

Chapter 1 : Division of labour - Wikipedia

8 The Division of Labour and Its Overcoming It is a fundamental element of Marx's philosophy that the division of labour is harmful and that it will be overcome in a future communist.

In such circumstances, according to David Emile Durkheim , the division of labour cannot command normative consensus and may become a source of anomie and breakdown of social solidarity. Only in folk society there is no anomic division of labour. From Anomie to Anomia and Anomic Depression: It is argued that these transformations are not fully in concordance with the original theories of anomie as they were set forth by Durkheim and Robert King Merton. Two approaches in social and cross-cultural psychiatry are examined in this context. First, the concept of anomia as introduced and applied in the research of Leo Srole is discussed. Second, attention is paid to the concept of anomic depression as it was introduced by Wolfgang Jilek in his research among the Coast Salish Indians. Durkheim first employed the concept of anomie in his doctoral thesis *The Division of Labor in Society* in which he devoted a chapter to the "anomic division of labour". Here Durkheim argues that under normal circumstances the division of labour produces social organic solidarity. Under exceptional circumstances, that is, when all the conditions for the existence of organic solidarity have not been realized, the division of labour presents pathological or anomic forms. The conditions for the existence of organic solidarity are two-fold: In the case of industrial or commercial crises and with respect to the conflict between labour and capital, and the lack of unity in the sciences, regulation does not exist or is not in accord with the degree of development of the division of labour. The Anomic Division of Labour, Section 1 Abnormal forms where the division of labour does not produce solidarity. Necessity for studying them. Abnormal cases in economic life; industrial crises more frequent as labour is divided; antagonism of labour and capital. Likewise, the unit of science is lost as scientific labour becomes specialised. Theory which makes these effects inherent in the division of labour. According to Auguste Comte , the remedy consists in a great development of the governmental organ and in the institution of a philosophy of the sciences. Inability of the governmental organ to regulate the details of economic life; - of the philosophy of sciences to assure the unity of science. If, in these cases, functions do not concur, it is because their relations are not regulated; the division of labour is anomic. How, normally, it comes from the division of labour. How it fails in the examples cited. This anomaly arises from the solidary organs not being in sufficient contact or sufficiently prolonged. This contact is the normal state. When the division of labour is normal, it does not confine the individual in a task without giving him a glimpse of anything outside it.

Chapter 2 : What are the Advantages of Division of Labour?

Marx on the Capitalist Division of Labour and its Overcoming in Capital 1 Marx envisions communism as a democratically planned society that replaces both capitalism and the state. In addition to being democratically structured and planned, a communist society, on Marx's view, must also do away with.

Marxism, Work, and Human Nature Marxism as a philosophy of human nature stresses the centrality of work in the creation of human nature itself and human self-understanding see the entry on Marxism. Both the changing historical relations between human work and nature, and the relations of humans to each other in the production and distribution of goods to meet material needs construct human nature differently in different historical periods: Marxism as a philosophy of history and social change highlights the social relations of work in different economic modes of production in its analysis of social inequalities and exploitation, including relations of domination such as racism and sexism. Marx , , ; Marx and Engels , ; Engels Within capitalism, the system they most analyzed, the logic of profit drives the bourgeois class into developing the productive forces of land, labor and capital by expanding markets, turning land into a commodity and forcing the working classes from feudal and independent agrarian production into wage labor. Marx and Engels argue that turning all labor into a commodity to be bought and sold not only alienates workers by taking the power of production away from them, it also collectivizes workers into factories and mass assembly lines. This provides the opportunity for workers to unite against the capitalists and to demand the collectivization of property, i. Women lose power when private property comes into existence as a mode of production. The rise of capitalism, in separating the family household from commodity production, further solidifies this control of men over women in the family when the latter become economic dependents of the former in the male breadwinner-female housewife nuclear family form. Reed , Leacock , Rosaldo and Lamphere Yet other feminist economic historians have done historical studies of the ways that race, class and ethnicity have situated women differently in relation to production, for example in the history of the United States Davis ; Amott and Matthaer Keys represented the difference side, that women are superior humans because of mothering; while Gilman and Goldman took the equality side of the debate, that is, that, women are restricted, and made socially unequal to men, by unpaid housework and mothering[3]. Second Wave Feminist Analyses of Housework In the second wave movement, theorists can be grouped by their theory of how housework oppresses women. Typically, liberal feminists critique housework because it is unpaid. This makes women dependent on men and devalued, since their work is outside the meaningful sphere of public economic production Friedan That the necessary work of reproducing the working class is unpaid allows more profits to capitalists. Some even make this analysis the basis for a demand for wages for housework Dalla Costa ; Federici More recently, Federici has done an analysis of the transition to capitalism in Europe. One of the philosophical problems raised by the housework debate is how to draw the line between work and play or leisure activity when the activity is not paid: If the former, then her hours in such activity may be compared with those of her husband or partner to see if there is an exploitation relation present, for example, if his total hours of productive and reproductive work for the family are less than hers cf. But to the extent that childrearing counts as leisure activity, as play, as activity held to be intrinsically valuable Ferguson , no exploitation is involved. Perhaps childrearing and other caring activity is both work and play, but only that portion which is necessary for the psychological growth of the child and the worker s counts as work. If so, who determines when that line is crossed? Since non-market activity does not have a clear criterion to distinguish work from non-work, nor necessary from non-necessary social labor, an arbitrary element seems to creep in that makes standards of fairness difficult to apply to gendered household bargains between men and women dividing up waged and non-waged work. One solution to this problem is simply to take all household activity that could also be done by waged labor nannies, domestic servants, gardeners, chauffeurs, etc. Or, one can argue that although the line between work and leisure changes historically, those doing the activity should have the decisive say as to whether their activity counts as work, i. Finally, one can argue that since the human care involved in taking care of children and elders creates a public good, it should clearly be characterized as

