

Leadership, Management or Command of a Hierarchical Organisation?

Robert Socha¹

¹ Akademia WSB w Dąbrowie Górniczej, ul. Ciepłaka 1C, 41-300 Dąbrowa Górnicza

Abstract— Praxeology has accounted for a significant amount factors and information into the field of people's leadership through scientific and management sections. The terms that constitute the Praxeology language have become universal in the management environment of practitioners and theorists. In the Polish thought devoted to scientific foundations of management, among others, praxeological definition of an organisation by T. Kotarbiński, has become universal. The organisation is an open and operating social system, which consists of people who perform in it specified functions and activities and who by means of carefully selected resources and methods are able to perform assigned tasks. Organisations are characterized by a specific structure in which hierarchical arrangement and structure can be separated. Therefore, is there in a such hierarchical organization leadership, management or command?

Index Terms— Praxeology, organization, social system.

I. INTRODUCTION

Praxeology has accounted for a significant amount factors and information into the field of people's leadership through scientific and management sections. The terms that constitute the Praxeology language have become universal in the management environment of practitioners and theorists. It results from a common interest of scientists of issues including, any kind of action, both individual and collective (Czermiński, Grzybowski & Ficoń 1999, p. 19). Praxeological theory of organisation considers the functioning of human teams mainly from the point of view of their efficiency. It uses an extensive language and research tools, these are created on the basis of the language of praxeology and its methodology¹. Additionally, theory of management took over from praxeology. A few well-done principles conducted, which include a demand of proficient acting, that is efficient and economical.

II. PRAXEOLOGICAL DEFINITION OF AN ORGANISATION

In the Polish thought devoted to scientific foundations of management, among others, praxeological definition of *an organisation* by T. Kotarbiński, has become universal and he

defines it as "[...] a kind of whole due to the attitude towards it of its own elements, namely, the whole of which all the components contribute to the success of the whole" (Kotarbiński 2000, p. 49). In this case, we deal with the organisation in terms of attribute-based (organisational structure). In the literature by T. Kotarbiński two additional understandings of the concept of *an organisation* can be found: in terms of material and functional, wherein the distinction is methodological, used to abstract three aspects of the organisation in order to bring into prominence in the context of the research that is being carried out (Szpaderski 2007, p. 87). In a substantive sense, an organisation (an organised thing) is a whole of many people composed of people and adapted things "[...] together in a certain way" (Szpaderski 2007, p. 31). Within the functional meaning, the organisation is: "[...] the action of joining certain people and things in a whole by defined relations" (Szpaderski 2007, p. 31).

Taking into account the above, praxeology can be defined as "[...] the organised system, i.e. the whole consisting of at least one active human coupled with the corresponding apparatus (Apparatus understood as "[...] all creations designed to help with the treatment of the material, otherwise known as equipment, covering not only tools of all kinds but also such objects, eg., as houses, crates, dishes, etc., so all sorts of rooms" (Kotarbiński 2000, p. 36)), so that the relations of parts of the whole to each other and to the whole that is composed of them, contribute to the success of this whole" (Szpaderski 2012, p. 88). Therefore, Praxeology is the human action, not the psychological event(s) that lead to an psychical action. This is the difference between the theory of human action and psychology, the subject of which are internal processes that cause or may cause a specified action (L. von Mises 2007, pp. 13-14).

The organisation is an open and operating social system, which consists of people who perform in it specified functions and activities and who by means of carefully selected resources and methods are able to perform assigned tasks. Organisations are characterized by a specific structure in which hierarchical arrangement and structure can be separated. The Chain of Command is a classic example of an organisational structure in



which the position of individual elements allows to distinguish subordinate and superior entities. Along with the increase in the number of hierarchical levels, difficulty in transmitting information may appear in a linear arrangement, this is because of subsequent levels of hierarchy, by so-called Chain of Command. From the Commanding Officers point of view, situational, instructive and prescriptive information and elements must be distinguished (*Leksykon wiedzy wojskowej*, 1977, p. 145). The first of the examples mentioned (situational). Information transmitted among others in the form of reports, messages create an existing or past condition of the environment, activities or its results. The instructive information, in turn, are concluded in regulations, procedures or other documents outlining the principles of operation. Prescriptive information is usually expressed in the following ways: Orders, commands, present future conditions and constitute an order to take or forego an action.

