Analyzing the Relationship between the Division of Labor and Total Quality in the Industrial Organization from a Durkheimian Perspective

Dr. Cheddad Abderrahmane
Faculty of Social and Human Sciences, University of Ziane Achour, djelfa - Algeria.
Email : abderrahmane.cheddad@univ-djelfa.dz

Received: 10/04/2025; Revised: 27 /01/2026; Accepted: 05/03/2026

Abstract:

This study examines the relationship between division of labor and Total Quality Management (TQM) in industrial organizations from the sociological perspective of Émile Durkheim. It argues that division of labor is not merely a technical tool for increasing productivity, but a social structure shaping roles, authority, and organizational cohesion. TQM, in contrast, represents a managerial philosophy based on horizontal cooperation, integration, and continuous improvement. The study adopts a descriptive-analytical approach through a review of relevant sociological and managerial literature. Findings indicate that successful TQM implementation depends on balancing specialization with effective coordination among units. Excessive specialization may lead to organizational anomie and weaken quality systems. The study concludes that a balanced integration of labor division and TQM enhances performance and competitiveness in industrial organizations.

Keywords: Division of Labor; Total Quality Management; Organic Solidarity; Anomie; Industrial Organization; Durkheimian Perspective.

The Research Problem:

From a sociological perspective, the division of labor in the industrial organization is more than a rational distribution of tasks; it represents a reproduction of power relations and a complex construction of hierarchies of statuses and roles within the organizational system. This structure, which organizes productive activity, necessarily generates specific forms of social interaction, patterns of communication, and implicit rules that regulate the behavior of individuals and groups. In contrast, Total Quality Management (TQM) emerges as an organizational philosophy that goes beyond narrow task boundaries and seeks to integrate all units and actors into a continuous improvement project based on horizontal cooperation, knowledge sharing, and shared accountability.

The interaction between these two logics—the logic of strict specialization and the logic of collaborative holism—is reflected not only in productive efficiency but also extends to the reshaping of organizational culture itself and the redefinition of the worker's position within the system. The challenge, therefore, does not lie merely in integrating TQM standards into the existing structure, but rather in reengineering the division of labor in a way that achieves a balance between the functional dimension and the social dimension of work. This is what makes the issue at hand not merely a technical or administrative matter, but a fundamentally sociological one, linked to a deep understanding of power relations, social integration, and the possibilities for change within the industrial organization.

Accordingly, the following research question is posed:

How does the division of labor affect the implementation of Total Quality Management principles in the industrial organization from a Durkheimian perspective?

First Axis: The Methodological Framework of the Study

First: Objectives of the Study

- To analyze the relationship between the division of labor and Total Quality Management from a theoretical perspective.
- To examine the impact of the division of labor on Total Quality Management in the industrial organization through Durkheim's theory of the division of labor.
- To develop a theoretical framework explaining the relationship between the division of labor and Total Quality Management.

Second: Importance of the Study

- Contributing to the enrichment of the scientific literature related to the topic of the study.
- Clarifying the theoretical dimensions that link the division of labor as a driver of efficiency with Total Quality Management as a framework for continuous improvement.
- Providing an analytical perspective that helps researchers understand how to reconcile task specialization with the requirements of flexibility and creativity.

Third: Methodology of the Study

- **Descriptive Method:**
  - Based on collecting theoretical information on the concepts of division of labor and Total Quality Management through a review of scientific literature and specialized references.
  - Analyzing the relationship between the two concepts by identifying points of integration and contradiction based on previous studies.
  - Using comparative analysis to present the theoretical positions of a number of thinkers and theorists in management and industrial studies.

Fourth: Definition of Concepts

A. Concept of the Division of Labor

- **Terminological Definition:**
- **Operational Definition:**

In this study, the division of labor refers to the degree to which tasks and functions within the industrial organization are distributed among workers and teams according to specialization and expertise. It can be measured through:

- The number of specialized departments or units within the organization.
- The level of task specialization (number of tasks assigned to each worker or team).
- The clarity of task and responsibility descriptions in organizational documents.
- The level of coordination among specialized departments.