work, and those who are caretakers, primarily women, should be fairly compensated for it by society or the state Ferguson and Folbre Folbre , Ferguson Patricia Hill Collins argues further that the racial division of labor, institutional racism and different family structures put African American women in yet a different epistemic relation to society than white and other women , Hence our perspectives are so intersectional that they cannot be unified simply by a common relation to work. This involves theorizing a separate system of work relations that organizes and directs human sexuality, nurturance, affection and biological reproduction. While Ferguson and Folbre agree that there is no inevitable fit between capitalism and patriarchy, they argue that there are conflicts, and that the family wage bargain has broken down at present. Walby has a similar analysis, but to her the connection between forms of capitalism and forms of patriarchy is more functional and less accidental than it appears to Ferguson and Smart. Walby argues that there are two different basic forms of patriarchy which emerge in response to the tensions between capitalist economies and patriarchal household economies: Private patriarchy as a form is marked by excluding women from economic and political power while public patriarchy works by segregating women. There is a semi-automatic re-adjustment of the dual systems when the older private father patriarchy based on the patriarchal family is broken down due to the pressures of early industrial capitalism. This is especially notable in the rise of poor single-mother-headed families. However, as it forces more and more women into wage labor, women are given opportunities for some independence from men and the possibility to challenge male dominance and sex segregation in all spheres of social life. The work of feminist sociologist Dorothy Smith has been a notable intervention into the public-private split by bringing into view the institutions and power regimes that regulate the everyday world, their gender subtext, and basis in a gendered division of labor. Legal feminist critics expand on the biopolitics of the patriarchal welfare state, which psychiatrizes as it threatens mothers with the loss of child custody. This represents a new eugenics twist on the enduring mistrust of working-class mothers and casting those who are imprisoned as undeserving parent Guggenheim ; Law African American mothers bear the brunt of punitive and racist family and criminal law Thompson ; Solinger et al. Psychological Theories of Women and Work The socialist-feminist idea that there are two interlocking systems that structure gender and the economy, and thus are jointly responsible for male domination, has been developed in a psychological direction by the psychoanalytic school of feminist theorists. Particularly relevant to the question of women and work are the theories of Mitchell , , Kuhn and Wolpe , Chodorow , , and Ruddick Mothering, or, taking care of babies and small children, as a type of work done overwhelmingly by women, socializes women and men to have different identities, personalities and skills. In a Freudian vein, Mitchell later argues that women learn that they are not full symbolic subjects because compulsory heterosexuality and the incest taboo bar them from meeting either the desire of their mother or any other woman. The sexual division of infant care gives boys, who must learn their masculine identity by separating from their mother and the feminine, a motive for deprecating, as well as dominating, women. On the other side of the debate, Brenner argues that women are not uniformly exploited by men across economic class lines: Hochschild and hooks point out that career women tend to pay working class women to do the second shift work in the home so they can avoid that extra work, and they have an interest in keeping such wages, e. Nancy Fraser and Susan Moller Okin formulate ethical arguments to maintain that a just model of society would have to re-structure work relations so that the unpaid and underpaid caring labor now done primarily by women would be given a status equivalent to other wage labor by various means. Interestingly, the debate between feminist theorists of justice, e. All of these theorists seem to have ideal visions of society which dovetail: Postmodernist Feminist Theory Useful anthologies of the first stage of second wave socialist feminist writings which include discussions of women, class and work from psychological as well as sociological and economic perspectives are Eisenstein , Hansen and Philipson , Hennessy and Ingraham , and Holmstrom Others such as Jaggar and Rothenberg , Tuana and Tong and Herrmann and Stewart include classic socialist feminist analyses in their collections, inviting comparisons of the authors to others grouped under the categories of liberal, radical, psychoanalytic, Marxist, postmodern, postcolonial and multicultural feminisms. Various post-modern critiques of these earlier feminist schools of thought such as post-colonialism as well as deconstruction and post-structuralism challenge the over-generalizations and economic reductionism of many of those constructing feminist theories that fall

under the early categories of liberal, radical, Marxist or socialist feminism cf. Grewal and Kaplan ; Kaplan et al. Others argue that part of the problem is the master narratives of liberalism or Marxism, the first of which sees all domination relations due to traditional hierarchies and undermined by capitalism, thus ignoring the independent effectivity of racism Josephs ; and the second of which ties all domination relations to the structure of contemporary capitalism and ignores the non-capitalist economics contexts in which many women work, even within so-called capitalist economies, such as housework and voluntary community work Gibson-Graham For example, Spivak , Mohanty , Carby , and Hennessy , are creating and re-articulating forms of Marxist and socialist-feminism less susceptible to charges of over-generalization and reductionism, and more compatible with close contextual analysis of the power relations of gender and class as they relate to work. They can be grouped loosely with a tendency called materialist feminism that incorporates some of the methods of deconstruction and post-structuralism Hennessy ; Landry and MacLean Nonetheless strong emphasis on issues of race and ethnicity can be found in their work on women, class and work. For example, Brewer shows that white and African-American working class women are divided by race in the workforce, and that even changes in the occupational structure historically tend to maintain this racial division of labor. Presupposed in the general theoretical debates concerning the relations between gender, social and economic class, and work are usually definitions of each of these categories that some thinkers would argue are problematic. For example, Tokarczyk and Fay have an excellent anthology on working class women in the academy in which various contributors discuss the ambiguous positions in which they find themselves by coming from poor family backgrounds and becoming academics. One problem is whether they are still members of the working class in so doing, and if not, whether they are betraying their families of origin by a rise to middle class status. Another is, whether they have the same status in the academy, as workers, thinkers and women, as those men or women whose families of origin were middle class or above. Rather than provide a standard philosophical definition in terms of necessary and sufficient conditions for membership in the working class, they provide a cluster of characteristics and examples of jobs, such as physically demanding, repetitive and dangerous jobs, jobs that lack autonomy and are generally paid badly. Examples of working class jobs they give are cleaning women, waitresses, lumberjacks, janitors and police officers. They challenge those that would argue that family origin can be overcome by the present position one has in the social division of labor: More recent work in socio-legal studies also has begun to question the limits of intersectional analysis Grabham et al. Furthermore, because such method is identity-focused it will not get at the dimension of class which has been traditionally thought in relational not locational terms , 29” For example, a woman may work on two levels: If in addition her family of origin is professional middle class because, say, her parents were college educated academics , the woman may be seen and see herself as either working class or middle class, depending on whether she and others emphasize her present relations of wage work her individual economic class, which in this case is working class , her household income middle class or her family of origin middle class. Sylvia Walby deals with this ambiguity of economic class as applying to women as unpaid houseworkers by claiming against Delphy that the relevant economic sex classes are those who are housewives vs. Such an identity is usually formed through political organizing and coalitions with other women at her place of employment, in her home and her community. In this sense the concept of sex class is exactly analogous to the concept of a feminist epistemological standpoint: Strategic gender interests, on the contrary, may ally women across otherwise divided economic class interests, since they are those, like rights against physical male violence and reproductive rights, which women have as a sex class to eliminate male domination. Her distinctions, and those of Molyneux, have been changed slightly ” practical vs. Many have pointed out that the concept of class itself is mystified in the U. The Ehrenreichs , in a classic article, argue that this mystification is due to the emergence of a professional-managerial class that has some interests in common with the capitalist class and some with the working class. Whatever its causes, there are empirical studies which show that class distinctions still operate between women, albeit in an indirect way. Barbara Ehrenreich , by adopting the material life conditions of a poor woman, did an empirical study of the lives of women working for minimum wages and found their issues to be quite different from and ignored by middle and upper-class women. Diane Reay does an empirical study of women from manual labor family

backgrounds and their relation to the schooling of their children, and discovers that they use a discourse that acknowledges class differences of educational access and career possibilities, even though it does not specifically define these by class per se. Anarchist Perspectives on Work and its Other So far, it has been assumed that work is an intrinsic good. What if waged or unwaged work itself were to be considered problematic or oppressive? Autonomous Marxists contest that liberal or socialist feminist perspectives have unnecessarily mystified work and have operated with a moralism. Whether one ought to be paid for housework or reproductive labor or seek equal employment opportunities, feminists have not sufficiently opposed the sanctification of work. Championing the refusal of work means to abandon a narrow focus on the critique of the extraction of surplus value or of the process of deskilling. Furthermore, it is imperative to interrogate how work dominates our lives Weeks , Kathi Weeks charges that a productivist bias is common to feminist and Marxist analysis. The Wages for Housework campaign demanded purposefully the impossible. These feminists did not only ask for compensation for unpaid domestic labor, but also postulated the end of such work Federici Post-work also means post-domestic care, something that gets lost in some of the ethic of care analysis, which inadvertently fosters a romantic attachment to endowing meaning to such work. A post-work ethic entails a playful commitment to leisure and unstructured activities such as day-dreaming. By ignoring the liberatory power of play, Weeks insufficiently engages the meaning of work and the asceticism of the work ethic Trullinger , Punitive Perspectives on Work and Non-Work While it is reasonable to champion daydreams and play as intrinsic goods, idle time itself is often not felt as a good or luxury, but instead a psychic imposition. Imprisonment is anathema to indigenous, socio-centric peoples in the Global South, and imprisonment is closely connected to the disciplinary apparatus of western colonization of the Americas and Africa Nagel Day-dreaming in a solitary cell becomes positively dangerous and suicides and mental illness increase exponentially Casella et al. In the US, poor children of color, especially Black, Latino, and American Indians living on reservations, are at higher risk of being taken away from their kin and carers and turned over to the foster care system Goldberg The world over, parents who are socially displaced such as Romanian immigrants in Norway, are under greater scrutiny by state actors, e.