At this stage, attention should be paid to the informative relationships appearing in the information system of the organisation. These are distinguished by the criterion of the organisational structure, as well as organisational relationships. At this moment, both should consider the criterion of the relationship. Taking into account the criterion of the organisational structure the following informative relationship, these can be distinguished by the following:

- **Official.** Also called hierarchical related to subordination, which can be divided according to the direction of information flow “down” - for orders and “up”- reports;
- **Coordination.** Which in turn, can be divided into: Internal informative relationships (related to the exchange of information between people within the headquarters) and external informative relationships of cooperation (related to the exchange of information within the specialty, supplementation of needed information between specialties at the same level or between different levels excluding superiors)
- **Cooperation.** Involving the exchange of information between the relevant positions of command, between parties where there is no business reliance directly resulting from the performed occupation (Strzoda 2005, p. 12).

In the theory of the organisation, four types of organisational relationships can be distinguished. Typology is based on the criterion of the direction of relationship between the elements that create the organisational structure. From this point of view, organisational relationships are divided into four factors. These are:

- **Official (hierarchical).** Which occur in the background of the deployment of the decision-making powers;
- **Functional.** Occurring in the background of the diversity of professional competence;
- **Informative.** Taking place in the background of the exchange of information;
- **Technical.** Resulting from the division of work.

Bearing in mind the role and the importance of different types of relationships within the organisation, it can be stated that hierarchical organisations which include (in the colloquial meaning) the uniformed services, are those in which the leading role is played by official relationship. It results from the fact that among others, they perform specific tasks, often in hazardous conditions, in which the celerity of decision-making, the need for coordination of many elements as well as the lack of conventionality in action enforce the need for existence of strong hierarchical relationship and a strong role of people holding executive positions including commanding positions. It should be noted here that the term *command* has been marginalised imperceptibly and thus, it has caused unintentional and gradual elimination of the hierarchical organisation from the general area of leadership. However, it does not affect in anyway the fact that commanding is an integral part of leadership, and any attempt to exclude it from this area will result in substantive gap in mental systematisation of the organisation side of social processes in which hierarchical organisations are a significant potential both quantitative and semantic (Ciborowski 2010, p. 82).

III. LEADERSHIP, MANAGING AND COMMANDING

It must be emphasised that in many publications, the concept of *leadership* and *management* are defined in ambiguous ways. Some authors refer them to such terms as: *‘Impact, administration, governance, control or command’*. Therefore, these definitions are often inconsistent and too general. It seems that the basis of such perception of the mentioned terms in the literature is the lack of compatibility of authors within the usage of uniformed indicators for determining the activities carried out by executives who work in different organisations with the use of different forms and means of influence. Therefore, both in theory and in practice there is a considerable confusion of notions, and thus, many and in addition often completely opposing views can be met in literature. It should be also noted that in the translation of Anglo-Saxon literature into the Polish language, the word *management* is translated interchangeably as *administration* or *leadership*. Wherein in the Polish literature, these two terms mean a different phenomena but in practice they are used interchangeably (Ściborek 1999, p. 22).

Leadership is based on influence, power and authority, while the power and influence constitute the basis of leadership’s power. The impact does the reaction of a subordinate on the behaviour of the executive and it takes the form of behaviour or attitude’s modification. The authority, in turn, consists of personal characteristics or is related to the occupied position in the organisational hierarchy, constituting at the same time the condition of the potential impact of an executive on a subordinate (Webberr 1990, pp. 144-149). Efficient collective action is provided by following specific standards of proceeding considered by an individual or a group as applicable during the process of leadership. In relation to the process of people’s leadership, for the first time in a comprehensive manner such standards were formulated by a French theorist of scientific organisation Henry Fayol in *Administration*

Industrielle et Generale, published in 1916. Despite the fact that one hundred years have passed since the publication, the pragmatist has proven that they are current in modern times. They include: hierarchy; authority; command-giving unity; uniformity of management; centralisation; order; division of work; remuneration; discipline; "human" treatment of subordinates; stability of staff; the match of personnel; initiative and the subordination of personal interests towards general interest.

