions as a key explanatory variable for differences in organizational forms and configurations, as it influences managerial practices, coordination mechanisms, and patterns of control, thereby reinforcing the idea that organizational diversity cannot be reduced to purely technical or economic determinants.

Geert Hofstede and Daniel Bollinger synthesize the cultural differences that shape the organizational modes of multinational subsidiaries operating in different national contexts. They identify four key cultural dimensions that influence managerial practices and organizational structures: power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism, and masculinity. By emphasizing these dimensions, the authors challenge the assumption of a convergence of management styles across countries and highlight the central role of national culture at political, cultural, and psychological levels. From this perspective, managerial authority and leadership styles cannot be standardized but must be adapted to culturally specific expectations and patterns of social regulation. Consequently, styles of "command" are required to vary according to national contexts, ranging, for example, from a paternalistic logic—observed in France, where employees tend to display both a significant distance from authority and strong individualism—to a participative logic, as in Germany, where employees are characterized by a lower power distance and a comparatively less pronounced form of individualism. This comparative analysis underscores the extent to which organizational functioning is embedded in broader cultural frameworks that condition actors' relationships to authority, cooperation, and decision-making within the firm[57].

Philippe d'Iribarne demonstrates, through his study of the subsidiaries of the Lafarge Group, that corporate management is profoundly shaped by the cultural specificities of the countries in which firms operate. His work shows that managerial practices, far from being universally transferable, are embedded in historically and socially constructed systems of meaning that influence authority relations, coordination mechanisms, and modes of cooperation within organizations[58]. In parallel, structural contingency approaches conceptualize the organization as an open system exposed to external influences and environmental constraints. P. R. Lawrence and J. W. Lorsch focus on the ways in which firms adapt their internal structures to changes in their environment. In a stable market, where organizational activity is weakly dependent on economic fluctuations, a secure external environment tends to generate relatively rigid or bureaucratic internal structures characterized by formalization and standardization. Conversely, under conditions of environmental uncertainty and

[57] Daniel Bollinger, Geert Hofstede. Les differences culturelles dans le management, Paris, les editions des organisatios, 1987, p58.

[58] Philippe d'Iribarne, L'épreuve des differences,le seuil, 2009, p37.

turbulence, organizational effectiveness relies on flexibility, decentralization, and adaptive coordination mechanisms within the internal structure[59]. This perspective reinforces the idea that organizational forms result from an ongoing adjustment between cultural, environmental, and structural variables rather than from a single universal model.

✓ The Concept of Corporate Culture: A Notion to Be Questioned

These analyses undeniably possess strong heuristic value; however, the concept of corporate culture itself raises important theoretical questions, particularly regarding its applicability to the world of the firm. For Renaud Sainsaulieu, the notion of corporate culture is associated with a number of theoretical difficulties that stem from the assumptions on which it is based. Specifically, the concept presupposes the existence of a shared culture—composed of common representations, norms, and values—embraced by all members of the organization. Such an assumption risks overlooking the internal heterogeneity of firms and the differentiated identities that emerge from positions within the organizational structure. Indeed, the enterprise is not only a space of integration and socialization but also a site of social conflicts and class antagonisms, where power relations, divergent interests, and struggles over resources and recognition shape everyday organizational life. From this critical perspective, corporate culture cannot be understood as a homogeneous and consensual system, but rather as a fragmented and contested field in which multiple cultural logics coexist and compete[60].

The notion of corporate culture also postulates that actors' behaviors and strategies within organizations are shaped by internalized values and systems of representations specific to the firm. Such an approach assumes that organizational action is primarily guided by shared meanings and normative orientations. However, Michel Crozier's analyses have revealed the extent to which actors' strategies must instead be interpreted in terms of opportunities for power and control over zones of uncertainty within organizational systems. From this perspective, strategic behavior is less the mechanical expression of internalized values than the result of rational and relational calculations embedded in power relations.
Furthermore, the concept of corporate culture is based on the idea that the firm constitutes a micro-society capable of durably instituting the rules governing its internal social functioning. This assumption, however, presupposes the existence of stable processes of learning, transmission, and diffusion of cultural elements, not only within the organization but also toward the broader society. Yet such

[59] Al-Johary Mohamed Mahmoud. OPCIT, p104.
[60] Philippe Pierre. Renaud Sainsaulieu cinq apports sociologiques essentiels pour le management intercultural, 2008, www.philippepierre.com .

mechanisms are far from self-evident, as organizational memberships are often fragmented, unstable, and subject to external constraints. Consequently, the issue of corporate culture cannot be taken for granted; it remains an open and problematic question that requires critical examination rather than uncritical acceptance as an explanatory framework.

Organization, Sociology, and Theories of Organizations

Organizational theory emerged primarily during the twentieth century, developing most notably in the 1930s in response to the growing need to identify optimal models capable of improving the organization of production and, consequently, enhancing firm performance. This period was marked by the dominance of rational and technical approaches, which sought efficiency, standardization, and control within industrial organizations, particularly under the influence of scientific management and bureaucratic models[61]. The concept of the sociology of organizations appeared later, during the 1950s, reflecting a shift toward a more sociological and critical understanding of organizations as complex social systems embedded in broader institutional and social contexts[62].

1. What Is an Organization?

An organization may be defined as a structured social system deliberately created to achieve a specific objective. It presupposes the existence of a formal goal, a division of labor and allocation of roles, a communication system, decision-making mechanisms, and a set of rules for evaluating activities and performance. From a sociological standpoint, these elements highlight the formal dimension of organizations; however, they do not fully capture the informal practices, power relations, and symbolic dimensions that also shape organizational life[63].

There is no unanimous consensus regarding a single definition of the concept of organization. Instead, the diversity of definitions reflects the plurality of theoretical approaches within organizational sociology. For instance, organizations can be understood as structured and coordinated sets of technical and human resources mobilized toward a common objective, an approach emphasizing efficiency, coordination, and rationality[64].

---

[61] Taylor F W. The Principles of Scientific Management, New York, Harper & Brothers, 1911, pp 36–42.

[62] Crozier M. The Bureaucratic Phenomenon, OPCIT, pp 19–20.

[63] Hall R H. Organizations: Structures, Processes, and Outcomes, NJ, Prentice Hall, 6th ed, 1996, pp 24–28.

[64] Mintzberg H. Structure et dynamique des organisations, Paris, Éditions d'Organisation, 1982, pp2–5.

5). From a strategic and conflict-oriented perspective, organizations are also conceived as arenas of power and domination, within which actors engage in struggles over resources, influence, and control[65].
In contrast, systems theory conceptualizes organizations as open systems, consisting of interrelated activities carried out by multiple individuals and continuously interacting with their environment. This approach underscores the importance of feedback, adaptation, and interdependence between organizational subsystems and external constraints[66]. Beyond these structural and systemic perspectives, cultural approaches view organizations as cultural units shaped by their history, shared values, norms, symbols, and rituals, which contribute to the construction of meaning and collective identity within the workplace[67]
Finally, from a managerial perspective, an organization may be defined as the specific way in which a firm arranges its resources, capabilities, and competencies in order to achieve strategic objectives. This approach focuses on coordination, strategic alignment, and performance optimization, often privileging instrumental rationality over social relations, yet it remains analytically useful for understanding contemporary organizational practices[68].