Chapter 3 : 10 Major Demerits of Division of Labour

This means the division of labor within a particular enterprise. Thus within a factory there are weavers, spinners, designers, accountants, managers and engineers. The work may be divided into complete tasks like spinning, weaving, bleaching, designing, finishing etc. or it may be divided into.

Social consequence of division of labour are as follows: Division of labour is concomitant to every production system. In simple terms, it implies the diversity of roles within an enterprise and is applicable to all the factors of production. It is termed as the specialisation of workers in particular parts or operations of a production process. Division of labour means the diversity of roles within the same enterprise, applicable to all the factors of production, necessitated by so many causes such as geography, training, physical strength, type of product and technology. The rapid increase in knowledge, scientific advancement and capital intensive technique production have enabled individuals to specialise in a specific branch of learning. This involves social division of labour. Division of labour may be defined as a specialisation of persons in particular activities. It may be simple or complex. When work within the same occupation is further subdivided into processes, each person being allotted a particular process, we have what is called complex division of labour. In modern industrial society the division of labour is complicated one. A simple division of labour exists in all societies. It is to some extent natural. Division of labour in industrial society is extensive due to minute roles that technology necessitates to be performed. The functions conferred on workers are specific either on the basis of his qualification or these become specific as he grows in his job. The degree of specialisation, its minute form and its extensive nature has made division of labour a peculiarity of the industrial culture. It has come to be a subject of great interest. According to Durkheim, in modern societies the division of labor is the principal source of social cohesion or social solidarity. He distinguished two types of solidarity – mechanical and organic. When division of labour becomes great it leads to specialisation of labour and the disappearance of mental and moral homogeneity of individuals. Social Consequences of Division of Labour: No modern society can work without the division of labour. It is an inevitable feature of the modern industrial system. The following are the merits of the division of labour. While analysing the social functions of division of labour, Durkheim sought to show that in modern societies the division of labour is the principal source of social cohesion or solidarity. He visualised the modern society as the society of organic solidarity. Division of labour involves diversification of roles and thereby an opportunity of life style is offered. It ensures growth of individuality and individual potential. It negates the necessity of a repressive law, since it strengthens solidarity and collectivity. Members of the society develop a strong sense of interdependence. By fostering regular contacts between labour and capital, the danger of economic and social disintegration can be stalled. Division of labour has necessitated extensive training of the workers and thus, get right type of job. It promises full career opportunities to the worker. But under capitalism, the division of labour has a dehumanising influence. Marx was more critical of concept of division of labour. Durkheim also expressed demerits of division of labour. He points out that division of labour may diminish rather than promote social cohesion in modern industrial societies. The forced division of labour refers to a condition in which individuals do not freely choose their occupation but are forced into them. Hence, there rise class conflicts. According to Karl Marx following are the important defects of the division of labour: A worker has no choice in the selection of jobs. A worker works not because he derives any job satisfaction from the work, but because he has to maintain himself. It is very difficult to determine the contribution made by a worker in the productive process and hence, his work is never estimated. He is paid for less than he produces. It has generated numerous industrial and social evils. It has been responsible for breeding industrial unrest. It increases the risk of unemployment. Capitalistic tendencies were nourished through division of labour leading to the division of society into two extremely antagonistic classes, posing serious challenges to social organisation and normal life. Division of labour play a crucial role in the development of different socio-economic systems and in producing social stratification. It has produced the process of alienation. The worker is alienated to the extent that the prerogative and the means of decision are expropriated by the ruling entrepreneurs. That is why the work is external to the worker – he

does not fulfil himself in his work but denies himself – the worker therefore feels himself at home during his leisure, whereas at work he feels himself homeless. His work is not voluntary but imposed. To conclude, capitalism which stimulated and sustained division of labour, caused social disorganisation. Durkheim developed this aspect fully. Division of labour thus affected the traditional society. There was great concern over the destructive impact of industrialisation and division of labour. The division of labour and the possession of different scarce goods by individuals and group make exchange necessary for higher level of efficiency in production. Exchange implies to give or take in return for another thing. It is based on reciprocal satisfaction. It is an incentive to social interaction. Essence of exchange is value return. It is natural link in the production consumption chain. It has remained so since the primitive local barter era to our own expanding economies and international trade. Exchange is found in every economy, even the most primitive. There has always been group interdependence. With growing economic complexities the exchange circle has ever been expanding. There are six possible kind of exchange: There is a wide variety of ways in which exchange takes place. In every society, institutions regulating exchange are just important as part of an economy as are the institutions of property and the division of labour. It has a regulatory system of its own. Johnson has discussed types of exchange as under: Distinction may be made between direct and indirect exchange. There are several forms of each. Four forms of direct exchange are barter, administered trade, exchange with the use of money without fixed prices and money barter. Barter is an exchange of service for service, good for service and goods for goods. Barter was the important system of exchange before currency came into vogue. It involves bargaining and haggling, unless the exchange is determined by norms or custom. Use of Money, without fixed prices: This is a type of exchange in which prices are determined, in principle, by competition among sellers on the one hand and among buyers on the other. This is so because in almost all actual markets there are monopolistic elements which restrict, more or less, the play of competition. In this form of direct exchange, some commodity – that is, some intrinsically valuable good – also serves as a medium of exchange, with fairly well recognised equivalence, by number or weight or quality, to many other commodities. Money barter is commonly practiced along with ordinary barter; it merely facilitates exchange persons with different wants. There are many transitions. In functional terms, money is anything that is widely used in the following ways: As medium of exchange. This is one of the most important use of money. As a standard of value. There are cases in which accounts are kept in terms of some recognised unit even though there is no tangible medium of exchange. As a means of payment. Payment is involved not only in exchange but also in fines. As a store of value. In this context, H. Johnson has discussed only two, gift exchange and redistribution. Gift exchange is probably the most common form of exchange among primitive people. One party to the exchange ostensibly makes a pure gift, of goods or services, to the other without any explicit bargaining or agreement concerning a return benefit. Exchange is most genuinely economic; when each party to a transaction acquires something he wants and cannot easily provide otherwise for himself. If economic exchange is primarily integrative, it symbolises friendly attitude and cements a social relationship. Indirectly, however, ceremonial gift exchange does have an economic functions.

Chapter 4 : Division of Labour: Meaning, Forms and Advantages | Economics

The Division of Labor in Society was a seminal contribution to the sociology of law and morality, and remains a sociological "classic" by any standards. By the same standards, however, it also contains undeniable shortcomings which have limited its appeal to modern sociologists.

