

A Study on the Concept of Organization and Administration

Abdullah Abdulaziz Abdullah Hakami¹, Saud Abdulaziz Hakami²

¹Deputy Director of Support Services at King Fahd Military Medical Complex

²Health Management Medical reports at King Fahd Military Medical Complex

Received: April 18, 2020

Accepted: May 16, 2020

Published: June 2, 2020

Abstract: In the article the fundamental standards of process of sorting out administrative management in undertakings and associations are watched. A chain of factors that impact the span of management is recommended and the advantages and disadvantages of limited and wide span of management are arranged. In the article the levels and sorts of power, sorts of departmentalization and concentrated administrative management are depicted. In view of the allotment of factors that influence the degree of centralization and decentralization of administrative management, the quantity of advantages and disadvantages of these processes are built up.

Keywords: organizing, administrative management, principles of management, departmentalization.

Introduction

The term administration is generally utilized with a comprehensive significance, to grasp the entirety of the exercises having to do with the utilization of labor and materials to accomplish the goals of an association or foundation. Association the gathering of work into working units (i.e., offices, divisions, areas) and the foundation of lines of expert for oversight and different controls is one of the parts of administration. Arranging, staffing, organizing, coordinating, planning, and revealing are different terms much of the time used to portray specific parts of management or administration. These territories are subjects deserving of proceeding with examination. The writing of administrative association is loaded with adages or standards of administrative association. A portion of these announce that administrative association ought to accommodate unity of management, a restricted span of control, assignment of power similar with duty, a hierarchy of positions, generally scarcely any levels in the hierarchy, gathering of workers based on homogeneity of movement, both line and staff capacities, and offices for coordination. To some degree less as often as possible cited standards are: designation of power ought to be as far down the line as is conceivable; assignment of power without sufficient controls is unreliable management; and the duty of more significant position expert for the demonstrations of its subordinates is supreme.

Impressive distinction is connected by various essayists to the value of details of standards of administrative association. While the greater part of the reading material and numerous articles allude to them as standards to be thought of, there is almost no recommendation concerning the relative load to be appended to any rule; or to the strategy to be followed when standards strife. The standards appear to be valuable in excusing a specific administrative association [1-5]. One pundit says: It is a deadly imperfection of the present standards of administration that, similar to sayings, they happen two by two. For pretty much every rule one can discover a similarly conceivable and adequate opposing guideline. In spite of the fact that the two standards of the pair will prompt precisely inverse hierarchical proposals, there is nothing in the hypothesis to demonstrate which the best possible one to apply is. Moreover, only very seldom is a solitary premise of administrative association reliably followed in the primary divisions and furthermore all through the different regions of an organization. Span of control has been broadly talked about in writes about association

and in reviews of administrative association. The size of the span of control of an administrative official is influenced by such factors as the capacities of the official (information on activities concerned, speed of work, capacity to change quickly from thought of one issue to another), the idea of the work directed, the quantity of staff in the working units, the level in the hierarchy, the geographic area of the units managed, and the steadiness of the association. These factors lead to such speculation as that, taking everything into account, the span of control changes legitimately with the capacity of the official and the dependability of the association, and contrarily with the multifaceted nature of exercises, the size of the working units, the level in the hierarchy and the dissipating of the units geologically [5-7].

Administration

"Administration can be characterized as the exercises of groups collaborating to achieve shared objectives". As can be seen, administration is characterized as cooperative human activity or cooperative group conduct. "Cooperative", is the main key component in this definition. Human movement is cooperative in the event that it has the impacts that would be missing if the participation didn't happen. For instance, for a second let us guess our shared objective is to teach a group of people in the field of open administration [8]. Having the particular objective as a main priority, various people who are authorities in the field of open administration have been united. At that point we have told the experts that they will instruct this group of people in the field of open administration and that they better beginning the matter of teaching individuals. In the event that every last one of the specialists demonstrations in his/her way without talking with the others, there will be disarray in the group. Every single one of the authorities may request that the group meet in a particular spot where he/she will give a talk; one of them may request that the group meet at 10.00 AM in the first part of the day at a particular area in the city for a talk in near open administration, another may request that a similar group meet at 10.30 AM at an alternate area in the city for a talk in work force administration but another may approach the group to meet for a talk in nearby government simultaneously [9]. As can be seen, if every expert demonstrations freely without talking with or helping out the others, they won't have the option to achieve their objective. Be that as it may, on the off chance that they help out one another they will hold a gathering and talk about how they can achieve the given goal. Most likely they will set up a period plan with respect to the talk hours, settle on a specific area for the gatherings of the understudies and decide needs; to put it plainly, they will set up a request for errands fundamental for the achievement of the shared objective. As can be seen effectively, cooperative human movement has the impacts that would be missing if the collaboration didn't occur. "Cooperative" is here characterized regarding the aftereffects of the human action. On the off chance that we take a much of the time utilized representation, when two men together roll a stone which neither of them could roll alone they are collaborating. Subsequently the embodiment of administration is the usage of cooperative activity for the achievement of shared objectives [10].