Each of the previously cited definitions emphasizes one or more dimensions of the organization, depending on the theoretical framework within which it is situated. This diversity of perspectives reflects the absence of a unified theoretical consensus and highlights the multidimensional nature of organizations. Consequently, it becomes analytically essential to grasp the various approaches to organization, as each sheds light on specific aspects such as structure, power, culture, coordination, or performance[69].
Work organization should not be understood as a natural, innate, fixed, or non-evolving phenomenon. Rather, it constitutes a deliberate and rational social construction, shaped by historical, economic, and social conditions. From a sociological standpoint, the organization of work emerges from collective choices and institutionalized arrangements aimed at coordinating human action in a coherent manner. This perspective challenges deterministic or purely technical views of organization by emphasizing the role of social actors, norms, and power relations in shaping organizational forms[70].
The organization of work is grounded in the fundamental principle that no individual can accomplish the totality of a given activity alone. This structural limitation generates the necessity to divide labor into missions, activities, or

[65] Crozier M. Ibid, pp 45-48.
[66] Katz D and Kahn R L. The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York, Wiley, 1966, pp 18–22.
[67] Schein E H. Organizational Culture and Leadership, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1985, pp 9–14.
[68] Chandler A D. Strategy and Structure: Chapters in the History of the Industrial Enterprise. Cambridge, MIT Press,1962, pp 14–18.
[69] Scott W R. Organizations: Rational, Natural, and Open Systems, OPCIT, pp 16–18.
[70] Durkheim E. The Division of Labor, OPCIT, pp. 13–15.

tasks distributed among multiple actors. As famously conceptualized by Durkheim, the division of labor is not merely a technical requirement but a social mechanism that produces interdependence and coordination among individuals within collective systems of action.
The organizational problem therefore arises as soon as a plurality of individuals comes together to perform a shared task through a structured distribution of responsibilities.
In this context, organizational sociology seeks to identify the structures, mechanisms, and methods that enable coordinated action and generate organizational performance. Rather than reducing performance to purely economic indicators, sociological approaches emphasize the role of informal relations, power dynamics, communication processes, and actor strategies in shaping organizational effectiveness. Performance is thus understood as the outcome of a complex interaction between formal structures and informal practices within organizations conceived as social systems[71].

2. What Is the Sociology of Organizations?

The sociology of organizations is a branch of general sociology that focuses on all forms of organizations, including firms, industrial enterprises, banks, hospitals, and other public and private institutions. It examines organizations not merely as technical or economic entities, but as social systems structured by norms, roles, power relations, and patterns of interaction. More specifically, it is concerned with organizational structure, modes of functioning, human relations, and productivity, emphasizing the social conditions under which coordinated action becomes possible.
At a deeper analytical level, the sociology of organizations refers to a reflection on collective action. In other words, it seeks to understand how concerted and convergent action is produced by a plurality of actors pursuing a shared objective. This collective action does not arise spontaneously; rather, it is grounded in mechanisms of cooperation, negotiation, regulation, and power that structure relations among actors within organizational settings. As Crozier and Friedberg argue, collective action is always the outcome of strategic interactions among actors who are simultaneously constrained by organizational rules and endowed with a margin of autonomy[72].
The central aim of organizational sociology is therefore to identify and analyze the mechanisms of cooperation and coordination upon which collective action rests.

3. What Is a Theory of Organizations?

[71] Mintzberg H. The Structuring of Organizations, NJ, Prentice Hall, 1979, pp 18–20.
[72] Crozier M and Friedberg E. Actors and Systems: The Politics of Collective Action, OPCIT, p 40.

The development of a theory of organizations depends both on the theoretical frameworks that precede it—whether they are confirmed, extended, or challenged—and on the economic, historical, and social context in which it emerges. Organizational theories are thus historically situated and cannot be dissociated from the transformations of capitalism, technology, labor relations, and institutional environments. This contextual embeddedness explains why organizational and managerial methods that are insufficiently elaborated or overly rigid tend to become rapidly ineffective when they fail to integrate changes in their environment, such as increased competition, economic instability, technological innovation, social change, or legal constraints[73] .

It is nevertheless important to emphasize that new organizational theories do not simply replace older ones in a linear or cumulative fashion. Rather, changes in context render certain theories more relevant or better suited to contemporary organizational realities. Earlier approaches may lose explanatory power in some respects, yet they often retain analytical value and continue to inform current research and practice. As a result, organizational theory evolves through processes of reinterpretation and recombination rather than outright substitution.

In organizational theory, paradigms therefore tend to accumulate and mutually influence one another over time. Rational, human relations, systemic, cultural, and strategic paradigms coexist and interact, each contributing distinct insights into organizational functioning. This pluralism reflects the complexity of organizations themselves and underscores the necessity of adopting a multi-paradigmatic perspective in order to fully grasp the dynamics of organizational structures, behaviors, and change[74].

Organizational theory has always been—and will continue to be—plural in nature, for several fundamental reasons. First, the diversity of organizational forms varies according to sector of activity (industry, agriculture, services), organizational age, size (small firms, large corporations), and legal status. These structural and institutional differences generate distinct modes of coordination, authority, and control, making it analytically impossible to account for all organizations through a single, universal theoretical framework.
Second, the range of problems addressed by organizational theory is itself highly diverse. Organizations constitute complex social universes characterized by continuous change, adaptation, and interaction with their environments. As objects of study, they may be analyzed from multiple angles, including their internal characteristics and structures, their relationships with external

[73] Chandler A D. Strategy and Structure: Chapters in the History of the Industrial Enterprise, OPCIT, p20.
[74] Burrell G and Morgan G. Sociological Paradigms and Organisational Analysis, London, Heinemann, 1979, pp. 17–20.

environments, interpersonal relations, power dynamics among individuals and groups, shared objectives, and mechanisms of regulation. This multiplicity of analytical entry points reflects the fact that organizations are simultaneously technical systems, social systems, and political arenas[75].

Third, the plurality of organizational theory stems from the diversity of scientific disciplines involved in its construction and evolution. There is no single "science of organization," but rather multiple sciences of organization. Organizational analysis draws on contributions from management studies, psychology, economics, sociology, and engineering sciences, each bringing distinct assumptions, methodologies, and conceptual tools. This interdisciplinary foundation explains both the richness and the fragmentation of organizational theories[76].

Each organizational theory is associated with specific hypotheses, vocabularies, and conceptual frameworks. Moreover, each tends to focus its analysis on particular aspects of organizational functioning and on key themes such as modes of organization, division of labor, coordination, control, power and authority, decision-making processes, structural design, motivation, and organizational change. No single theory can fully capture the totality of these dimensions, which reinforces the necessity of a pluralistic and complementary approach to organizational analysis[77].

In this sense, there is no unified or synthetic definition of what an organization is. Rather, the concept of organization remains open, contested, and theoretically constructed, reflecting the diversity of perspectives through which organizational reality can be interpreted and understood.

[75] Hall R H. Organizations: Structures, Processes, and Outcomes, OPCIT, pp 41-43.

[76] Burrell G and Morgan G. Sociological Paradigms and Organisational Analysis, OPCIT, pp 21-22.

[77] Mintzberg H. The Structuring of Organizations. OPCIT, p 40.

The Classical Theory of Organizations

The classical school of organization refers to the earliest authors who, at the beginning of the twentieth century, laid the foundations of what would later become the sociology of organizations. This intellectual current emerged in response to the new requirements generated by the rise of industrial society. Indeed, managing a production-oriented enterprise demanded qualifications and modes of coordination radically different from those required to run a small workshop. During the nineteenth century, the only truly hierarchical organizations were institutions such as the army and the church. Although early organizational thinkers drew inspiration from these models, the management of productive organizations had to develop its own distinctive logic, one that was adapted to the specific constraints and objectives of industrial enterprises operating within an entirely new socio-economic context.