Workers will require less training to be an efficient worker. Therefore this will lead to an increase in labour productivity and firms will be able to benefit from economies of scale lower average costs with increased output and increased efficiency. Examples of specialisation and division of labour In the process of producing cars, there will be a high degree of labour specialisation. Some workers will design the cars Some will work on testing cars Some will work on marketing. Some workers will work on different sections of the assembly line. Their job may be highly specific such as putting on tyres e. Specialisation within economies Specialisation can also mean that individual countries can produce certain goods that they are best at producing and then exchange them with other countries. The theory of comparative advantage states countries should specialise in producing those goods where they have a lower opportunity cost relatively best at producing Specialisation requires trade. Specialisation and trade mean that countries that produce no oil can consume oil products and countries with large reserves of raw materials can export them in exchange for other goods that they need. This helps reduce the problem of scarcity in individual countries and enables countries PPF to shift outwards. If there is increased trade there will also be increased competition. This means that domestic monopolies will now face competition from abroad, therefore, they have increased incentives to cut prices and be efficient. Problems of specialisation in production However, there are problems of specialisation. Firstly if workers do specific tasks, it may become boring and their productivity may fall as a result. High levels of specialisation could lead to possible diseconomies of scale. If an assembly line becomes highly specialised, production could be brought to a halt if there is a blockage in one area. It can be beneficial if there are more people specialised in different aspects. Problems of specialisation in trade In terms of trade, poor countries may be encouraged to use up their non-renewable resources to sell to developing countries, therefore in the long term we could run out of non-renewable resources. Over specialisation in one country can lead to countries becoming over dependent on one particular commodity, e. Some primary products have quite a low income elasticity of demand. Critics of free trade argue that with increased specialisation there will be intense competition to cut costs and therefore wages will have to fall. However, this point is not necessarily true because firms can compete by producing capital-intensive goods with better technology.

Chapter 5 : Social Consequences of Division of Labour | Sociology

In this article we will discuss about the definition of division of labour. Also learn about its drawbacks and disadvantages. The modern age is the age of large-scale industries and businesses.

Well then, how will our state supply these needs? It will need a farmer, a builder, and a weaver, and also, I think, a shoemaker and one or two others to provide for our bodily needs. So that the minimum state would consist of four or five men Silvermintz notes that, "Historians of economic thought credit Plato, primarily on account of arguments advanced in his Republic, as an early proponent of the division of labour. Just as the various trades are most highly developed in large cities, in the same way food at the palace is prepared in a far superior manner. In small towns the same man makes couches, doors, ploughs and tables, and often he even builds houses, and still he is thankful if only he can find enough work to support himself. And it is impossible for a man of many trades to do all of them well. In large cities, however, because many make demands on each trade, one alone is enough to support a man, and often less than one: In his Muqaddimah , he states: The power of the individual human being is not sufficient for him to obtain the food he needs, and does not provide him with as much as he requires to live. Even if we assume an absolute minimum of food Thus, he cannot do without a combination of many powers from among his fellow beings, if he is to obtain food for himself and for them. Through cooperation, the needs of a number of persons, many times greater than their own number, can be satisfied. Classically the workers in a shipyard would build ships as units, finishing one before starting another. But the Dutch had it organized with several teams each doing the same tasks for successive ships. People with a particular task to do must have discovered new methods that were only later observed and justified by writers on political economy. Petty also applied the principle to his survey of Ireland. His breakthrough was to divide up the work so that large parts of it could be done by people with no extensive training. Bernard de Mandeville[edit] Bernard de Mandeville discusses the matter in the second volume of The Fable of the Bees But if one will wholly apply himself to the making of Bows and Arrows, whilst another provides Food, a third builds Huts, a fourth makes Garments, and a fifth Utensils, they not only become useful to one another, but the Callings and Employments themselves will in the same Number of Years receive much greater Improvements, than if all had been promiscuously followed by every one of the Five. David Hume[edit] When every individual person labors apart, and only for himself, his force is too small to execute any considerable work; his labor being employed in supplying all his different necessities, he never attains a perfection in any particular art; and as his force and success are not at all times equal, the least failure in either of these particulars must be attended with inevitable ruin and misery. Society provides a remedy for these three inconveniences. By the conjunction of forces, our power is augmented: By the partition of employments, our ability increases: And by mutual succor we are less exposed to fortune and accidents. We are going to go through these operations in a few words to stimulate the curiosity to know their detail; this enumeration will supply as many articles which will make the division of this work. Adam Smith[edit] In the first sentence of An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations , Adam Smith foresaw the essence of industrialism by determining that division of labour represents a substantial increase in productivity. Like du Monceau, his example was the making of pins. Unlike Plato , Smith famously argued that the difference between a street porter and a philosopher was as much a consequence of the division of labour as its cause. Therefore, while for Plato the level of specialization determined by the division of labour was externally determined, for Smith it was the dynamic engine of economic progress. However, in a further chapter of the same book Smith criticizes the division of labour saying it can lead to "the almost entire corruption and degeneracy of the great body of the people. Smith saw the importance of matching skills with equipment " usually in the context of an organization. For example, pin makers were organized with one making the head, another the body, each using different equipment. Similarly he emphasised a large number of skills, used in cooperation and with suitable equipment, were required to build a ship. In modern economic discussion, the term human capital would be used. Babbage wrote a seminal work "On the Economy of Machinery and Manufactures" analyzing perhaps for the first time the division of labour in factories. All

crafts, trades and arts have profited from the division of labour; for when each worker sticks to one particular kind of work that needs to be handled differently from all the others, he can do it better and more easily than when one person does everything. Where work is not thus differentiated and divided, where everyone is a jack-of-all-trades, the crafts remain at an utterly primitive level. He described the process as alienation: The worker then becomes "depressed spiritually and physically to the condition of a machine". As the work becomes more specialized, less training is needed for each specific job, and the workforce, overall, is less skilled than if one worker did one job entirely. He also argues that in a communist society, the division of labour is transcended, meaning that balanced human development occurs where people fully express their nature in the variety of creative work that they do. He claimed that the average man in a civilized society is less wealthy, in practice, than one in a "savage" society. Durkheim arrived at the same conclusion regarding the positive effects of the division of labour as his theoretical predecessor, Adam Smith. In *The Wealth of the Nations*, Smith observes the division of labour results in "a proportionable increase of the productive powers of labor. Durkheim hypothesized that the division of labour fosters social solidarity, yielding "a wholly moral phenomenon" that ensures "mutual relationships" among individuals. The main argument here is the economic gains accruing from the division of labour far outweigh the costs. It is argued that it is fully possible to achieve balanced human development within capitalism, and alienation is downplayed as mere romantic fiction. The price system is just one of those formations which man has learned to use though he is still very far from having learned to make the best use of it after he had stumbled upon it without understanding it. Through it not only a division of labour but also a coordinated utilization of resources based on an equally divided knowledge has become possible. The people who like to deride any suggestion that this may be so usually distort the argument by insinuating that it asserts that by some miracle just that sort of system has spontaneously grown up which is best suited to modern civilization. It is the other way round: Had he not done so, he might still have developed some other, altogether different, type of civilization, something like the "state" of the termite ants, or some other altogether unimaginable type. This would mean that countries specialize in the work they can do at the lowest relative cost measured in terms of the opportunity cost of not using resources for other work, compared to the opportunity costs experienced countries. Critics, however, allege that international specialization cannot be explained sufficiently in terms of "the work nations do best", rather this specialization is guided more by commercial criteria, which favour some countries over others. Efficient policies to encourage employment and combat unemployment are essential if countries are to reap the full benefits of globalization and avoid a backlash against open trade. Job losses in some sectors, along with new job opportunities in other sectors, are an inevitable accompaniment of the process of globalization. The challenge is to ensure that the adjustment process involved in matching available workers with new job openings works as smoothly as possible. Few studies have taken place regarding the global division of labour. Information can be drawn from ILO and national statistical offices. The majority of workers in industry and services were wage and salary earners – 58 percent of the industrial workforce and 65 percent of the services workforce. But a big portion were self-employed or involved in family labour. Filmer suggests the total of employees worldwide in the 1980s was about 1 billion, compared with around 2 billion working on own account on the land mainly peasants, and some 1 billion working on own account in industry and services. Agriculture decreased from 1980 to 2000. The industry sector accounted for 25 percent of the workforce. Please help improve this section by adding citations to reliable sources. Unsourced material may be challenged and removed. April 2014. Learn how and when to remove this template message. In the modern world, those specialists most preoccupied in their work with theorizing about the division of labour are those involved in management and organization. In view of the global extremities of the division of labour, the question is often raised about what division of labour would be most ideal, beautiful, efficient and just. Two styles of management that are seen in modern organizations are control and commitment, control being the division of labour style of the past and commitment being the style of the future. Control management is based on the principles of job specialization and the division of labour. This is the assembly line style of job specialization where employees are given a very narrow set of tasks or one specific task. Commitment division of labour is oriented on including the employee and building a level of internal commitment towards accomplishing tasks. Tasks include more responsibility and are coordinated