B. Concept of Total Quality Management

- **Terminological Definition:**
- **Operational Definition:**

Total Quality Management refers to the extent of comprehensiveness and integration of activities and procedures adopted by the industrial organization to ensure that the final product meets customers' requirements and expectations, with a focus on continuous improvement of all processes, from product design to after-sales services.

C. Concept of the Industrial Organization

- **Terminological Definition:**
- **Operational Definition:**

An organized productive unit that aims to transform raw or semi-finished materials into final products suitable for consumption or use, through the utilization of human resources, technology, and capital, within a defined organizational structure and in accordance with quality standards and market requirements.

Second Axis: The Theoretical Framework of the Division of Labor and Total Quality Management

First: An Introduction to Work and the Division of Labor

A. Definition of Work

From the Marxist perspective, it is through work that human beings are distinguished from animals, as nature becomes placed at the service of humankind; humans transform it and adapt it according to their needs. Work takes diverse forms, each reflecting the level of development of social relations in a given historical period. In primitive communism, work was collective and ownership was collective as well; consequently, there was no exploitation of others' labor. In contrast, in social systems based on exploitation, human labor becomes subject to exploitation, giving rise to the phenomenon of alienation, since the worker becomes estranged from what he produces… (Murad Wahba, 2007, p. 437).

Work constitutes a central issue in contemporary society in terms of order, social relations, values, and goods; human life revolves around it. Some individuals practice work through physical effort, while others do so through intellectual effort and acquired knowledge.

The central status of work is a fundamental reason for the difficulty of defining it in all its economic, social, normative, and ethical dimensions (Mustafa Al-Filali, 2006, pp. 63–65).

Work is the intelligent action through which human beings engage with matter. In the view of economists, work is what distinguishes humans from animals, and our mission on earth is nothing other than learning how to work (Henri Aviron, 1977, p. 53).

B. The Value Dimension of Work

Nietzsche notes that "if we were to determine the value of work by the amount of time devoted to it, enthusiasm, goodwill or ill will, coercion or creativity, laziness, integrity or hypocrisy, such an evaluation would never be fair, because it would require placing the whole person on the scale, which is impossible.

There is thus reason to say here: do not judge! Yet we hear those who lament the decline in the value of work today calling for justice.

If we reflect carefully, we find that each person is not fully responsible for what he produces; work is good or bad necessarily within a given constellation of forces and weaknesses, knowledge and needs. It does not depend solely on the worker to decide whether he will work or how he will work. The only perspectives—whether broad or narrow—that have established the foundations for evaluating work are perspectives of utility. What we currently call justice undoubtedly occupies its proper place, since it represents a very refined form of utility, one that does not confine itself to momentary considerations or opportunism, but rather concerns itself with the duration of all circumstances and thinks of the worker's welfare and material and moral satisfaction, so that he and his descendants may work diligently for our descendants as well, and so that we may rely on them for a period longer than a single human lifetime.

We now realize that exploiting the worker was folly… In any case, the costs of maintaining peace, signing treaties, and gaining trust will become exorbitant, because the folly of exploiters was great and persistent…" (Friedrich Nietzsche, 2010, p. 205).

C. The Nature of the Division of Labor According to Thinkers

Adam Smith:

Smith viewed the division of labor as the fragmentation of the production process into a number of simple tasks, with each worker specializing in a specific task, thereby increasing efficiency and productivity. He illustrated this in *The Wealth of Nations* through the example of pin manufacturing, where a specialized worker produces far more than a worker who performs all tasks alone. Smith notes that the division of labor "increases productivity when work is divided into small tasks performed by specialized workers" (Smith, 1776, p. 14).

Karl Marx:

Marx argued that the division of labor, especially under capitalism, leads to the alienation of the worker from the product of his labor and from himself, as he becomes merely an instrument in a fragmented production process. He states: "The more the division of labor increases, the more the worker becomes dependent on a production process over which he has no control" (Marx, 1844, p. 78).

Frederick Taylor:

In his theory of scientific management, Taylor emphasized that the division of labor involves distributing tasks between management (planning) and workers (execution) to ensure maximum efficiency. According to him, "the best results are achieved when responsibilities are divided between those who think and those who execute" (Taylor, 1911, p. 36).