The second key component of the above definition is the objective or reason. The possibility of an objective is key to the idea of administration as in if there was not an objective, the individuals from the group would not meet up and help out one another. At the point when you unite various people at a specific area, the primary thing they will ask is for what valid reason they have been united, what the target of the group is. Without the plan of a target or objective, nobody inside the group would recognize what to do and they would not engage in any movement [11]. At the point when someone decides the goal, and the group is educated about that, at that point the group individuals will begin to consider what they can accomplish for the achievement of that goal and they will begin to help out one another. As can be seen effectively, without a particular goal or objective, it is difficult to get individuals to help out one another. In that sense, the idea of objective is the second key component of the idea of administration [12].

In another definition, administration is characterized as "an action or process primarily worried about the methods for doing endorsed closes." In this definition the idea of objective achievement again

assumes a significant job. As the definition unmistakably shows, administration is mostly worried about the implies that are fundamental for the achievement of pre-decided objectives. In this it appears that another component is presented, that is the idea of means. The methods is the path by which something is done or acquired. At the point when a group of people are working for the achievement of a shared objective, a division of work is important, with the goal that every individual will comprehend what to do [13]. Or on the other hand there is the requirement for a position structure to control and organize the exercises of the people in question. Division of work and authority structure are implies—there are numerous others—for doing endorsed closes. In this sense, administration is an action principally worried about the methods. So far as that is concerned collaboration and whatever other strategy which will protect cooperative movement is a methods too [14].

It is conceivable to think of various different definitions which, when all is said in done, would be like the ones examined previously. They may present some different components or ideas however basically they would be worried about cooperative action in the achievement of wanted objectives. "administration is a sort of cooperative human exertion that has a high level of soundness." As should be obvious cooperative human action is again stressed and another idea of "judicious activity" is presented. Normal activity is here characterized as activity effectively determined to acknowledge given wanted objectives with least misfortune to the acknowledgment of other wanted objectives [15].

Organization

As indicated by one of the unmistakable researchers, "organizations are social units (or human groupings) intentionally developed and recreated to look for explicit objectives". In this definition organizations are viewed as social units or human groupings, which infers that the essential elements of organizations are people. In this way the main key element of this definition is the way that organizations are groupings of people. Another fundamental element is purposeful development that is, organizations are intentionally built for achieving explicit targets. The third element is obviously the idea of objectives, organizations are set up for the achievement of specific objectives [16].

In another definition organizations are characterized as "collectivities that have been built up for the quest for moderately explicit targets on a pretty much nonstop premise." Again in this definition organizations are characterized as social units made out of people, and they are explicitly made for the quest for specific goals [17].

"Organization is the organizing of people and capacities into profitable relationship". Again as it very well may be seen the fundamental element of organizations is people, an organization is a grouping of people. In this definition organization isn't just a grouping of people yet in addition various capacities are united close by people. The idea of objective is another essential element of this definition; the term, "gainful relationship", just infers that the people and capacities are united for the goal of delivering something, products or administrations [18].

At the point when the above definitions are assessed cautiously, clearly there are sure normal elements in the meanings of various researchers with respect to the idea of organization. These normal elements are a grouping of people, conscious foundation or development, and the achievement of explicit objectives. By alluding to the above basic elements, we will characterize organizations as "social units or human groupings intentionally settled for the achievement of explicit goals". Ministries, partnerships, colleges, emergency clinics, schools, ideological groups, jails, affiliations and so on are organizations in this sense [19].