based on expertise rather than formal position. However, disadvantages of job specialization included limited employee skill, a dependence on entire department fluency, and employee discontent with repetitious tasks. Labour hierarchy is a very common feature of the modern workplace structure, but of course the way these hierarchies are structured can be influenced by a variety of different factors. Size, cost, and the development of new technology are factors that have influenced job specialization structures in the modern workplace. The cost of job specialization is what limits small organizations from dividing their labour responsibilities, but as organizations increase in size there is a correlation in the rise of division of labour. Technological developments have led to a decrease in the amount of job specialization in organizations as new technology makes it easier for fewer employees to accomplish a variety of tasks and still enhance production. New technology has also been supportive in the flow of information between departments helping to reduce the feeling of department isolation. This important concept of meritocracy could be read as an explanation or as a justification of why a division of labour is the way it is. In general, in capitalist economies, such things are not decided consciously. This does not present a problem,[citation needed] as the only requirement of a capitalist system is that you turn a profit. Limitations[edit] Adam Smith famously said in *The Wealth of Nations* that the division of labour is limited by the extent of the market. This is because it is by exchange that each person can be specialized in their work and yet still have access to a wide range of goods and services. Hence, reductions in barriers to exchange lead to increases in the division of labour and so help to drive economic growth. Limitations to the division of labour have also been related to coordination and transportation costs. Hence, a Taylorist approach to work design contributed to worsened industrial relations. There are also limitations to the division of labour and the division of work that result from work-flow variations and uncertainties. For instance, one stage of a production process may temporarily work at a slower pace, forcing other stages to slow down. One answer to this is to make some portion of resources mobile between stages, so that those resources must be capable of undertaking a wider range of tasks. Another is to consolidate tasks so that they are undertaken one after another by the same workers and other resources. Stocks between stages can also help to reduce the problem to some extent but are costly and can hamper quality control. Note also that modern flexible manufacturing systems require both flexible machines and flexible workers. In project-based work, the coordination of resources is a difficult issue for the project manager as project schedules and resulting resource bookings are based on estimates of task durations and so are subject to subsequent revisions. Again, consolidating tasks so that they are undertaken consecutively by the same resources and having resources available that can be called on at short-notice from other tasks can help to reduce such problems, though at the cost of reduced specialisation. There are also advantages in a reduced division of labour where knowledge would otherwise have to be transferred between stages. It is also likely to result in the query being handled faster due to the elimination of delays in passing the query between different people. Gendered division of labour[edit] Main articles:

Chapter 6 : Division of Labour: Meaning, Forms, Merits, Demerits and Division

The division of labour is the separation of tasks in any system so that participants may specialize. Individuals, organizations, and nations are endowed with or acquire specialized capabilities and either form combinations or trade to take advantage of the capabilities of others in addition to their own.

Read this article to learn about the division of labour: Division of labour first originated from the division of workers in different occupations. Now, when the production is done on a large scale with the help of heavy machines, it is split up into a number of processes and many people join to produce an article. It is called the division of labour. For instance, in a large scale readymade garment factory, a man does cutting of cloth, the second man stitches clothes with machines, the third buttons, the fourth makes folding and packing, etc. This way of doing the work is called division of labour because different workers are engaged in performing different parts of production. Production has become so technical and complex that different workers are put to different tasks according to their capacity and ability. One becomes specialised in the production of those goods for which he or she is best suited. Different workers perform different parts of production on the basis of their specialisation. The result is that goods come to the final shape with the cooperation of many workers. Thus, division of labour means that the main process of production is split up into many simple parts and each part is taken up by different workers who are specialised in the production of that specific part.

Forms of Division of Labour: The division of labour has been divided into different forms by the economists which can be explained as follows:

Simple Division of Labour: When the production is split up into different parts and many workers come together to complete the work, but the contribution of each worker cannot be known, it is called simple division of labour. For example, when many persons carry a huge log of wood, it is difficult to assign how much labour has been contributed by an individual worker. It is simple division of labour.

Complex Division of Labour: When the production is split up into different parts and each part is performed by different workers who have specialised in it, it is called complex division of labour. For example, in a shoe factory one worker makes the upper portion, the second one prepares the soles, the third one stitches them, the fourth one polishes them, and so on. In this way, shoes are manufactured. It is a case of complex division of labour.

Occupational Division of Labour: When the production of a commodity becomes the occupation of the worker, it is called occupational division of labour. Thus, the production of different goods has created different occupations. The caste system in India is perhaps the best example of the occupational division of labour. The work of farmers, cobblers, carpenters, weavers and blacksmiths is known as occupational division of labour.

Geographical or Territorial Division of Labour: Sometimes, due to different reasons, the production of goods is concentrated at a particular, place, state or country. This particular type of division of labour comes into being when the workers or factories having specialised in the production of a particular commodity are found at a particular place. That place may be the most suitable geographically for the production of that commodity. This is called the geographical or territorial division of labour. For example, Assam has specialised in the production of tea, whereas the textile industry is localised in Mumbai and the jute production in West Bengal.

Merits and Demerits of Division of Labour: Division of labour possesses the following merits and demerits:

Division of labour has the following merits:

With the adoption of division of labour, the total production increases. Adam Smith has explained the advantage of division of labour with the help of an example that a worker can produce only 20 pins daily. If the making of pins in a modern factory is divided into 18 processes, then 18 workers can produce 48, pins in a single day.

Increase in Efficiency of Labour: With division of labour, a worker has to do the same work time and again, and he gets specialisation in it. In this way, the division of labour leads to a great increase in efficiency.

Division of labour contributes to the development of skill, because with the repetition of the same work, he becomes specialised in it. This specialisation enables him to do the work in the best possible way, which improves his skill.