Henri Fayol:

Within his fourteen principles of management, Fayol considered the division of labor a fundamental principle for reducing the number of tasks performed by an individual, thereby increasing skill and mastery. He asserted that "specialization is the best means of increasing efficiency and improving the quality of work" (Fayol, 1916, p. 27).

Émile Durkheim:

In *The Division of Labor in Society* (1893), Durkheim defined it as the foundation of social solidarity in modern societies, distinguishing between "mechanical solidarity" in

simple societies, characterized by similarity of roles, and "organic solidarity" in complex societies, marked by specialization and complementarity of roles. He emphasized that "the division of labor is not merely a means of increasing productivity, but a source of social integration" (Durkheim, 1893, p. 50).

The Importance of the Division of Labor

Every society is a moral society, and this characteristic is more evident in organized societies. Since the individual is not self-sufficient, he receives from society everything that is necessary for him, while at the same time he works for society. Thus, a strong sense of dependence on the society to which he belongs is formed, leading him to value himself appropriately, seeing himself as part of a whole and a member of a cohesive structure. Such feelings not only give rise to daily sacrifices that ensure the regular growth of social life, but under certain conditions also generate acts expressing total self-sacrifice and complete self-denial.

In turn, society becomes accustomed to viewing its members not merely as objects that owe it duties, but as collaborators who are indispensable and to whom it owes rights. It is futile to oppose a society based on doctrinal unity to one based on cooperation, attributing moral character to the former while viewing the latter as merely an economic society.

For example, when the movement that activates all parts of a machine is very rapid, it is transmitted from one part to another without interruption. If no function within the machine is isolated from the whole, all functions become more effective, and the activity of each increases. As a result, functions become more solidaristic in practice, remaining in constant contact and interconnected.

Any work carried out in any field, if it is neither useful nor sufficient, naturally prevents the completion of solidarity among individuals, rendering it almost nonexistent. This is evident in some institutions where functions are distributed in a way that makes each worker's activity disproportionate to his intellectual and physical capacities. This imbalance affects all functions within such institutions, leading them into a state of fragmentation or disintegration, rendering them incapable of cohesion and harmonious operation, thereby creating a form of disunity and separation that negatively affects productive performance regardless of its type.

In general, the division of labor develops only with the growth of functional activity. The reasons that drive us toward greater specialization are the same reasons that compel us to work more. As the number of competitors in society as a whole increases, this is reflected in each profession, intensifying competition in a positive way (Émile Durkheim, 1960, pp. 205–387).

Durkheim argued that the division of labor is not merely an economic method for increasing productivity, but a fundamental social phenomenon that contributes to social cohesion. In traditional societies with simple structures, solidarity was based on similarity among individuals, what Durkheim termed "mechanical solidarity." As societies evolve and become more complex, the division of labor becomes necessary to organize relations among individuals, leading to the emergence of "organic solidarity" based on mutual dependence among different professions and functions.

Durkheim also pointed out that the division of labor in modern societies fosters the development of individual specializations, giving each person a specific role within the social system, thereby enhancing efficiency and reducing overlap and role conflict. He maintained that this division extends beyond the economic sphere to encompass social, political, and cultural domains, making relationships more organized and clearer.

However, Durkheim warned that the division of labor may sometimes lead to problems such as the weakening of social bonds, or what he termed *anomie*, a breakdown in the balance between different roles and a disintegration of the network of shared values and norms. Therefore, the success of the division of labor depends on the existence of an ethical and legal system that supports, regulates, and maintains balance.

Anthony Giddens similarly views the division of labor as a fundamental pillar in the transition from mechanical to organic solidarity in Durkheim's conception, despite the potential harms it may produce. He argues that specialization in roles—whether in simple or complex tasks—reflects the evolution of society from simplicity to complexity and serves as a means of social solidarity. Nevertheless, he emphasizes the necessity of a value-based and institutional framework to ensure that this division functions as a tool for social integration rather than disintegration.

Thus, instead of individuals living in isolation as self-sufficient units, they become interconnected and cooperative through mutual dependence, resulting in the reinforcement of solidarity as a consequence of multiple interconnections within production processes (Anthony Giddens, 2005, p. 440).