The hierarchy determines the flow of commands and information through the official channel, however, in case of the extensive hierarchical structure, the official channel (Chain of Command) is long and dealt tardily. The authority, in turn, has the right to give orders and the ability to enforce obedience towards ones self. Fayol distinguished formal authority, resulting from a location in personal and official hierarchy. Success can be only achieved if formal authority will be supported by personal authority, resulting among others, from knowledge, experience, etc. The unity of giving orders relates to the fact that a subordinate receives commands only from one person, because duality of command-giving disorganises the work and causes distortions in the functioning of the organisation. Uniformity of giving orders should not be identified with the unity of leadership which depends on the fact that one objective should be the subject of control of only one executive who uses one plan. Uniformity of leadership determines efficiency of team's organisation and uniformity of giving orders affects its functioning. Reducing the role of subordinates in decision making means centralisation. According to H. Fayol, the main aim of a good organisation should be the usage of staff's abilities whereas order means that people should be in those positions which are most suitable for them according to the principle: "the right man in the right place / job." By making the proper division of work between the controlled entities, better results can be achieved in the same amount of work involved. It is possible primarily due to the specialisation which was mentioned before. Fair remuneration for both employees and employers is another rule impacting the effectiveness of leadership. The discipline is compliance with the standards of the organisation. Its level largely depends on the behaviour of a supervisor. "Human" treatment of subordinates should rely on encouragement of subordinates so that they were engaged wholeheartedly in the performance of their duties. Stability of staff as another norm influences the efficiency of the organisation, as the high fluctuation of personnel reduces the efficiency, especially if the changes are to executive positions. This is because before the new executive will begin to make responsible decisions, a specified time is necessary to get acquainted with people and problems and errors of subordinated organisation. The executive's task is to keep an harmonious atmosphere which fosters cooperation of all staff at all levels. Situations that may conflict subordinates should be avoided. According to Fayol, causing disagreement among subordinates in any case does not belong to the superior's merit, as every aspiring executive can do it. In fact, real talent is needed to coordinate efforts, stimulate enthusiasm, use the competence and reward merit of each employee without

arousing envy and without spoiling the harmony of good relations between employees. Subordinates should be allowed to participate in the creation and implementation of action plans of the organisation, because the atmosphere of creative freedom increases the involvement of employees at all levels. At the same time, H. Fayol emphasizes that the supervisor should be able to give up his or her ambitions so that his or her subordinates could get the satisfaction resulting from the undertaken initiative. The subordination of personal interests towards general interest results from the fact that the interest of the employee cannot prevail over the interests of the organisation as a whole (Czermiński, Grzybowski & Ficoń 1999, pp. 34-36).

Management may in turn be considered from the functional and institutional points of view. In the first meaning, management consists of carrying out specified activities necessary to achieve the objectives and tasks. In general terms, it includes planning, coordination, stimulation and control. Institutional management in turn, is the action of the superior causing that the behaviour of the subordinate is in accordance with the established intention which mainly results from the hierarchy of the organisation (institution), in which the superior exercises specific organisational power. In the structure of institutional management three basic elements can be distinguished, i.e. a managing entity, a managed object and feedback occurring between them (Czermiński, Grzybowski & Ficoń 1999, pp. 30-32).

Leadership is therefore a broader concept than *management*, which is the most common form of formal managing the people where each *management* is a special case of *leadership*, but not every *leadership* is *management* (Kurnal 1970, pp. 365-366).

In the following section, the relationship between *leadership*, *managing* and *commanding* should be presented based on the analysis of literature of the subject. In the literature of the XXI century on management, the term *command* is generally not used, although it was functioning much earlier than the concept of *management* in the military and paramilitary organisations. Currently leadership is more common in the literature in terms of the process category and a property. As the process the leadership means the use of impact, without using recourse to coercive measures, with the aim of shaping the objectives of the group or organization, motivating behaviors aimed at achieving these objectives and to help in defining the group or organization. (Griffin 1999, p. 491). According to L. Ciborowski "[...] This means that now a significant part of the human population, functioning in a hierarchical structure, has been allegedly excluded from the scientific management area.

This can be interpreted that a shaped theory is essentially canceled out of management universalism features (Ciborowski 2010, pp. 89-90). Substantive justification of the need to include this area of knowledge within the general management theory comes from the fact that "[...] hierarchical organisations have never operated in isolation from the scientific basis of management, created by centuries of commanders and were often misinterpreted. It was and it is an inherent part of management, desirable for use in special conditions when the speed and significance of the meaning carried reaction obscure

threat of danger to life and health of participants of the action, and the executive decision issued with the power of command becomes the act of the coercion" (Ciborowski 2010, p. 90). First of all, it applies to the hierarchical formations, for example: the armed forces, police, etc., What it does not relate to are the organisations that need a command manifested by the single Commanding Officer. In hierarchical structures some superiors, especially those who because of the limited knowledge or innate autocratic are afraid of making substantive disputes with subordinates, they still abuse this form. According to quoted L. Ciborowski "[...] Significant evidence of immanent location of command in the substantive management space are in management environment and in-kind management structure" (Ciborowski 2010, p. 90).

L. Krzyzanowski classifies command as a kind of leadership of organisation, accepting formal powers of an executive as a dominant criterion, at the same time he does not deny the presence of other titles to be in charge. He also considers the term leadership in a wider scope in comparison to management and command.