Increase in Mobility of Labour: Division of labour facilitates greater mobility of labour. In it, the production is split up into different parts and a worker becomes trained in that very specific task in the production of the commodity which he performs time and again. He becomes professional, which leads to the occupational mobility. On the

other hand, division of labour implies a large-scale production and labourers come to work from far and near. Thus, it increases geographical mobility of labour. Increase in Use of Machines: The division of labour is the result of the large-scale production, which implies more use of machines. On the other hand, the division of labour increases the possibility of the use of machines in the small-scale production also. Therefore, in modern times the use of machines is increasing continuously due to the increase in the division of labour. Increase in Employment Opportunities: Division of labour leads to the diversity of occupations which further leads to the employment opportunities. On the other hand, the scale of production being large, the number of employment opportunities also increases. Work According to Taste: Workers have their own taste in production. For example, a person can take up that type of job for which he considers himself to be the most suitable and which is in accordance with his taste. Division of labour extends the work to such an extent that every person can find work according to his taste and interest. Division of labour splits up the production work in small processes and different persons can work at different places with the help of machines. Certain machines can be operated with the help of hands only and others with the help of foot as well. Therefore, the disabled persons can also find work according to their suitability. Best Use of Tools: In this system, it is not necessary to provide each worker with a complete set of tools. He needs a few tools only for the job in which he can make their best use. Therefore, the continuous use of tools is possible which are used at different stages. Best Selection of the Workers: Division of labour helps the employers in the best selection of workers. As the work is divided into different parts and each part is taken up by such a worker who is more suitable for it, the employer can select very easily the man who is best suited for the work. Saving of Capital and Tools: Division of labour helps in the saving of capital and tools. It is not essential to provide a complete set of tools to every worker. He needs a few tools only for the job he has to do. Thus there is the saving of tools as well as capital. For instance, if a tailor stitches the shirt, he requires a sewing machine, scissors, etc. But on the basis of division of labour, one can do the cutting and the other can stitch the clothes. In this way, two tailors can work with the help of one pair of scissors and one machine only. Goods of Superior Quality: Division of labour is beneficial in making goods of superior quality. When the worker is entrusted with the work for which he is best suited, he will produce superior quality goods. There is no need for the worker to shift from one process to another. He is employed in a definite process with certain tools. He, therefore, goes on working without loss of time, sitting at one place. Continuity in work also saves time and helps in more production at less cost. Right Man at the Right Job: Division of labour implies splitting up of production into a number of processes. Each person is given the job for which he is best suited. There will be no round pegs in square holes. In this way, a right man is placed at the right job. Reduction in the Cost of Production: If a shoe-maker makes himself two pairs of shoes daily, then four shoe-makers can make more than eighth pairs of shoes if they work in cooperation with each other. In this way, division of labour increases production which reduces the average cost of production. Saving of capital, tools and machinery, etc. Division of labour helps in mass production. Thus production becomes less expensive and more economical. Therefore, cheaper goods are turned out, which improve the standard of living of the people. Saving of Time and Expenses in Training:

Chapter 7 : Division of Labour: Meaning, Types and Advantages| Economics

Division of labour first originated from the division of workers in different occupations. Now, when the production is done on a large scale with the help of heavy machines, it is split up into a number of processes and many people join to produce an article.

Now when the manufacture is done on a large scale with the help of heavy machines, it is split up into a number of procedure and many people join to produce an article. It is called the division of labour. For instance, in a large scale readymade garment factory, a man does cutting of cloth, the second man stitches clothes with machines, the third buttons, the fourth, makes folding and packing etc. In the words of Watson, "Manufacture by division of labour consists in splitting up the productive procedure into its component parts. Complex Division of Labour - Where the manufacture is split up into diverse parts and each part is executed by diverse workers who have expert in it, it is called complex division of labour. Occupational Division of Labour - When the manufacture of an article becomes the job opportunity of the worker, it is called job occupational division of labour. Thus the manufacture of diverse goods has shaped diverse job opportunities. Geographical or Territorial Division of Labour - Sometimes due to diverse reasons, the manufacture of goods is focused at an exacting place, state or nation. This specific type of division of labour comes into being when the workers or factories having expert in the manufacture of specific article are found at a specific place. That place may be the most appropriate geographically for the manufacture of that article. Merits and Demerits Merits Augment in Manufacture - With the adoption of division of labour, the total manufacture augments. Adam Smith has explained in his work the advantage of division of labour. Augment in Efficiency of Labour - With such division, a worker has to do the same work time and again and he gets specialisation in it. It is in this way, the division of labour leads to a great augment in efficiency. Augment in Skill - Division of labour supplies to the development of skill, for the reason that with the recurrence of the same work, he becomes expert in it. This specialisation facilitates him to do the work in the best possible way, which improves his skill. Augment in use of machines - The division of labour is the result of the large scale manufacture, which entails more use of machines. Alternatively, the division of labour augments the opportunity of the use of machines in the small scale manufacture also. Augment in employment Opportunities - Division of labour guides to the diversity of job opportunities which further leads to the employment opportunities. Alternatively, the scale of manufacture being large, the number of employment opportunities also augments. Works according to taste - Workers have their own liking in manufacture. For instance, a person can take up that type of job for which he regards to be the most appropriate and which is in accord with his taste. Work for Disable - Division of labour splits up the manufacture work in small procedures and diverse persons can work at diverse places with the help of machines. Definite machines can be functioned with the help of hands only others with the help of foot as well. Hence disabled persons can also find jobs according to their appropriateness. Best use of Tools - In this system, it is not indispensable to provide each worker with an entire set of tools. He requires a few tools only for the job in which he can make their best use. Best selection of workers - Division of labour helps the employers in the best selection of workers. As the work is divided into diverse parts and each part is taken up by such a worker who is more appropriate for it, the employer can select very easily the man who is best suited for the worker. Saving of Capital and Tools - Division of labour helps in the saving of capital and tools. It is not vital to provide an entire set of tools to every worker. He requires a few tools only for the job he has to do. Thus there is the saving of tools as well as capital. Goods of superior Quality - Division of labour is advantageous in making goods of better quality. When the worker is delegated with the work for which he is best suited he will produce better quality goods. Spirit of Co-operation among workers - Division of labour gives opportunity of working under the same roof and with the co-operation of each other. It also gives rise to the feeling of co-operation and trade unionism in their daily lives. Development of International Trade - Division of labour enhances the tendency of specialisation not only in the workers or industries, but in diverse nations also. On the basis of specialisation, every nation produces only those goods in which it has a relative advantage and imports such goods from those nations which have also greater relative advantage. Hence

division of labour is advantageous for the development of overseas trade also. Demerits Monotony - Under Division of Labour, a worker has to do the same job time and again for years together. Hence after some time the worker feels uninterested or the work becomes infuriating and tedious. There remains no happiness or pleasure in the job for him. Loss of joy - In the absence of division of labour, he feels a lot of pleasure on the successful completion of his goods. But under division of labour, nobody can claim the credit of making it. The work gives him neither pride nor pleasure. Hence, there is total loss of joy, happiness and interest in the work. Loss of responsibility - Many workers joins hands to produce an article. If the manufacture is not good and adequate none can be held accountable for it. Augmentd Dependence - When the manufacture is split up into a number of procedures and each part is performed by diverse workers, it may lead to over dependence. For instance, in the case of a readymade garments factory, if the man cutting cloth is lazy, the work of stitching, buttoning etc. Danger of Un-employment - This is another disadvantage. When the worker makes a small part of goods he gets expert in it and he does not have entire knowledge of the manufacture of goods. Danger of Over Manufacture - Over manufacture means the supply of manufacture is relatively more than its demand in the market. For the reason that of the division of labour when manufacture is done on a large scale, the demand for manufacture lags much after its augmented supply. Such circumstances create over manufacture which is very detrimental for the producers as well as for the workers when they become unemployed. Exploitation of labour - Division of labour is apprehensive with large scale manufacture in big factories which are owned by the capitalists. No poor worker can pay for to start his own manufacture. Hence, they have to seek employment in big factories of the capitalists. These employers pay fewer wages to them as matched up to to their marginal productivity. Evils of Factory system - The modern industrial or factory system has been developed as a result of the division of labour. The system further gives rise to the evils like dense population, pollution, bad habits of gambling, alcoholic, low standard of living, poor food clothes and housing etc. Industrial Disputes - The industrial dispute mean strikes by workers, closure of factory etc. Division of labour results in the division of society into workers and employers. The employers always try to augment his profits by exploiting or to make them augment their wages. We have the best tutors in Economics in the industry. Our tutors can break down a complex Division of Labour and Machinery problem into its sub parts and explain to you in detail how each step is performed. This approach of breaking down a problem has been appreciated by majority of our students for learning Division of Labour and Machinery concepts. You will get one-to-one personalized attention through our online tutoring which will make learning fun and easy. Our tutors are highly qualified and hold advanced degrees. Please do send us a request for Division of Labour and Machinery tutoring and experience the quality yourself. If you are stuck with an Forms of Division of Labour, Merits and Demerits Homework problem and need help, we have excellent tutors who can provide you with Homework Help. Our tutors have many years of industry experience and have had years of experience providing Forms of Division of Labour, Merits and Demerits Homework Help. Please do send us the Forms of Division of Labour, Merits and Demerits problems on which you need help and we will forward then to our tutors for review. Other topics under Production Theory:

Chapter 8 : ANOMIC DIVISION OF LABOUR is based on power and status.