Ibn Khaldun also argued that the division of labor is specialization according to talents and inclinations, based on the similarity of needs and the diversity of capacities. Exchange is therefore a pressing social necessity, representing the complementarity of roles among members of society. He interpreted the concept of the division of labor through his notion of cooperation, which symbolizes adherence to values and norms (Shetouh Amira & Al-Abed Linda, 2022, p. 84).

Benefits of the Division of Labor

Durkheim considers the division of labor a necessary historical process that leads members of society toward increasing social solidarity. He believes that the activities performed by individuals within society, carried out regularly within a defined hierarchical order in which levels of wealth, power, and social prestige vary, contribute to social cohesion, while taking into account the general moral context (Harairiya Atika, 09/07/2020, p. 94).

Based on our observations and readings of numerous studies and research works, it appears that one of the most important manifestations of development and skill in the fields of work and productivity—and of the sound judgment followed by many institutions worldwide—has emerged through the division of labor.

The effects of the division of labor in general social affairs become easier to understand when we examine how it operates within a particular craft. It is generally believed that these effects reach their maximum in certain very simple industries, not because they are pushed further there than in more complex forms of work, but because the total number of

workers in these simple industries, designed to meet the limited needs of a small number of people, must necessarily be small. As a result, workers in each branch of work can often be gathered within the same establishment and observed simultaneously. In large institutions designed to meet the needs of the vast majority of people, however, each branch of work employs such a large number of workers that it becomes impossible to assemble them all in a single establishment. Rarely can one observe at a glance more than those employed in a single branch. Although work in such institutions may in fact be divided into a greater number of parts than in simpler establishments, this division is less obvious and subject to less direct observation.

Let us take a very simple example of a craft in which the division of labor has been most closely observed: the manufacture of pins. A worker not trained in this craft—which the division of labor has made an independent occupation—nor accustomed to the use of the machines employed in it (which the division of labor has most likely led to the invention of), could hardly, even with the utmost effort, produce more than one pin per day, and certainly not twenty.

However, if we examine how this industry is practiced today, we find that the work is not merely a single craft but is divided into a number of branches, most of which are themselves distinct trades. One man draws out the wire, another straightens it, a third cuts it, a fourth sharpens it, a fifth grinds it and prepares it to receive the head. The making of the head itself requires three distinct operations: attaching it is one task, whitening the pins is another, and placing the pins into paper is yet another separate occupation. Thus, the manufacture of a pin is divided into approximately eighteen distinct operations, carried out in some factories by separate hands, although in other factories the same worker may perform two or three of these tasks.

Adam Smith observed a small establishment of this kind employing only ten workers, some of whom performed two or three of these operations. Despite being very poor and not fully equipped with the necessary machinery, they were able, by exerting themselves, to produce collectively about twelve pounds of pins per day. Since one pound contains more than four thousand medium-sized pins, these ten workers were able, together, to produce more than forty-eight thousand pins per day.

The effects of the division of labor in all other arts and manufactures follow the same pattern as in this very simple industry. Although in many cases work may not be divisible into the same number of operations, nor reduced to such extreme simplicity of execution, the division of labor, insofar as it is possible, leads in every craft and trade to a proportional increase in productive labor power. This separation of different trades and occupations from one another appears to have arisen from this advantage. In general, this separation is carried to its greatest extent in countries that enjoy the highest degree of industry and development. What is performed by a single individual in a society suffering from hardship is often carried out by several individuals in a more prosperous society. In every well-to-do society, the farmer is solely a farmer, and the craftsman is solely a craftsman.

Moreover, the labor required to produce any complete commodity is almost always divided among a large number of hands. How many different trades are involved in each branch of the linen and woolen industries, from the producers of flax and wool to the

scourers and polishers of linen, or to cloth dyers and garment makers! Agriculture, however, does not truly admit of the same degree of division of labor or the same complete separation between tasks as manufacturing does. It is impossible to establish a strict division between the work of the shepherd and that of the blacksmith. The spinner is permanently or nearly permanently distinct from the weaver; but the person who tills the land, prepares it, sows the seeds, and harvests the crops is most often the same individual. Since the causes of these different kinds of agricultural work recur with the seasons, it is impossible for one person to be continuously employed in only one of them. Perhaps this impossibility of a complete and thorough separation among the various branches of agricultural labor is the reason why the development of productive labor power in agriculture does not always keep pace with that in manufacturing (Adam Smith, 2007, pp. 1–11).