One of the serious issues in talking about or contemplating organizations is that the very term is so like the more extensive term of "social organization". Social organization alludes to the manners by which human lead turns out to be socially sorted out. This announcement essentially demonstrates

that the watched regularities in the conduct of individuals are because of the social conditions wherein they get themselves as opposed to their physiological or mental qualities as people. That is, social conditions impact the lead of individuals. Social conditions which impact the conduct of individuals can be partitioned into two primary sorts: (a). the structure of social relations in a group. (b). the common convictions and directions that unite the individuals from the group or collectivity and guide their lead. These two primary sorts of social conditions comprise the two fundamental perspectives or attributes of social organizations [20-21].

The origination of structure infers that in a social organization people remain in some connection to one another. Hence, there is a sure system of relations which is one of the components of social organization. The second component of social organization is the arrangement of shared convictions and directions which fill in as gauges for human lead. Over the span of social cooperation, regular thoughts emerge regarding how individuals should act that is, basic desires concerning how individuals should carry on. In short social standards create, and social assents are utilized to dishearten the infringement of these standards. By thinking about the above conversations, we can characterize social organizations as "systems of social relations and shared directions". Society is a social organization of which regions, associations, ministries, ideological groups, partnerships as organizations are parts. In this sense, the idea of social organization demonstrates the more extensive arrangement of connections and processes. Organizations as we are utilizing the term here are portions of the more broad idea of social organization, being influenced by it and, correspondingly, influencing it thusly. In this sense, society itself, ethnic groups, companionship groups, families, clans and so forth are social organizations [22].

At the point when the term "organization" is utilized in this content, reference is made to what has been called by numerous individuals as formal organization. That is, the terms "formal organization" and "organization" mean exactly the same arrangement of relationship for our motivations. Starting now and into the foreseeable future, at whatever point the term "organization" is utilized in this content, we are alluding to what has been designated, "formal organization".

Concepts in the Administration of Organizations

There are sure ideas which are much of the time utilized in considering, dissecting and assessing the working of organizations. Ideas like discernment, adequacy and productivity are utilized according to the exercises of organizations. In this segment, the importance of these every now and again utilized ideas and their suggestion for organizations and their administration will be examined.

Rationality

Rationality is one of the most as often as possible utilized key ideas in the investigation, assessment and examination of organizations and their administration. By and large, rationality is identified with dynamic and decision. "Rationality is one of the crucial hypothetical parts of dynamic". Rationality is characterized as "the limit of man to settle on decisions dependent on cognizant thought about the methods chose to accomplish determined closures". The above definition obviously demonstrates that rationality and being rational are taken as a human capacity and by and large, it is identified with dynamic. Choices and activities of the individuals will be considered as rational to the degree they have the accompanying characteristics: (1) Decision or move ought to be made purposely and intentionally, that is, the individual ought to know about what he/she is doing and meaning to achieve. (2) Since there are generally different other options and intends to achieve exactly the same goal, there ought to be a push to recognize the arrangement of options and different intends to accomplish them. (3) The choice ought to be coordinated to the hunt of finding the best accessible methods, and this inquiry must be founded on coherent thinking and logical information [23-25]. (4) There ought to be a purposeful endeavor to perceive or discover to what degree feelings, propensities, convictions and intrigue go into the process of decision. The above depiction is a glorified origination of rationality, and it is troublesome, if certainly feasible, to be completely rational in this sense.

At the point when the previously mentioned qualities are mulled over, it appears that being intentional and cognizant is by all accounts the prevailing quirk (highlight) of rationality. In such an origination, rationality is related to deliberateness and awareness. At that point the inquiry to be posed is this: isn't the activity of a person who naturally pulls back a finger that is singled rational? Obviously, the response to such an inquiry will be: truly, it is rational. Or on the other hand take the case of a typist who trains himself/herself to strike a specific key in light of the improvement of a specific letter. When prepared, the typist can type an archive at rapid by utilizing ten fingers of two hands, yet not settling on a cognizant choice with each stroke. The conduct of the typist is rational, yet certain qualities which are related to rationality are not there. One last thought corresponding to rationality is the subject of in terms of what goals and whose qualities rationality be judged. Consider the case of two warriors sitting in a channel inverse an automatic weapon home. One of them remains under spread. The other, at an amazing expense, annihilates the automatic rifle home with a projectile. Which activity is rational? As can without much of a stretch be seen, there are complexities associated with the utilization of the term. As one of the noticeable researchers, Simon, proposes, maybe the best way to stay away from such complexities is to utilize the term "rational" related to proper qualifiers. At that point a choice is "impartially" rational if in truth it is the right conduct for boosting given qualities in a given circumstance. It is "intentionally" rational to the extent that the modification of intends to the finishes is a cognizant process. A choice is "organizationally" rational on the off chance that it is situated to the organization's objectives; it is "by and by" rational in the event that it is arranged to the person's objectives [26].