Division of labor combines specialization and the partition of a complex production task into several, or many, sub-tasks. Its importance in economics lies in the fact that a given number of workers can produce far more output using division of labor compared to the same number of workers each working alone.

In this article we will discuss about the definition of division of labour. Also learn about its drawbacks and disadvantages. The modern age is the age of large-scale industries and businesses. Though the bigger is not always the better and bigger does not always become the biggest, trend towards the bigger "the larger" is much too pronounced. As a matter of fact, if small-scale enterprises had retained the fields of industry and commerce, single ownership firms, partnership firms and cooperative societies would have been the main forms of business organisation "not joint stock companies and State enterprises. In that case, joint stock companies and State management would not have come into prominence. We now discuss scale of production and its two primary factors, i. Meaning and Definition of Division of Labour: Perhaps the most interesting and important feature of production in a modern economy is the fact that a worker never makes a complete product, however simple it might be. The food that we eat, the cars that we drive, the clothes and shoes we wear, the furniture we use are all made by the labour of other people. The fact is that workers specialise. Each worker makes a very small contribution to the production of some commodity or the provision of some service. This is the essence of the concept of division of labour. It refers to the fact that the production process is divided split into a very large number of individual operations and each operation is the special task of a single worker. A visit to a modern factory such as an automobile assembly plant shows that the principle of division of labour is now carried to remarkable lengths. Even in small workshops producing nuts and bolts, the production process may be broken down into several separate processes. In Adam Smith gave a simple example of specialisation which has by now become the most celebrated account of specialisation. Adam Smith pointed out that division of labour was an important source of efficiency in the economy. He cited the example of pin manufacturing in this context. To explain the workings of the division of labour, he described a factory making pins. On a visit to a factory making a very simple item, viz. The important business of making pins is, in this manner, divided into about 18 distinct operations. Adam Smith estimated that production per day in this factory was about 5, pins per worker. He estimated that if the whole operation had been carried out from start to finish by the same worker, he would have been able to make only a few dozen each day. If making a pin can be split into eighteen separate processes, each being done by a different worker, then it is obvious that making something as complicated as a car would involve thousands of different processes. Five Types of Division of Labour: A glance over any modern industrial organisation reveals distinctly that it is based on specialisation. The division of labour is not a quaint practice of eighteenth century pin factories; it is a fundamental principle of economic organisation. Specialisation or division of labour denotes the limiting of the range of activities within a particular field. Under specialisation or division of labour, a particular work is divided into several processes, and a separate group of labourers is employed for each and every process. There are at least five different types of division of labour: Different countries specialise in the production of different commodities in which they enjoy certain advantages. And international trade is based on international division of labour and specialisation. There are several reasons why the division of labour is such an efficient way of producing goods and services. Products can be produced at low cost. This is because specialist workers can be employed who are obviously far quicker and more skilful at their jobs than a worker who tries to do all the tasks by him or herself. A specialist worker is also less likely to lose time moving between jobs. A pin worker who makes and packs pins is going to have to move between a pin-making machine and a packing table. This movement wastes time compared to a situation where workers specialise in each task. Less time and effort are also needed to train workers. Special tools can be developed to help with the production of part of the finished product. These tools will also be in far greater use than in a situation where each worker had to have his or her own set of tools, which for most of the time would lie idle. The division of labour is also efficient because it is only by sharing and cooperating that complex modern products

can be created and produced. No individual, for instance, could alone have produced a pocket calculator, or a television set or a modern office block. Some advantages of division of labour are easily understandable: Great development in the fields of industry and commerce has been made possible by division of labour. For example, steam engines are manufactured by a large number of persons, each doing a little bit. Therefore, the total output of steam engines has increased enormously. Secondly, division of labour leads to great increases in the productivity of labour. As Adam Smith pointed out long ago, no man is equally efficient in all lines of production. Under a system of division of labour a man can adopt the profession or occupation for which he has an aptitude. In such an occupation he can produce more. Increase in skill and dexterity: Thirdly, division of labour increases the skill and dexterity of the labourer. Under this system a man does the same thing repeatedly for a long time. Constant practice increases his skill. With experience he becomes an expert in his chosen line. Thus, specialisation not only saves time, it saves skill as well. Fourthly, division of labour saves time. Change from one job to another and thus putting down one set of tools and picking up another or moving from one place to another involves loss of time. Division of labour confines a man to one job in one place. Hence, there is a saving of time. Time is also saved in the training of operatives. A worker can be trained very quickly for the performance of a single operation. More use of machinery: Fifthly, division of labour leads to the use of more machinery. With extreme division of labour, the duties of individual labourers become more and more simplified. A time soon comes when a machine is invented to do the work formerly done by a human being. It is no doubt very difficult, for example, to produce a machine which would carry out the whole process of making a chair. But, once the job has been reduced to a series of separate tasks operations, it becomes quite easy to use electric saws, planing machines, power-driven lathes, etc. Cheaper goods and higher wages: Finally, as a result of various advantages, the cost of production declines. More goods are available to the consumers at cheaper prices. The wage rate also tends to rise, because each labourer produces more. There are also some disadvantages of division of labour: First, division of labour when carried to extreme lengths makes work dull and monotonous. A man, who has to do the same thing throughout the day, finds no pleasure in his job. A worker gets hardly any opportunity to exercise initiative, judgment, manual skill or responsibility. Most specialised workers find their jobs rather frustrating. Specialisation, carried to a great length, creates monotony and boredom. A change from one task to another has a soothing effect on the mind. A too narrowly specialised worker does not get the chance of such relaxation. Due to technological progress i. So, an average worker is denied the psychic satisfaction of making something or enjoy the pride in creation. Thirdly, a specialised worker is an expert only in his own line of work. If, for any reason, he loses his job, he finds it difficult to get another. To put it differently, specialisation means that the workers lack marketable skills since they do not have the wide industrial training which would make them adaptable to changes in the techniques of production. This simply means that their specialised functions can become obsolete when new machines are invented and their particular skills become useless elsewhere. Hence, there is a danger of unemployment in a rapidly changing world. Most modern systems of production are based on a number of different but interrelated processes and sub-processes. This is the danger of over-specialisation. We may illustrate the point by taking the example of the publishing industry. If the offset printing machine is out of order for a couple of days, virtually all other processes will become useless. The binders and sales people will have to sit idle for even a week. A specialised worker is not self-sufficient. He has to depend on others for the fulfilment of his needs. Thus, a blacksmith depends on the farmer for his food and the farmer in his turn depends on the blacksmith for his tools. Without such cooperation, conscious or unconscious, production comes to a halt and division of labour becomes useless. Extent of the market:

Chapter 9 : What are the advantages and disadvantages of division of labor?