Second: The Nature of Total Quality Management

1. The Concept of Quality

Quality in the Oxford Dictionary:

Quality refers to a high degree of excellence and value. The International Organization for Standardization (ISO), in its 1994 standard terminology for quality, defined quality as the total set of characteristics possessed by a product or service that enable it to satisfy needs and achieve satisfaction or fitness for purpose. This definition is considered among the most appropriate formulations of the concept of quality.

The Concept of Quality According to Some Pioneers:

Philip Crosby's definition: Quality is conformity to requirements, and its standard is the absence of defects.

Ishikawa's definition: Quality is the development of product design in an economical and more beneficial manner that continuously satisfies the customer (Lamia Khazzar, 2022, p. 266).

2. The Concept of Total Quality Management (TQM)

Total Quality Management is a multidimensional concept with several definitions, including the following:

Dean Boone and Rick's definition: TQM is a standard, goal, or set of requirements; it is a measurable objective rather than a vague sense of adequacy. It represents an effort toward improvement, not a limited or fixed degree of excellence.

Al-Bilawi's view: The concept of quality refers to a new culture in dealing with productive institutions through the application of standards characterized by continuity, in order to ensure product quality and the quality of the production process (Atiya Mohamed Mohsen, 2019, p. 20).

David Kreitz's definition: TQM is the continuous achievement of beneficiaries' goals, desires, and needs.

Badiro's definition: TQM is a set of procedures that provide a product or service with the capability to satisfy specific, well-defined needs. This means that quality implies performing work correctly the first time, without errors (Salama Abdel Azim Hussein, 2004, p. 34).

It can be said that the concept of quality is closely linked to the production process and to the manner in which the product is presented to the consumer. It is not limited to conformity with specifications or predefined standards, but also includes product design, performance level, suitability to customers' needs and preferences, and the method of presentation. Quality, in this sense, reflects the institution's ability to achieve a balance between productive efficiency and excellence in delivering added value that meets consumer expectations.

3. The Intellectual Development of the Concept of Total Quality Management

The principle of quality is one of the ancient human values that has been associated since the dawn of civilizations with the idea of mastery and the achievement of benefit, as a guarantee of safety and an indicator of competence. Linguistically, quality denotes goodness and excellence; one says that goods are good and work is well done, deriving from the verb meaning to perform proficiently and to master good work, in contrast to what is poor or defective.

The roots of this principle appeared in ancient times, particularly in Mesopotamian civilization more than five thousand years ago. During the reign of King Hammurabi (circa 1754 BCE), a set of laws was enacted that embodied the importance of adherence to quality standards. Among the most notable was the legal text stating: "If a person builds a house and it collapses on its occupants and causes their death, the punishment shall be death" (Atiya Mohamed Mohsen, 2019, p. 26).

This text reflects an early awareness of the importance of mastery and of holding individuals fully accountable for shortcomings in their work, thereby ensuring the protection of lives and the preservation of social trust.

From an Islamic perspective, quality signifies excellence and perfection in work rather than mere quantity. The Holy Qur'an reinforced this principle by placing mastery at the core of religious values, as in the verse: ﴿And say, 'Work, for Allah will see your deeds, and His Messenger and the believers'﴾ (At-Tawbah: 105), which encourages diligence and perfection in work. Another verse states: ﴿Indeed, those who believe and do righteous deeds—We will not allow the reward of anyone who does good work to be lost﴾ (Al-Kahf: 30) (Ibn Kathir, 1998).

The Prophetic tradition also emphasized this principle, as the Prophet Muhammad ﷺ said: "Allah loves that when any one of you does a job, he perfects it," and also stated: "Whoever deceives us is not one of us," thus stressing sincerity and excellence in work (Al-Bayhaqi, 1994).