What is the pertinence of rationality for organizations? Organizations are intentionally settled to accomplish explicit objectives. The meaning of organization infers that they are at any rate wanted to be rational. Since an organization is relied upon to achieve its objectives with the commitment of a few (hundreds or thousands of) individuals, and so far as that is concerned they need to design their exercises, they need to set up a particular request. To put it plainly, deliberateness and cognizance are as a result in the choices made to setting up the organization and the measures presented for accomplishing rationality in its structure and tasks. In any case, total rationality is practically inconceivable in an organization. Organizations utilize individuals, and individuals take choices and participate in an assortment of activities, and they are required to be rational. Be that as it may, this isn't so natural, there are rational and irrational elements in their conduct. Enthusiastic factors like dread, love, kinship, warmth, outrage, envy, convictions, and loyalties are deterrents to rationality in individuals. In this way, complete rationality is just about an out of reach perfect in organizations. Since complete rationality is viewed as an out of reach perfect, an altered origination of rationality, which is classified "restricted rationality" has been created. Immaculate rationality can be accomplished once in a while, in exceptionally constrained circumstances. Along these lines, by and large rational endeavors are coordinated to getting satisfactory arrangements as opposed to ideal or ideal arrangements.

Effectiveness

Effectiveness is characterized as "the degree to which (an organization) understands its objectives." organizations are built up to achieve explicit objectives and the majority of the exercises that occur in organizations are conveyed for cognizant explicit points, the idea of effectiveness is significant for organizations. Inside this understanding organizational effectiveness is the degree to which an organization satisfies its targets. Effectiveness is anything but a basic issue, since organizations when all is said in done don't have a solitary objective. The essential trouble in examining effectiveness is the reality of different and frequently clashing objectives in numerous organizations. Effectiveness in one lot of objectives may prompt ineffectiveness in another [27].

Efficiency

The idea of efficiency is commonly utilized as an equivalent word for rationality and it is utilized in the significance of economy, lessening the uses. Efficiency is characterized as "the measure of resources used to create a unit of yield". In this sense, efficiency is legitimately identified with how

an organization utilizes its resources in the creation of merchandise or administrations. On the off chance that we can gauge an organization's inputs and yields, such an idea of efficiency is both exceptionally helpful and applicable in the activity and assessment of organizations. As a rule, it is hard to gauge the inputs and yields of an organization, however this circumstance ought not keep us from focusing on the idea of efficiency in assessing the presentation of an organization. Since the resources at the removal of an organization are restricted, how they are utilized in the achievement of objectives ought to be the worry of everyone included. A helpful methodology in this sense is to recognize squander and unused inputs. On the off chance that there are inputs which are not utilized, if there is a lot of inactive labor or hardware, this would show inefficiency in that organization.

Rationality, effectiveness and efficiency are significant ideas identified with the exhibition of organizations. When all is said in done, it very well may be contended that organizations must be rational so as to be successful and productive. However, rationality isn't the main determinant of efficiency and effectiveness, there are some different factors included. In this sense the ideas of efficiency and effectiveness are identified with one another, however an organization can be productive without being successful, or can be viable yet not proficient [28].

Conclusions

In this manner, considering the system of standards of arranging process, appropriate distinguishing proof of the factors impacting on the centralization and decentralization of administrative management, and establishment of advantages and disadvantages of this process add to the powerful organization of administrative management in organizations and undertakings. Further examination needs more investigation of the interconnection of process sorting out of administrative management with arranging, spurring and controlling administrative activities.