From a sociological perspective, this shift reflects a structural transformation in forms of authority and coordination. While traditional institutions relied on long-established norms and rigid hierarchies, industrial organizations required formalized rules, clearly defined roles, and impersonal mechanisms of control to ensure efficiency and predictability. As Max Weber emphasized, the emergence of modern organizations coincided with the rise of rational-legal authority, which became a central principle in the structuring of industrial enterprises[78].

The classical theory of organizations emerged within a specific historical and conjunctural context. The industrial revolution, initiated in the eighteenth century, led to the concentration of the means of production and fostered the development of a new mode of large-scale industrial production. This transformation was accompanied by the rapid expansion of factories and the growing need to coordinate complex technical processes. At the same time, the expanding industrial sector attracted a large agricultural workforce that was largely unprepared for the technical and disciplinary requirements of industrial production. Integrating this workforce into the factory system became a central organizational challenge.

In response to these challenges, classical organizational theory proposed a rational and scientific approach to work organization. Human beings were perceived as inherently lazy and cognitively limited, incapable of spontaneously organizing their tasks efficiently. Consequently, work had to be simplified, standardized, and closely supervised. The organization was thus conceived as a mechanism designed to decompose tasks into elementary operations, reduce physical effort, and minimize individual discretion. This vision of the worker as

[78] Weber M. Economy and Society, OPCIT, p217.

an instrument of production justified the strict division of labor and the centralization of decision-making authority [79].
From an analytical standpoint, this conception reflects a mechanistic view of organizations, where efficiency is achieved through control, discipline, and the optimization of technical processes rather than through the autonomy or creativity of workers. While this approach contributed significantly to productivity gains in early industrial capitalism, it also generated social tensions and alienation, which later schools of organizational sociology—such as the human relations movement—would seek to address and critique.

I. The Scientific Approach: F. W. Taylor (1856–1915):

Scientific Management, commonly referred to as the Scientific Organization of Work (SOW), represents a rational approach to work organization based on the extreme division of tasks and the high level of specialization of each employee. Developed by Frederick Winslow Taylor, an engineer by training, this approach rests on both the vertical and horizontal division of labor. Vertical division separates the conception, planning, and control of work from its execution, while horizontal division breaks down the production process into simplified and repetitive tasks assigned to different workers [80].

Completed and reinforced by the assembly line introduced under Fordism, Scientific Management paved the way for the fragmentation of work tasks. Each worker became responsible for only a minute segment of the overall production process. This phenomenon was famously described by sociologist Georges Friedmann as “crumbled work” (travail en miettes), a term he coined in 1946 to emphasize the loss of meaning and coherence in industrial labor[81] . From a sociological perspective, this extreme parcellization transformed workers into executors of narrowly defined operations, reducing their autonomy and limiting the mobilization of their skills and cognitive capacities.

Although Scientific Management significantly increased productivity, it also generated various forms of resistance within the working-class population. Practices such as absenteeism, deliberate slowdown (freinage), and informal opposition emerged as collective responses to the intensification and monotony of work. These reactions challenged the presumed efficiency of the Taylorist system and revealed the social limits of a purely technical and rational conception of work organization .

[79] Taylor F W. The Principles of Scientific Management, OPCIT, pp 36-38.
[80] Taylor F W. The Principles of Scientific Management, OPCIT, pp 19-21.
[81] Friedmann G. Work and Leisure, London, Free Press, 1961, pp 53–55.

The primary objective of Scientific Management was to improve productivity within industrial enterprises. According to Taylorist logic, higher productivity would mechanically lead to lower production costs, reduced prices, and, consequently, a general improvement in living standards. This assumption reflects the broader ideology of industrial capitalism at the beginning of the twentieth century, which viewed economic efficiency as the main driver of social progress. However, subsequent sociological analyses have shown that productivity gains do not automatically translate into social well-being, especially when issues of power, inequality, and worker participation are ignored[82].

Objectives and Principles of Scientific Management (OST)

The primary objective of Scientific Management, also known as the Scientific Organization of Work (SOW), is to improve productivity in industrial enterprises. According to Taylorist logic, increased productivity would logically lead to lower production costs, a reduction in prices, and a general improvement in living standards. This causal chain reflects the dominant industrial ideology of the early twentieth century, which equated economic efficiency with social progress and collective well-being[83].
Taylor's scientific method is based on five fundamental principles that together structure the rational organization of work[84]:

P1. Horizontal Division of Labor

The horizontal division of labor leads to the fragmentation and parceling of work tasks, resulting in a high degree of specialization. Each task is broken down into elementary operations, and execution times are carefully measured in order to determine the most efficient way of performing each operation—what Taylor famously called "the one best way". This principle reflects a technicist and rational view of work, where efficiency is achieved through standardization and optimization of gestures rather than through worker initiative or creativity. From a sociological standpoint, this process contributes to the loss of task autonomy and the reduction of work to repetitive routines.

P2. Vertical Division of Labor

The vertical division of labor aims to strictly separate those who execute work from those who design and command it. Planning, coordination, and decision-making tasks are reserved exclusively for management, while workers are

[82] Braverman H. Labor and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century, New York, Monthly Review Press, 1974, pp 70–72.

[83] Taylor F W. The Principles of Scientific Management, OPCIT, pp 7-8.

[84] Ibid, pp36-42.

confined to execution. This principle is encapsulated in the idea of placing "the right man in the right place", implying that individuals must be assigned to positions that best fit their predefined functional role. Sociologically, this separation institutionalizes power asymmetry within the organization and reinforces hierarchical authority structures characteristic of bureaucratic systems[85].

P3. A System of Work Control

Scientific Management also relies on a strict system of work control. Managers must ensure that workers correctly execute all tasks defined by management. This principle assumes that every movement of the worker must be monitored and evaluated. As a result, supervisory roles—such as foremen—are introduced in factories to oversee performance and enforce compliance. This form of surveillance reflects a disciplinary logic that treats control as a prerequisite for efficiency, but it also generates resistance and informal practices aimed at circumventing managerial oversight[86].

P4. A Performance-Based Wage System

Another key principle of Taylorism is the establishment of a wage system based on individual output. Taylor advocated piece-rate pay, which he believed would serve as a powerful incentive for workers. This approach assumes that workers are rational actors who consciously seek to maximize their monetary gains. From an analytical perspective, this principle reduces motivation to economic calculation and overlooks social, symbolic, and relational dimensions of work, which later sociological approaches—particularly the human relations school—would highlight as crucial for understanding worker behavior.

P5. Specialization

Finally, specialization is considered a cornerstone of organizational efficiency. According to Taylorist theory, a highly specialized workforce offers several advantages:

- It enables workers to learn tasks quickly due to their simplicity.
- It shortens the work cycle, making performance almost automatic and reducing—or even eliminating—mental effort.
- It facilitates recruitment, as workers with minimal qualifications can be easily trained.
- It reduces the need for supervision because simplified and standardized tasks are easier to control.

While specialization contributes to productivity gains, sociological analyses have shown that it also leads to deskilling, alienation, and the erosion of

[85] Weber M. Economy and Society, OPCIT, p956.

[86] Crozier M. The Bureaucratic Phenomenon, OPCIT, pp41-42.

professional identity, thereby revealing the social costs of excessive rationalization in industrial organizations.