This perspective links quality to moral value and worship, making it a human commitment and a mechanism of social regulation. On the administrative and institutional level, formal interest in quality began to emerge clearly in Europe during the seventeenth century, amid economic transformations. In 1664, the French Minister of Finance, Jean-Baptiste Colbert, sent a letter to King Louis XIV proposing that ensuring high-quality manufacturing through mastery of work would make French goods more attractive to foreign importers, thereby enhancing France's competitiveness in international markets (David A. Garvin, 1988, p. 333).

This orientation laid the foundation for linking quality to national economic strength and paved the way for the emergence of industrial inspection and control systems during the Industrial Revolution of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (Smith, W., 1984, p. 218).

Thus, the principle of quality is not a product of the modern era, but rather the result of a long historical evolution in which legal, religious, and economic dimensions intertwined, making it one of the fundamental pillars of civilization-building and continuity. Quality has consistently represented a core commitment to achieving excellence and competitiveness across eras, serving as a key to success and development for any organization seeking survival and sustainability.

4. The Importance of Quality and Its Impact on the Organization

Most major organizations that have achieved remarkable success and outstanding business performance are those that have clearly recognized the strong relationship between quality, profitability, and market share. The business community has become convinced that quality constitutes a fundamental pillar for ensuring excellence and continuity in competition.

Quality affects organizational life in several ways, including:

Improved profitability and competitiveness:

Enhancing quality makes higher prices more acceptable to consumers and increases sales volume, allowing the product to market itself. This, in turn, reduces marketing costs and strengthens competitiveness. The essence of quality management lies in doing things right the first time, which leads to cost reduction and increased profitability.

Strengthening the company's competitive position:

By providing high-quality products or services that meet consumer demands at reasonable prices and appropriate timing.

Maintaining organizational vitality:

Through renewal, continuous improvement, education and training, and adaptation to environmental changes, thereby ensuring survival and continuity.

Achieving labor turnover optimization and improving performance and productivity:

Through material and moral motivation, teamwork, problem-solving, and collective quality improvement based on team spirit (Khudair Kazem Hammoud, 2000, p. 28).

Fourth: The Dynamics of the Relationship between the Division of Labor and Total Quality Management Systems

After reviewing the two concepts within their theoretical frameworks, the importance of analyzing the interaction between the division of labor and Total Quality Management systems becomes evident. Each plays a central role in shaping the efficiency and effectiveness of the productive system within the industrial organization, necessitating a dynamic approach that reveals the dimensions and characteristics of this relationship.

1. Organic Solidarity as a Basis for Integrating Specialization and Quality

Durkheim points out that modern societies are characterized by a transition from mechanical solidarity, based on similarity, to organic solidarity, founded on difference and functional complementarity (Durkheim, 1893/2010, p. 27). In the industrial enterprise, this

concept is manifested through a division of labor based on specialization, which enhances mutual dependence among units. When TQM principles are integrated into this organizational pattern, organizational cohesion is strengthened through clarity of roles and their interconnection in achieving quality objectives.

2. Organizational Cohesion through Mutual Dependence and Quality Concepts

Durkheim emphasized that the division of labor creates a system of rules that maintains balance among different specializations and supports social solidarity (Durkheim, 1893/2010, p. 30). Similarly, Total Quality Management relies on the coordination of efforts across all departments—from production to management—to achieve consistent results (Evans & Lindsay, 2017, p. 42). This integration between TQM philosophy and the concept of organic solidarity contributes to improving institutional performance and ensuring smooth workflow.

3. Risks of Excessive Specialization: Anomie and Unit Isolation

Durkheim warned that excessive specialization may lead to a state of *anomie* or weakened social regulation, thereby threatening cohesion (Durkheim, 2010, p. 35). In the context of TQM, the absence of coordination among units or a weak organizational culture may turn specialization into functional isolation, which contradicts the principle of continuous improvement (Goetsch & Davis, 2016, p. 58). Therefore, the success of TQM requires maintaining a balance between role clarity and interactive flexibility among units.

4. Total Quality Management as an Organizational Mechanism for Enhancing Mutual Dependence

Durkheim argued that specialization, when accompanied by ethical norms and standards, becomes a tool for increasing productivity and improving product quality (Durkheim, 2010, p. 39). This aligns with the philosophy of Total Quality Management, which seeks to integrate all roles within a unified organizational culture aimed at continuous improvement and process control (Evans & Lindsay, 2017, p. 46). In this context, TQM becomes a mechanism that ensures the division of labor strengthens mutual dependence rather than undermines it.