Division of Labour results in the division of society into workers and employers. The employer always tries to increase his profits by exploiting the workers and workers from trade unions against the employees to put an end to their exploitation or to make them increase their wages.

Paul Raekstad Marx on the Capitalist Division of Labour and its Overcoming in Capital1 Marx envisions communism as a democratically planned society that replaces both capitalism and the state. I argue that communism, as Marx conceives of it, requires an end to hierarchical divisions of labour in order to be a plausible vision of a free and non-hierarchical society democratically managed by and for the associated producers. Although Michels and Weber do give convincing arguments that hierarchical divisions of labour result in de facto minority rule " which Marx agrees with " they fail to show that it is impossible to overcome. I would like to thanks all the other participants for their thoughtful comments and useful feedback. German Ideology, Part 1 and Selections from Parts 2 and 3. Foundations of a Critique of Political Economy. My discussion will move through all three, respectively. Just as at first the capitalist is relieved from actual labour as soon as his capital has reached that minimum amount with which capitalist production, properly speaking, first begins, so now he hands over the work of direct and constant supervision of the individual workers and groups of workers to a special kind of wage-labourer. An industrial army of workers under the command of a capitalist requires, like a real army, officers managers and N. This has a clear effect on the relations of power and domination between workers and capitalists Division of labour within the workshop implies the undisputed authority of the capitalist over men, who are merely the members of a total mechanism which belongs to him. Although this increases the totality of social productive powers, it does so only under the aegis of capital, strengthening its force and control over the people it commands. A Critique of Political Economy. Factory production extends and exacerbates all of this. The separation of the intellectual faculties of the production process from manual labour, and the transformation of those faculties into powers exercised by capital over labour, is, as we have already shown, finally completed by large-scale industry erected on the foundation of machinery. Factory work exhausts the nervous system to the uttermost; at the same time, it does away with the many-sided play of the muscles, and confiscates every atom of freedom, both in bodily and in intellectual activity. Even the lightening of the labour becomes an instrument of torture, since the machine does not free the worker from the work, but rather deprives the work itself of all content. What Marx does want to abolish is all forms of hierarchical division of labour. This means an end to the exclusion of workers from mental and conceptual tasks, from the planning, management, and overseeing of their individual and collective labour, and allowing their work-week or year to consist of any number of specific tasks both within and between industries " subject, of course, to the individual and collective needs of their society, and to their abilities. Why is this important for Marx? Because in any process of deliberation and decision-making regarding the affairs of that workplace this layer of bureaucrats would, inevitably, be the only people with sufficient information, knowledge, and competence to contribute to many vital issues; and this would render everyone else in that workplace critically dependent on them, both for their input and goodwill in deliberation and decision-making and for securing the continued smooth operation of the workplace. Over time this power imbalance would undermine any potential for genuine worker self-management. This problem has been noted numerous times throughout the last century, including not only in various forms of state socialism seen in the various Soviet states, but also in market socialist societies such as in Yugoslavia, and among numerous co-operatives and recuperated factories which failed to take this issue into consideration. Over time, this elite minority gradually monopolises more and more power within any would-be democratic institution, inevitably leading to de facto oligarchy The supposed need for bureaucratic power and control rules out Marxian socialism since it entails that any conscious control over society by the associated producers is impossible. The former route is problematic for methodological reasons: If, on the other hand, we choose also to give up on either large-scale human organisation or modern industry and technology, then the comparative assessment between capitalism and socialism becomes much more problematic. If socialism requires us to give up the

immense productive powers of large-scale social organisation or modern industry and technology, is it still plausible to think that it will compare favourably to capitalism, all things considered? One way of eliminating a hierarchical division of labour in a future socialist society is to replace it with a system of Balanced Jobs

Balanced Jobs are 19 See Michels, Robert. Cambridge University Press, p. An examination of this model as a whole is beyond anything I can venture into here, but for the model, and for Balanced Jobs a. Balanced Job Complexes in particular, see Albert, M. An Essay on Capitalism, Socialism and Revolution. South End Press, The Political Economy of Participatory Economics. Princeton University Press, and Participatory Economics for the Twenty First Century. South End Press, Albert, M. Economic Justice and Democracy: From Competition to Cooperation. Of the People, By the People: The Case for a Participatory Economy. Deltakende demokrati " en socialisme for fremtiden. Marxistisk Tidsskrift 40 3 , pp. Democracy, Socialism, and Human Development: A Realist and Comparative Critique of Capitalism. PhD Thesis, University of Cambridge, pp. First, that everyone in a workplace does both some of the more challenging and rewarding work, as well as some of the heavier and more boring work. Secondly, that tasks and responsibilities that involve critical knowledge and competence about the way that workplace operates are distributed evenly between those who work there. The undoubtedly best argument for Balanced Jobs being possible is the fact that they have actually been implemented in a variety of cooperatives. Some of these are very small indeed; but others are larger. Furthermore, in some cases the balancing has taken some very demanding forms " considerably more demanding than balancing work would be in a normal factory. There are also encouraging historical examples of larger-scale industries experimenting with breaking up the division of labour²⁴, as well as very encouraging contemporary examples from places like the recuperated Zanon-factory in Argentina We should first note that, though common, such arguments almost never come with any real supporting evidence. A common supporting argument is that education is required for certain tasks and ensuring that only a small bureaucracy monopolise them means that only that small minority requires such specialised education, which would be more efficient than the alternative, at least ceteris paribus. This ceteris paribus clause is important here because we can expect countervailing factors influencing the efficiency of workplaces that are worker self-managed. South End Press and also Wright, E. Varieties of Marxist Conceptions of Class Structure. Ours to Master and to Own: In fact, his arguments have recently been re-tooled by Jodi Dean Verso as part of a re-conceptualisation of the role of the party today and to critique any would- be anti-authoritarian and anti-hierarchical Marxist and anarchist currents as inherently unrealistic. These arguments go far beyond the focus of this piece, namely the division of labour, so I leave them aside here. Explanations for these results include the psychological finding that higher autonomy leads to much greater productivity per person and the idea that workers in workplaces have a great deal of knowledge and skill which they are able to utilise much better under various systems of worker management and participation. In one case, due to a government reorganisation, a tomato processing plant was suddenly and unexpectedly left without a manager and increased its production from 90 kg to kg of tomatoes per month The Venezuelan case illustrates three things: However, my argument so far has ignored a common premise of capitalist apologetics which should not be left unexamined, namely the premise that efficiency is a single value-neutral concept. By this I mean not that it is not something which may or may not be valued, but that it is, or is taken to be, something which is neutral with respect to other evaluative commitments like freedom, equality, and human development and flourishing. Efficiency is often construed as the value- neutral comparison between the costs and benefits of inputs and outputs, where one solution is more efficient than another if and only if it has a higher benefit-cost ratio. This presupposes that we have some way of reducing the many qualitatively different inputs and outputs in question to some single quantitative measure, which is usually taken to its monetary value as determined by a real or hypothetical capitalist marketplace. Goods that Marx and many others hold to be important " such as freedom, self-management, and human development " are usually tacitly excluded This exclusion is critical for socialists of all stripes, since once e. In 27 Blinder, A. A Look at the Evidence. See also the meta-study of Doucouliagos, C. Industrial and Labor- Relations Review 49 1 , pp. Historical Materialism 21 4 , pp. In other words, what counts as efficient or not is completely dependent on what we choose to assign value to when we estimate the costs and benefits of inputs and outputs. This is a point that any critical discussion of capitalism and socialism needs to

take into account.