Advantages of Scientific Management

The advantages of Scientific Management (also referred to as the Scientific Organization of Work – SOW) are multiple and primarily related to the rationalization of industrial labor.
First, it allows for better preparation and adaptation of workers to specific tasks. Through training and task simplification, workers can quickly acquire the skills required to perform narrowly defined operations efficiently[87].
Second, Scientific Management contributes to increased worker productivity. By standardizing tasks and optimizing execution times, output per worker is significantly improved, which aligns with the central objective of industrial efficiency. From an organizational standpoint, this productivity gain is perceived as the result of eliminating uncertainty and reducing variability in work practices[88].
Third, communication within the organization becomes faster and more structured. The clear hierarchy and formalized procedures characteristic of Taylorist organizations facilitate the transmission of orders and instructions from management to workers. At the same time, information becomes more specialized, as each organizational level is responsible for a specific and well-defined domain of activity[89]. This specialization of information enhances coordination but also reinforces compartmentalization within the organization.

Finally, Scientific Management encourages the increasing use of specialists, such as engineers, planners, and supervisors. These experts play a central role in designing work processes, controlling execution, and ensuring efficiency. From a sociological perspective, this reliance on expertise strengthens technocratic power within organizations and marginalizes workers' experiential knowledge[90].

Critiques of Scientific Management

Although Scientific Management became widespread in industrial settings, Taylorism has been subject to extensive criticism on several grounds.
One major critique concerns the strict separation between conception and execution, which creates a gap between those who design work and those who perform it. This separation deprives workers of any involvement in decision-

[87] Taylor F W. The Principles of Scientific Management, OPCIT, p38.
[88] Weber M. Economy and Society, OPCIT, p220.
[89] Mintzberg H. The Structuring of Organizations. OPCIT, p23.
[90] Braverman H. Labor and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century, OPCIT, p40.

making and problem-solving, leading to a loss of meaning and engagement in work activities. Sociological analyses have shown that this disconnection undermines organizational learning and limits adaptability[91].
Another critical point is the excessive division of labor, which results in repetitive, monotonous, and alienating tasks. The fragmentation of work reduces tasks to mechanical routines, thereby diminishing workers' cognitive involvement and professional identity. Georges Friedmann described this phenomenon as a central feature of modern industrial labor, highlighting its negative consequences on workers' psychological and social well-being[92].

Finally, Taylorism is criticized for its assumption that individuals are motivated solely by financial incentives. By reducing motivation to monetary gain, Scientific Management overlooks social, symbolic, and relational dimensions of work, such as recognition, belonging, and job satisfaction. This narrow view of human motivation was later challenged by the human relations movement, particularly through the work of Elton Mayo, who emphasized the importance of social relations and informal groups in shaping worker behavior[93].

[91] Crozier M and Friedberg E. Actors and Systems: The Politics of Collective Action. OPCIT, p32.
[92] Friedmann G. Work and Leisure, OPCIT, p55.
[93] Mayo E. The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization, New York, Macmillan, 1933, pp 54–56.

The Administrative Approach: Henri Fayol (1841–1925)

Henri Fayol, a French mining engineer, is widely regarded as one of the earliest and most influential theorists to have systematically addressed the issue of business administration and managerial authority within organizations. His contribution represents a foundational moment in the sociology of organizations, as he shifted analytical attention from the technical execution of work to the function of management and command as a central organizational problem. Fayol's perspective is often considered complementary to Frederick W. Taylor's scientific management, insofar as Taylor focused primarily on shop-floor efficiency and task rationalization, whereas Fayol concentrated on the nature, structure, and social role of managerial functions within enterprises[94].

From a sociological standpoint, Fayol's work highlights the emergence of management as a distinct social function within modern organizations. He conceptualizes direction not merely as a technical necessity, but as a coordinating and integrative activity that ensures organizational cohesion, stability, and continuity. In this sense, Fayol anticipates later organizational theories that emphasize coordination, authority, and hierarchy as key mechanisms for regulating collective action in complex organizations.

Fayol developed a comprehensive administrative theory in which he emphasized the need to modernize and professionalize the command function, particularly within large-scale enterprises. He argued that effective administration requires not only technical competence but also the development of leadership qualities, such as authority, discipline, unity of direction, and responsibility. These ideas reflect an early sociological concern with legitimacy and authority in organizations, themes that would later be elaborated by Max Weber in his analysis of rational-legal domination[95].

The Six Functions of Management According to Fayol

Fayol identified six major functions that characterize organizational activity, each contributing to the overall functioning and stability of the enterprise[96]:

---

[94] Fayol H. General and Industrial Management, London, Pitman. 1949, pp. 3–5.
[95] Weber M. Economy and Society, OPCIT, p215.
[96] Fayol H. OPCIT, pp6-11.

Technical function: concerned with production and transformation processes. This function corresponds to the core productive activity of the organization and reflects the material basis of organizational work.
Commercial function: involving buying, selling, and exchange. Sociologically, this function connects the organization to its external environment and markets, emphasizing the organization's embeddedness in broader economic and social systems.
Security function: aimed at protecting both personnel and property. This dimension highlights early managerial concern for risk management, safety, and organizational survival, prefiguring later discussions on organizational responsibility and labor protection.

Accounting function: responsible for financial records, cost calculation, and statistical reporting. This function plays a key role in rationalization and control, enabling management to monitor performance and make informed decisions, a point later emphasized by Weber in his analysis of bureaucratic rationality.

Financial function: focused on the optimal acquisition and use of capital. This function underlines the strategic dimension of management and its role in ensuring organizational sustainability over time.

Administrative function: encompassing planning, organizing, coordinating, commanding, and controlling. Fayol considered this function as the most critical, as it integrates all other functions and ensures coherence within the organization. From an organizational sociology perspective, this function constitutes the core mechanism through which authority is exercised and collective action is coordinated.
Overall, Fayol's administrative approach represents a key transition in organizational thought, moving from a purely technical view of work toward a broader understanding of management as a social and organizational process. His ideas laid the groundwork for later theories of organizational structure, leadership, and coordination, and continue to influence contemporary analyses in the sociology of organizations and work.

According to Henri Fayol, the administrative function—long neglected in organizational practice and theory—is the most important function within the enterprise, primarily because it is the only function that cannot be delegated by top management. By "administrative," Fayol explicitly refers to what is now commonly understood as management, namely the set of activities through which organizational action is directed, coordinated, and controlled. From this perspective, administration is not a secondary or supportive task but rather the

core function upon which the proper functioning and stability of the organization depend[97].

From a sociological point of view, Fayol's emphasis on the non-delegable nature of the administrative function reflects an early recognition of the central role of authority and responsibility in organizations. Management, in this sense, embodies the locus of decision-making power and strategic coordination, a theme later developed in organizational sociology through analyses of hierarchy, leadership, and legitimacy[98]. Fayol thus positions management as a social function that ensures cohesion and continuity within complex organizational systems.

Fayol further argues that effective organizational management must be grounded in a set of administrative principles that structure managerial action. These principles, which he presents as universal, constitute the foundation of any efficient form of organizational governance. He identifies five key administrative functions, which, according to him, are applicable to all types of organizations regardless of their size or sector of activity. These functions are as follows[99]:

1. Forecasting and Planning

Forecasting and planning involve the rational preparation of the future by anticipating events and defining objectives and actions in advance. This function reflects a belief in rationality and predictability as core elements of modern management. Sociologically, planning can be interpreted as a mechanism through which organizations seek to reduce uncertainty and impose order on an otherwise unstable environment.