Taking the issue of command the words of Marshal Jozef Pilsudski cannot be omitted, according to him the command is simply giving orders. Therefore, (bearing in mind the words of the Marshal) it can be assumed that the process of leadership is often called commanding in a hierarchical structure, it is the one in which a commander with the usage of orders implements the will in the subordinate structures. It is generally accepted that the right to give orders is granted to people possessing proper preparation and knowledge i.e. commanders.

Because of this, command is a decision-making process, i.e. a sequence of operations on the collection of information about own and enemy forces as well as operating conditions. Command consists of actions based on the results of creative thinking which constitute a series of solutions to specific decision-making situations. Hence, the essence of command comes down to making decisions about performing the task. Command is usually seen in two areas, power and process. Power means both the right to give orders as well as to bear full responsibility for any actions taken. In contrast, the process is the exercise of command in which the commander assisted by his/her staff performs tasks related to planning, organising, directing and coordinating activities of subordinate forces. Therefore, it can be assumed that there are several views on command, namely: empirical, organisational, cyber and psychosocial. According the first one, command is the whole operation, the commander and commanding bodies. In the second reason, command is treated in the category of structure and abilities to leadership of specified organisational units.

For example, the police and armed forces. In terms of cyber / I.T Command is a form of control with taking into account feedback which has an informative processes, i.e. to acquire, process and transmit information. Within the psychosocial approach, the human factor is crucial which constitutes both the subject and object of command. Considering the fact that the command is the decision-making process, it's essence is making a decision on how to perform the task. Therefore it is an action based on the results of creative thinking, which is "[...]

a sequence of solutions to specific decision-making situations" (*Podstawy dowodzenia* 2007, p. 12).

IV. CONCLUSIONS

Taking everything into account, management is a particular form of leadership and it's action manifests itself by the prism of making decisions on owned or subordinated resources. Command is a specific form of leadership and it is also included in the concept of leadership. The difference between command and management concerns the scope of the power which a commander has in relation to a subordinate. It should be noted that among the various environments there is also the belief that command is on the same level as management.

Command, due to it's scope of executive pressure resulting from the nature of orders can be compared with an order, which is sanctioned with legal compulsion, because an order in command is also sanctioned with legal compulsion, with the only variation which is a greater regime. The source of its essence is in the destiny of the organisation, as in other organisations than those whose purpose is to provide a broad sense of security, everyone has the right to refuse to execute the command if it's implementation threatens the life or health of personal caring out the order. There will not be any negative consequences of this title, which is unacceptable in the case of receiving an order such organisations as the armed forces or police. The truth is also that no military or paramilitary hierarchical organisation cannot operate effectively only on the basis of command which in fact restricts the executive creativity of human potential.

V. REFERENCES

- Ciborowski L. (2010). *Zarządzanie i dowodzenie w organizacjach zhierarchizowanych*, Kwartalnik Naukowy Politechniki Śląskiej w Gliwicach „Organizacja i Zarządzanie”, Nr 4 (12).
- Czermiński A. Grzybowski M., Ficoń K., (1999). *Podstawy organizacji i zarządzania* „Wyższa Szkoła Administracji i Biznesu w Gdyni”, Gdynia.
- Kotarbiński T. (2000). *Dziela wszystkie. Traktat o dobrej robocie*, Wrocław: Ossolineum
- Kurnal J. (1970), *Zarys teorii organizacji i zarządzania*, Warszawa: PWE (1977) *Leksykon wiedzy wojskowej*, Warszawa.
- Mises L. (2007). *Ludzkie działanie. Traktat o ekonomii*, W. Falkowski (tłum.), Warszawa: Instytut Ludwiga von Misesa
- (2007) *Podstawy dowodzenia*, red. J. Kręcikij, J. Wolejszo, Warszawa: AON.
- Ricky W. (1999). *Podstawy zarządzania organizacjami*, Warszawa: Wyd. Nauk. PWN.
- Strzoda M. (2005). *Techniki zarządzania w organizacji zhierarchizowanej*, Warszaw: AON
- Szpaderski A. (2012). *Prakseologia a nauki o zarządzaniu*, [w:] *Współczesne przedsiębiorstwo. Teoria i praktyka*, red. A. Sopińska, SGH, Warszawa.
- Szpaderski A. (2007). *W kierunku prakseologii jako teorii sprawnej (efektywnej) organizacji działania*, [w:] *Efektywność zespołów w organizacji*, Warszawa: AON.

Ściborek Z. (1999). *Analiza możliwości wykorzystania ogólnej teorii kierowania podczas podejmowania decyzji do działań bojowych*, Warszawa: AON.

Webberr A. (1990). *Zasady zarządzania organizacjami*, Warszawa: PWE.