Conclusion

It can be argued that, in Durkheim's view, the division of labor—when managed according to clear ethical and organizational rules—becomes a fundamental mechanism for strengthening organic solidarity among units and individuals within the organization. This form of solidarity, based on specialization and functional complementarity, contributes to supporting the principles of Total Quality Management, particularly with regard to coordination, continuous improvement, and process control. Thoughtfully designed specialization allows each unit to focus precisely on its tasks, while simultaneously requiring reliance on other units, thereby creating a network of interdependent relationships that supports the achievement of quality at all levels.

However, the Durkheimian perspective warns that excessive specialization or a lack of coordination may lead to a state of organizational anomie, in which social ties weaken and Total Quality Management systems lose their effectiveness. Consequently, successful integration between the division of labor and Total Quality Management requires a careful balance between role clarity and flexible interaction among the various components of the

organization. This balance enables the division of labor to be transformed from a mere organizational tool into a strategic lever for improving performance and enhancing the competitiveness of the industrial organization in a changing work environment.

References

Mustafa, Al-Filali. (2006). The Society of Work. Beirut: Center for Arab Unity Studies.

Henri, Aviron. (1977). The Philosophy of Work, translated by Adel Al-Alaa. Beirut: Oueidat Publications.

Murad, Wahba. (2007). The Philosophical Dictionary. Cairo: Dar Quba Al-Haditha.

Friedrich, Nietzsche. (2010). Human, All Too Human: "The Free Spirits" Book II (2nd ed.), translated by Mohamed Al-Naji. Africa East.

Mustafa, Al-Filali. (2006). The Society of Work. Beirut: Center for Arab Unity Studies.

Mohsen, Ali Atiya. (2007). Total Quality Management and Methodology. Amman: Dar Al-Manahij.

Al-Bayhaqi, Ahmad ibn Al-Husayn. (1994). Shu'ab Al-Iman. Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyyah.

Lamia, Khazzar. (2022). The Theoretical Framework of Total Quality Management. Al-Bahith Journal for Academic Studies, Issue 1, Volume 9.

Salama, Abdel Azim Hussein. (2004). Modern Trends in School Administration. Amman: Dar Al-Fikr.

Khudair, Kazem Hamoud. (2000). Total Quality Management. Amman: Dar Al-Masira for Publishing and Distribution.

Ibn Kathir, Ismail ibn Umar. (1998). Tafsir Al-Qur'an Al-Azim. Cairo: Dar Taiba.

Harairia, Atiqa. (09/07/2020). The Phenomenon of the Division of Labor and Its Social Dimensions in Durkheimian Thought. Algeria: Studies in the Sociology of Organizations Journal, Volume 8, Issue 1.

Adam, Smith. (2007). An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations, translated by Hosni Zeina. Beirut: Institute of Strategic Studies, 1st ed.

Shtouh, Amira, & Al-Abed, Linda. (2022). Gender and the Division of Labor in the Economic Work Environment. Algeria: Journal of Social Studies and Research, Volume 10, Issue 2.

Anthony, Giddens. (2005). Sociology, translated by Fayez Al-Sabbagh. Beirut: Arab Organization for Translation.

Durkheim, É. (1893). The Division of Labor in Society. Paris: Félix Alcan.

Durkheim, É. (1960). The Division of Labor. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France (P.U.F.).

Fayol, H. (1916). Industrial and General Administration. Paris: Dunod.

Marx, K. (1844). Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844. Moscow: Progress Publishers.

Smith, A. (1776). An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations. London: W. Strahan and T. Cadell.

Taylor, F. W. (1911). The Principles of Scientific Management. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Smith, W. (1998). The Economic Policies of Colbert. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Garvin, D. A. (1988). Managing Quality: The Strategic and Competitive Edge. New York: Free Press.

Evans, J. R., & Lindsay, W. M. (2017). *Managing for Quality and Performance Excellence* (10th ed.). Boston, MA: Cengage Learning.

Goetsch, D. L., & Davis, S. B. (2016). *Quality Management for Organizational Excellence: Introduction to Total Quality* (8th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.