2. Organizing

Organizing consists in allocating and structuring the resources necessary for the functioning of the enterprise, including materials, tools, capital, and human resources. This function highlights the importance of organizational structure and the division of labor, central themes in the sociology of work and organizations. By defining roles and responsibilities, organizing contributes to the institutionalization of coordination and authority within the organization

3. Commanding

Commanding refers to directing personnel in such a way as to obtain the best possible contribution from organizational members. This function underscores Fayol's concern with leadership, motivation, and discipline. From a sociological perspective, commanding is closely linked to issues of power, authority, and compliance, echoing Weber's analysis of rational-legal authority in bureaucratic organizations[100] .

4. Coordinating

---

[97] Fayol H. General and Industrial Management, OPCIT, p12.

[98] Weber M. Economy and Society, OPCIT, p216.

[99] Fayol H. General and Industrial Management, OPCIT, pp 12-16.

[100] Weber M, OPCIT, p217.

Coordinating involves harmonizing and synchronizing all organizational activities in order to ensure coherence, balance, and efficiency. Fayol viewed coordination as essential to preventing fragmentation and conflict between organizational units. This idea anticipates later organizational theories that emphasize integration mechanisms and interdependence among tasks and actors.

5. Controlling

Controlling consists in verifying whether activities are carried out in accordance with established rules, plans, and standards. This function plays a crucial role in maintaining organizational discipline and accountability. In sociological terms, control mechanisms contribute to the regulation of behavior and the reinforcement of organizational norms, a central feature of bureaucratic rationalization.

Overall, Fayol's conception of the administrative function represents a foundational contribution to organizational theory by framing management as a systematic, rational, and universal process. His work laid the groundwork for subsequent developments in management studies and organizational sociology, particularly in relation to leadership, coordination, and control as fundamental dimensions of organized work.

According to Henri Fayol, the proper functioning of an organization is conditioned by compliance with a set of fourteen administrative principles. These principles constitute normative guidelines intended to ensure efficiency, coordination, and stability within organizations. From a sociological perspective, they reflect an early attempt to formalize the rules governing authority, cooperation, and control in modern bureaucratic organizations, anticipating later analyses of organizational rationality and structure[101]:.

Division of labor

This principle implies a high degree of worker specialization in order to increase productivity. Fayol assumes that specialization enhances efficiency by allowing individuals to develop expertise in specific tasks. Sociologically, this principle echoes classical analyses of the division of labor as a source of productivity but also raises issues related to fragmentation of work and alienation, later discussed by Durkheim and Marx.

Unity of command

Each employee should receive orders from only one superior. This principle aims to prevent confusion, conflict, and divided authority. From an organizational sociology perspective, unity of command reinforces hierarchical clarity and reduces uncertainty in role expectations.

[101] Fayol H. General and Industrial Management, OPCIT, p19-31.

Authority
Authority is defined as the right to give orders, the power to ensure obedience, and, in return, the obligation to be accountable for results. Fayol thus links authority with responsibility, a key element of legitimate leadership. This conception aligns with Weber's notion of rational-legal authority as a cornerstone of bureaucratic organization .

Discipline
Discipline refers to obedience, diligence, and visible signs of respect in accordance with the rules established between the organization and its employees. From a sociological standpoint, discipline functions as a mechanism of social control that ensures conformity to organizational norms and sustains order within the workplace .

Unity of direction
This principle holds that activities pursuing the same objective should be directed by one leader and guided by a single plan. Unity of direction promotes coherence and alignment of organizational efforts, reducing internal contradictions and inefficiencies .

Hierarchical authority
According to Fayol, every leader must be capable of assuming hierarchical responsibilities, demonstrating courage, and taking initiative. This principle emphasizes the centrality of leadership and the moral qualities expected of those in positions of authority. Sociologically, it highlights the personalization of authority within formal structures .

Subordination
Subordination refers to the obligation of personnel to obey their superiors. This principle reflects a vertical conception of power relations within organizations and reinforces the asymmetry between managers and subordinates characteristic of classical organizational models.

Fair remuneration system
Remuneration methods should encourage value creation and motivate employees. Fayol recognizes that economic incentives play a crucial role in securing cooperation and commitment. This principle anticipates later debates on motivation and rewards in organizational behavior .

Equity
Equity refers to the fair and just treatment of employees, aiming to foster a sense of social justice within the organization. From a sociological perspective, this principle underlines the importance of perceived fairness in maintaining legitimacy and employee loyalty.

Stability of tenure of personnel
Stability is ensured through a low rate of employee turnover. Fayol views high turnover as a symptom of social dysfunctions within the organization. This principle highlights the link between organizational stability and social integration at work.

Order
Fayol distinguishes between two types of order: material order—"a place for everything and everything in its place"—and social order—"a place for every person and every person in their place." This dual conception reflects the organizational concern with both physical efficiency and social positioning within the workplace .

Initiative
Initiative consists in granting employees a minimum degree of freedom, both in proposing ideas and in executing tasks. Although Fayol advocates hierarchical control, he acknowledges the importance of limited autonomy for motivation and organizational dynamism.

Centralization
Centralization implies that all orders that set the organization in motion originate from top management. This principle reflects a centralized model of decision-making, characteristic of classical organizational theory and later questioned by contingency and human relations approaches .

Esprit de corps (Union of personnel)
This principle emphasizes the importance of harmonious relationships within the organization. Fayol famously states that unity creates strength and that it is the responsibility of management to ensure cohesion and prevent divisions among personnel. Sociologically, esprit de corps contributes to collective identity and social integration within organizations .

Overall, Fayol's fourteen principles represent an early normative framework aimed at regulating organizational life through hierarchy, discipline, and coordination. While they have been subject to criticism for their rigidity, they remain foundational in understanding the classical conception of management and continue to inform sociological analyses of organizational structure and authority.

Advantages and Limitations of Fayol's Administrative Approach

Advantages

Fayol's administrative approach presents several advantages that contribute to organizational efficiency and clarity. First, it is characterized by simplicity and clarity, mainly due to the principle of unity of command. By ensuring that each employee receives orders from a single superior, this model reduces ambiguity in authority relations and limits the risk of contradictory instructions. From an organizational sociology perspective, such clarity strengthens role definition and stabilizes hierarchical relationships[102].

Second, Fayol's model allows for a clear and precise identification of responsibilities. By formally defining authority and responsibility at each hierarchical level, the organization can more easily assign accountability for decisions and outcomes. This aspect reflects an early rationalization of organizational control mechanisms, typical of classical management theories.

Third, the absence of ambiguity in interpersonal relations within the organization is considered a major strength. The clear hierarchy reduces confusion in interactions between individuals and departments, thereby limiting informal power struggles and role conflicts. This structural clarity also contributes to the efficient resolution of conflicts, as authority lines provide a clear framework for arbitration and decision-making[103].

Overall, these advantages illustrate how Fayol's principles aim to create order, predictability, and discipline within organizations, values that are central to the classical bureaucratic model.

Limitations and Critiques

Despite its strengths, Fayol's administrative theory has been subject to significant criticism. One major critique concerns the concentration of power in the hands of managers, while subordinates are expected primarily to obey. Employees are often implicitly treated as mechanical executors of orders rather than as social actors with autonomy, creativity, and agency. From a sociological perspective, this conception reflects a mechanistic view of work that neglects the human and relational dimensions of organizational life, a critique later developed by the Human Relations School[104].

This managerial dominance leads to several structural and functional limitations. First, the model tends to produce rigidity within the hierarchy, even when formal communication channels or "bridges" between departments exist. Such rigidity can hinder adaptation and innovation in changing environments, an issue highlighted by later contingency theories[105].