Conflict of Interest: The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

References

1. Şinasi A, Aykut P. Decentralization and the Strengthening of Local Government. Council of Europe Local and Regional Authorities in Europe. Publication no: 48;1991.
2. Şinasi A. Turkish Experience with Privatization: An Overview and Evaluation. Turkish Pub Admin Ann. 17-19; 1991-1993.
3. Ar Fikret A. Administrative Reform Efforts in Turkey. Turkish Pub Admin Ann. 11;1984.
4. Ziya C, Yapılanma YY. (Ankara: 20 Mayıs Eğitim, Kültür Ve Sosyal Dayanışma Vakfı, 1995)
5. Nabi D, Turan VE, Merkezi Hükümet Teşkilatı Araştırma Projesi (MEHTAP) Tavsiyelerinin Uygulama Durumunu Değerlendirme Araştırması, (Ankara: Türkiye ve Orta Doğu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü Yayınları, 1974).
6. Ergun T, Polatoğlu A. Kamu Yönetimine Giriş. Türkiye ve Orta Doğu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü Yayınları; 1992.
7. Karaer T. Kamu yönetimini yeniden düzenleme girişimleri ve sonuçları üzerine bir deneme. Amme İdaresi Dergisi. 1987;20(2):25-46.
8. Keleş R. Yerel Yönetimler Özerklik Şartı Karşısında Avrupa ve Türkiye. Çağdaş Yerel Yönetimler Dergisi. 1995;4(6):3-19.
9. Keleş R. Avrupa'nın bütünleşmesi ve yerel yönetimler. Türk Belediyecilik Derneği; 1999.
10. Müdürlüğü MIG, Mahalli İdareler Reformu Kanun Taslakları, (Ankara: İçişleri Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1997).

11. Payashoğlu AT. Merkezî idarenin taşra teşkilâtı üzerinde bir inceleme. Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi; 1966.
12. Aykut P. The Turkish Province as an Administrative Division of Central Government. Turkish Pub Admin Ann. 2;1975.
13. Polatoğlu A. İl yönetiminde eşgüdüm sorunu ve yeni bir yönetim modeli. Amme İdaresi Dergisi. 1985;18(4):27-40.
14. Aykut P. Bölge Valiliği Üzerine Düşünceler. Mülkiyeliler Birliği Dergisi, Şubat 1998.
15. Aykut P. Bölge Planlaması ve Yönetim Yapı (İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi, 2. Ulusal Bölge Planlaması Kongresine sunulan Tebliğ.), Bildiriler, İ.T.Ü. Mimarlık Fakültesi Baskı Atelyesi, 1989.
16. Aykut P. Kent Yönetiminde Sorun Alanları ve Örgütlenme, Şehircilik Hukuk ve Yönetim İlişkileri (12. Dünya Şehircilik Günü Kolloquyumuna sunulan tebliğler), A.Ü.Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Basın Yayın Yüksek Okulu Basımevi, 1990.
17. Polatoğlu A. Türk kamu örgütlerinde ast ve üst arasında iletişim. Amme İdaresi Dergisi. 1988;21(2):85-98.
18. Aykut P. (Ed.), Özelleştirme Tartışmaları, (İstanbul: Bağlam Yayınları, 1994).
19. Polatoğlu A. Southeastern Anatolia Project and administrative organization. METU Stu Dev. 1995;22(2):191-206.
20. Polatoğlu A. Mahallî İdarelerin Yeniden Yapılandırılmasına İlişkin Yasa Tasarısı Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme. Çağdaş Yerel Yönetimler Dergisi. 1996;5(3):25-34.
21. Aykut P. Administrative Structure: Regional considerations” paper presented to the Workshop on Local Government Structuring, organized by Center for Public Policy and Urban Research (METU) with the participation of Birmingham and Manchester Universities, Ankara, October 13, 1997.
22. Aykut P. A Critical Look at the Turkish Local Governments: The Urgent Need for Reform. Middle Eastern Studies, (To be published), 1999.
23. Soysal M. 100 Soruda Anayasanın Anlamı, Gerçek Yayınevi, 6. Baskı, Mayıs. 1986.
24. Türkiye ve Orta Doğu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü., T.C. Devlet Teşkilatı Rehberi, (Ankara: TODAİE Yayınları, 1998).
25. Türkiye ve Orta Doğu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü., Kamu Yönetimi Araştırması, (Ankara: TODAİE Yayınları, 1991).
26. Türkiye Sanayicileri ve İşadamları Derneği., Yerel Yönetimler: Sorunlar, Çözümler, (İstanbul:TÜSİAD Yayınları, 1995).
27. Selçuk Y. Local Government in Turkey: Problems and Solutions. Turkish Pub Admin Ann. 22-23;1996-1997.
28. Yavuz F. Türk mahalli idarelerinin yeniden düzenlenmesi üzerinde bir araştırma. Türkiye ve Orta Doğu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü; 1966.

Citation: Hakami AAA, Hakami SA. A Study on the Concept of Organization and Administration. Int J Rec Innov Med Clin Res. 2020;2(2):50-56.

Copyright: ©2020 Hakami AAA, Hakami SA. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.