---

[102] Fayol H. General and Industrial Management, OPCIT.

[103] Ibid, p33.

[104] Mayo E. The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization, OPCIT, p 53.

[105] Mintzberg H. The Structuring of Organizations, OPCIT, p86.

Second, Fayol's emphasis on functional specialization and hierarchical separation often results in a lack of coordination between organizational units, due to the compartmentalization (silo effect) of departments. This fragmentation can weaken collective efficiency and generate organizational inertia[106] (Crozier & Friedberg, 1980).

Third, the model suffers from limited responsiveness, as information circulates slowly and imperfectly through hierarchical levels. From an organizational sociology standpoint, this poor information flow reduces the organization's capacity to react quickly to internal or external changes, thereby undermining effectiveness in dynamic environments[107].

Finally, Fayol's approach places heavy demands on the manager, who is expected either to possess multiple competencies or to rely on a specialized staff. This requirement reflects the growing complexity of managerial roles but also exposes a tension within the model: the centralization of authority increases managerial burden and decision-making overload.

In sum, while Fayol's administrative approach provides a coherent and structured framework for organizational management, its limitations reveal the tensions inherent in classical theories between efficiency, control, and human autonomy. These critiques paved the way for more flexible and human-centered approaches in organizational sociology and management theory.

[106] Crozier M and Friedberg E. Actors and Systems: The Politics of Collective Action, OPCIT, p45.

[107] March J G and Simon H A. Organizations. New York, Wiley, 19581, p 101.

The Bureaucratic Approach: Max Weber (1864–1920)

Max Weber is considered the first theorist to have systematically analyzed the role of leadership within organizations and to have examined how and why individuals respond differently to various forms of authority. From a sociological perspective, Weber's contribution lies in his effort to understand authority not merely as coercion, but as a form of legitimate domination that is socially recognized and accepted by those who are subject to it[108].

In this context, bureaucratic organization corresponds to a specific type of domination known as rational-legal authority, which is fundamentally distinct from traditional domination, based on customs and inherited norms, and charismatic domination, grounded in belief in the extraordinary qualities of a leader. Weber's analytical framework highlights that obedience in organizations is not accidental, but structured around shared beliefs regarding the legitimacy of power[109].

The starting point of Weber's contribution to organizational theory is his analysis of administrative forms. His work focuses on how individuals govern others in order to impose authority and, more importantly, how they ensure that such authority is perceived as legitimate by all members of the organization. From this standpoint, Weber identifies three ideal types of authority, distinguished according to the mode through which power is exercised and justified. These ideal types do not describe empirical reality perfectly, but serve as analytical tools to understand organizational dynamics and power relations[110].

a) Rational-Legal Authority

Weber considers rational-legal authority to be the dominant form of authority in modern societies. It is based on a rationally designed system of goals and functions aimed at maximizing organizational efficiency and performance. Authority is exercised through a formal framework of rules, procedures, and regulations, which define duties, responsibilities, and hierarchical relations[111].

In this form of authority, it is the position or office, rather than the individual occupying it, that is vested with power. This impersonality is a central characteristic of bureaucracy, which Weber views as the most technically efficient form of administration because it minimizes arbitrariness and personal favoritism. From a sociological point of view, bureaucracy represents the rationalization of social action, as it replaces traditional and affective forms of obedience with rule-based coordination[112]. This analysis has profoundly

[108] Weber M. Economy and Society, An Outline of Interpretive Sociology, OPCIT, p212.
[109] Ibid, p 324.
[110] Ibid, p217.
[111] Weber, M. The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, OPCIT, p331.
[112] Weber M. Economy and Society, An Outline of Interpretive Sociology, OPCIT, p223.

influenced contemporary studies of organizations, particularly in understanding formal structures, hierarchy, and control mechanisms in large-scale organizations.

b) Traditional Authority

Traditional authority is more closely linked to the person than to the function, and it is particularly prevalent in family-owned businesses or organizations rooted in long-standing customs. This form of authority derives its legitimacy from inherited social status and from established traditions that define who has the right to command and who must obey[113].

In organizational terms, traditional authority can also be observed in corporate cultures where dominant attitudes are expressed through statements such as "this is how things have always been done." Sociologically, this type of authority limits organizational change and innovation, as obedience is justified by continuity with the past rather than by rational evaluation of efficiency or performance[114].

c) Charismatic Authority

Charismatic authority is based exclusively on the personal qualities of an individual, such as exceptional leadership, vision, or heroism. Its legitimacy stems from the belief of followers in the extraordinary character of the leader, rather than from formal rules or traditions.

Unlike rational-legal or traditional authority, charismatic authority cannot be transmitted or inherited, as it is inseparable from the personality of the leader. From the perspective of organizational sociology, this form of authority is often unstable and temporary, since it tends to disappear once the leader loses legitimacy or is no longer present. However, it can play a crucial role in periods of organizational crisis or transformation, where routine bureaucratic mechanisms are perceived as inadequate[115].

2. Types of Organizations

Max Weber distinguishes three pure types of organizations according to the way authority is legitimized. In empirical reality, however, organizations rarely correspond to a single pure type; rather, they often represent a hybrid combination of these three forms. This typology reflects Weber's methodological use of ideal types as analytical instruments for understanding

[113] Weber, M. The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, OPCIT, p341.
[114] Scott, W. R. Organizations: Rational, Natural, and Open Systems, OPCIT, p 59.
[115] Weber, M. The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, OPCIT, p358.

organizational structures and power relations, rather than as exact descriptions of reality[116]:

Bureaucratic Organization

For Weber, the bureaucratic organization is the most efficient and high-performing form of organization. Its effectiveness stems from a clearly defined hierarchical structure in which authority is institutional rather than personal. Authority is embedded in the formal statutes of the organization and is explicitly defined within the framework of the employment contract. Each position is associated with specific duties, rights, and responsibilities, and authority is exercised strictly within the limits of formally assigned roles.

Managers or heads of departments possess clearly delimited functions and give orders only to their direct subordinates. From a sociological perspective, this principle reinforces predictability, accountability, and rational coordination of activities. Bureaucracy thus embodies the rationalization of organizational life, as obedience is directed toward impersonal rules rather than toward individuals.

This model has profoundly influenced modern public administrations and large private organizations, where stability and calculability are central objectives.

Traditional Organization

In the traditional organization, authority is based on precedents, customs, and long-established practices. The leader holds authority by virtue of an inherited status, often linked to lineage, family position, or long-standing social roles. The scope and limits of this authority are defined by custom rather than by formal rules or contracts.

Within organizations, this type can be observed particularly in family firms or in organizational cultures where past practices are considered self-legitimating. From the standpoint of organizational sociology, traditional authority tends to constrain structural change, as obedience is justified by continuity with tradition rather than by rational evaluation of efficiency or performance.

Charismatic Organization

The charismatic organization is based on the personal qualities of the leader, such as exceptional charisma, vision, or perceived heroism. Followers—often referred to by Weber as "disciples"—constitute, together with the leader, the core of the organization. Authority in this context derives from emotional devotion and belief in the leader's extraordinary qualities rather than from formal rules or inherited traditions.

By its very nature, this type of organization is structurally unstable, as it depends entirely on the continued recognition of the leader's charisma. Once this belief weakens, the organization risks disintegration unless charisma becomes

[116] Weber, M. The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, OPCIT, pp 221-318.

routinized and transformed into either bureaucratic or traditional authority. Sociologically, charismatic organizations are particularly significant in periods of crisis, innovation, or radical change, where existing bureaucratic arrangements are perceived as inadequate.

Weber strongly advocated the bureaucratic type of organization, emphasizing rules and procedures as the primary means of coordination. Through his theory of authority structures, he sought to classify organizations and to answer a fundamental sociological question: why do individuals obey orders? His response lies in the concept of legitimacy, which explains obedience not as mere constraint, but as a socially constructed belief in the validity of authority.

Fordism (1863–1947)

Fordism is a model of production organization developed by Henry Ford in the United States and characterized primarily by the central role of the assembly line. Beginning in the 1910s, Henry Ford extended Frederick W. Taylor's principles of Scientific Management by integrating the assembly-line system into the Organization of Scientific Work (OSW). This system relied on the use of a mechanized conveyor belt that transported parts from one workstation to another. As a result, it was no longer the workers who moved, but the parts themselves, which significantly reduced idle time and decreased the need for handling personnel.

From a sociological perspective, the assembly line represents a radical intensification of the rationalization of labor, as it not only organizes tasks scientifically but also directly imposes the pace of work on workers. The rhythm of production is dictated by the machine rather than by the worker, reinforcing managerial control over the labor process and limiting workers' autonomy[117]. This transformation illustrates the shift from craft-based production to highly standardized industrial labor.

The development of assembly-line work was accompanied by major advances in factory mechanization. Machines became increasingly specialized and efficient, leading to the standardization of parts and finished products. In Ford's automobile plants, this logic resulted in the production of a single standardized model, without variations in shape or color, famously known as the Ford Model T. This standardization allowed for economies of scale and significantly reduced production costs, thereby laying the foundations for mass production[118].

Fordism, characterized by an extreme fragmentation of tasks, enabled the large-scale employment of unskilled labor, including immigrants in the United States and rural workers in European countries. While this division of labor reduced skill requirements, it also intensified labor discipline and repetitive work. Nevertheless, Fordism is primarily associated with substantial gains in productivity and the emergence of mass production as a dominant industrial paradigm[119].

In 1914, Henry Ford made a landmark decision to increase workers' wages from $2.40 to $5 per day, a policy known as the "Five-Dollar Day." Although this measure aimed to reduce labor turnover caused by harsh working conditions, it also reflected a broader economic and social strategy. By increasing workers' purchasing power, Ford sought to enable his employees to buy the very

[117] Friedmann G. Le travail en miettes, OPCIT, p 112.

[118] Hounshell D A. From the American System to Mass Production, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984, p 101.

[119] Aglietta M. A Theory of Capitalist Regulation: The US Experience, London, Verso, 1979, p 54.

automobiles they produced, thereby linking mass production with mass consumption. From the perspective of the sociology of work, this policy illustrates the Fordist compromise, in which higher wages are exchanged for intensified labor and strict managerial control[120].

There exists another conception of Fordism that goes beyond its technical and organizational dimensions and refers to a model of economic growth in which gains in competitiveness lead to wage increases, thereby fostering mass consumption. This expansion of consumption, in turn, ensures the absorption of large-scale production, which itself generates further productivity gains through economies of scale. From a sociological and economic standpoint, this self-reinforcing dynamic constitutes a virtuous circle linking productivity, wages, consumption, and growth[121].

This model is characteristic of the period known as the "Thirty Glorious Years" (les Trente Glorieuses), which spanned roughly from the end of the Second World War to the mid-1970s in Western industrialized countries. During this period, substantial productivity gains contributed to a significant improvement in living standards. Mass consumption developed particularly around durable goods, such as automobiles and household appliances. In this context, mass production and mass consumption mutually reinforced each other, forming a stable growth regime based on standardized production and expanding markets[122].

Henry Ford's major contribution lies in his practical implementation of Taylor's ideas, which led to the emergence of Fordism in two fundamental domains. First, Ford pioneered the large-scale development of assembly-line work, a decisive innovation in which the pace of work is no longer set by the worker but imposed by the conveyor belt. Each worker is compelled to follow the rhythm of the machine under the threat of exclusion. From a sociological perspective, this transformation reduces the worker to an extension of the machine, a phenomenon famously illustrated by Charlie Chaplin in Modern Times, which offers a critical cultural representation of the dehumanizing effects of industrial rationalization[123].

Second, Ford applied Taylorist principles in a social dimension, particularly through wage policy. Ford's workers became the highest-paid industrial workers in the United States, not out of altruism, but as part of a strategic economic rationale. Ford correctly assumed that the primary consumers of Ford automobiles would be his own employees. By raising wages, he sought both to stabilize the workforce and to expand demand for mass-produced goods. This policy exemplifies the Fordist social compromise, in which higher wages and

[120] Gramsci A. Selections from the Prison Notebooks, New York, International Publishers, 1971,p 303.
[121] Aglietta M. A Theory of Capitalist Regulation: The US Experience, OPCIT, p56.
[122] Boyer R. La théorie de la régulation. Paris: La Découverte, 2004, p 23.
[123] Braverman H. Labor and Monopoly Capital, OPCIT, p91.

mass consumption are exchanged for labor discipline, standardization, and managerial control[124].

[124] Gramsci A. Selections from the Prison Notebooks, p303.

The Human Relations School

The Human Relations Theory assumes that the individual is not merely a rational and mechanical actor, but fundamentally a sensitive, emotional, and social being. Consequently, organizational hierarchy must acknowledge these human dimensions and actively involve workers in the objectives of the firm in order to enhance motivation and commitment. This perspective emerged as a response to the dysfunctions generated by classical organizational models—particularly Taylorist scientific management—which tended to dehumanize work by reducing workers to machine-like performers subjected to piece-rate wages, extreme work rhythms, and strict control. Such conditions resulted in absenteeism, declining morale, hidden costs of poor quality, and social tensions within organizations.

In reaction to these dysfunctions, several theorists—most notably those associated with the Human Relations School—turned their attention to the systematic study of human motivation at work. This school placed the worker at the center of organizational analysis by restoring human dignity to labor and redefining work as a social and meaningful activity, rather than a purely technical operation. From a sociological standpoint, this shift marks a transition from a mechanistic vision of organization to a social system approach, in which psychological and social factors are recognized as key determinants of productivity and organizational performance[125].

The Human Relations School highlights the significant impact of psychological factors—such as recognition, group belonging, communication, and morale—on productivity. Its founder, George Elton Mayo (1880–1949), did not entirely reject the principles of Taylorism, but rather sought to complement them by integrating the human and social dimensions of work that scientific management had largely ignored.

[125] Crozier M and Friedberg E. L'acteur et le système, OPCIT, p 33.

George Elton Mayo (1880–1949) and the Hawthorne Effect

Elton Mayo conducted one of the most influential empirical studies in organizational sociology at the Hawthorne Works of the Western Electric Company in Chicago. His research focused on examining the relationship between working conditions and worker productivity. Initially, the objective was to analyze the effect of improved lighting on industrial output. The Hawthorne studies were conducted over a period of five years, from 1927 to 1932, and progressively led to the discovery of what later became known as the Hawthorne Effect[126].

The Hawthorne Experiments (1924–1932)

The first experiment involved two groups of employees: an experimental group that benefited from improved lighting conditions, and a control group that did not. Observations showed that productivity increased not only in the experimental group (an expected outcome), but also in the control group (an unexpected result). This finding challenged the assumption that physical working conditions alone determine performance.

The second experiment focused on a group of voluntary female workers. Significant changes were introduced regarding wage systems (individual pay, group-based pay, performance-related pay), working hours, rest breaks (one or several, with or without refreshments), and general work schedules. Surprisingly, regardless of whether these changes were perceived as improvements or constraints, productivity continued to rise[127].

From a sociological perspective, these results demonstrated that productivity gains could not be explained solely by material or economic incentives. Instead, they pointed toward the decisive role of social interaction, attention, and symbolic recognition within the workplace.

Key Findings: The Hawthorne Effect

The Hawthorne Effect was discovered unexpectedly, as the initial goal of the experiments was to optimize material working conditions in line with Taylorist logic. However, the research ultimately revealed that non-material factors played a crucial role in stimulating human behavior at work.

First, Mayo observed that workers' awareness of being observed and valued significantly altered their productive behavior. The increase in productivity was

[126] Mayo E. The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization, OPCIT, p 72.

[127] Roethlisberger F J and Dickson W J. Management and the Worker, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1939, p120.

largely attributed to the interest shown by management toward employees, which fostered a sense of importance, recognition, and inclusion[128].

Second, Mayo emphasized the importance of interpersonal relationships within work groups. Contrary to Taylor's individualistic approach, the Human Relations perspective demonstrated that the group constitutes a powerful social unit capable of regulating behavior, motivating individuals, and influencing performance. Informal group norms and social cohesion emerged as decisive factors in organizational efficiency[129].

Third, work groups were shown to generate their own social systems of interpersonal relations, characterized by shared values, informal leadership, and collective regulation of effort. This insight laid the groundwork for later sociological analyses of organizations as complex social systems, notably developed in the works of Barnard and later organizational sociologists[130].

[128] Mayo E. The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization, OPCIT, p98.
[129] Roethlisberger F J and Dickson W J. Management and the Worker, OPCIT, p558.
[130] Barnard C I. The Functions of the Executive, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1938, p 82.

Bibliography :

.

1. Aglietta M. A Theory of Capitalist Regulation: The US Experience, London, Verso, 1979.
2. Al-Johary Mohamed Mahmoud, Ilm al-ijtimaa al-sinaai wa al-tandheem, Amman, Dar al-maseera, 2011.
3. Argyris, C. Personality and organization: The conflict between system and the individual, New York, Harper & Row, 1957.
4. Barnard C I. The Functions of the Executive, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1938,
5. Bernoux P. Sociologie des organisations, Paris, Éditions du Seuil, 2004.
6. Bernoux Philip. La Sociologie des organisations, Paris, édition le seuil, 3e éd, 2005.
7. Blau P M. Exchange and Power in Social Life, New York, Wiley, 1964.
8. Bourdieu P and Passeron J C. Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture, London, Sage, 1977.
9. Boyer R. La théorie de la régulation. Paris: La Découverte, 2004.
10. Braverman H. Labor and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century, New York, Monthly Review Press, 1974.
11. Burrell G and Morgan G. Sociological Paradigms and Organisational Analysis, London, Heinemann, 1979.
12. Chandler A D. Strategy and Structure: Chapters in the History of the Industrial Enterprise. Cambridge, MIT Press,1962.
13. Chanlat Jean-Francois. Sociologie des organisations : une perspective francaise, Paris, Eska, 1998.
14. Coase R H. The nature of the firm, Economica on JSTOR, vol4, 16 nov 1937.
15. Crozier M and Friedberg E. Actors and Systems: The Politics of Collective Action, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1980.
16. Crozier M, Friedberg E. L'Acteur et le Système: Les contraintes de l'action collective. Paris, le seui, 1977, p75.
17. Crozier Michel, Friedberg Erhard. Actors and Systems: the politics of collective action. Chicago, University of Chicago press, 1980.
18. Daft R. Organization Theory and Design, NY, Cengage Learning, 2016.
19. Daniel Bollinger, Geert Hofstede. Les differences culturelles dans le management, Paris, les editions des organisatios, 1987.
20. Etzion., A. Modern organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.1964.
21. Etzioni A.. A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations, New York: Free Press,1961.

22. Etzioni, A. A comparative analysis of complex organizations. New York, Free Press, 1975.
23. Fayol H. General and Industrial Management, London, Pitman. 1949.
24. Foucault M. Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison, New York, Pantheon Books,1977.
25. Foudriat M. Sociologie des organisations, Paris, Pearson éducation, 2015.
26. Friedmann G. Le travail en miettes: Spécialisation et loisirs, Paris, Gallimard, 1964 .
27. Friedmann G. Problèmes humains du machinisme industriel. Paris, Gallimard, 1950.
28. Friedmann G. Work and Leisure, London, Free Press, 1961.
29. Goffman E. Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates.,New York: Anchor Books, 1961.
30. Gramsci A. Selections from the Prison Notebooks, New York, International Publishers, 1971.
31. Hall D J and Saias, M A. Strategy Follows Structure, Strategic Management Journal, vol1, Wiley online library, 1980.
32. Hall D J. Organizations: Structure, Processes, and Outcomes, NJ, Prentice Hall, (8th ed), 2002.
33. Hall R H. Organizations: Structures, Processes, and Outcomes, NJ, Prentice Hall, 6th ed, 1996.
34. Hounshell D A. From the American System to Mass Production, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984.
35. Katz D and Kahn R L. The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York, Wiley, 1966.
36. Mayo E. The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization, New York, Macmillan, 1933.
37. Mintzberg H. Structure et dynamique des organisations, Paris, Éditions d'Organisation, 1982.
38. Mintzberg H. Structure in Fives: Designing Effective Organizations, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall. 1983.
39. Mintzberg H. Structure in Fives: Designing Effective Organization, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1983.
40. Mintzberg H. Structure in Fives: Designing Effective Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, 1983.
41. Mintzberg H. The Structuring of Organizations, NJ, Prentice Hall, 1979.
42. Mintzberg Henry. Power in and around organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: prentice-hall, 1983.
43. Morgan G. Images of organization, CA, Sage publications, (updated edition), 2006.
44. Parsons T. Suggestions for a Sociological Approach to the Theory of Organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1956.

45. Philippe d'Iribarne, L'épreuve des differences,le seuil, 2009.
46. Robert K. Merton. Bureaucratic Structure and Personality. University of North Carolina Press, Social Forces, vol18, n4, 1940.
47. Roethlisberger F J and Dickson W J. Management and the Worker, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1939.
48. Schein E H. Organizational Culture and Leadership, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 4th ed, 2010.
49. Schein E H. Organizational Culture and Leadership, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1985.
50. Schein Edgard. Organizational Culture and Leadership, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 4th ed, 2010.
51. Scott W R. Organizations: Rational, Natural, and Open Systems. Upper Saddle River, Prentice Hall, 5th ed, 2003.
52. Scott W. R. Organizations: Rational, Natural, and Open Systems, NJ: Prentice Hall, 5th ed, 2003.
53. Simon H A. Administrative Behavior, New York, Free Press, 4th ed, 1997.
54. Taylor F W. The Principles of Scientific Management, New York, Harper & Brothers, 1911.
55. Touraine A. L'évolution du travail ouvrier aux usines Renault, Paris, CNRS, 1955.
56. Touraine, A. (1969). La société post-industrielle, Paris, Denoël, 1969.
57. Weber M. Tarjamat Mohammed Al-Subai'i, Al-Iqtisad wa Al-Mujtama', Al-Qahira, Markaz Dirasat Al-Wahda Al-'Arabiyya, 2017.
58. Weber Max. Economy and Society : An outline of interpretive sociology, University of California Press, 1979.
59. www.philippepierre.com