MANAGEMENT ANALYSIS OF THE EXPANSIONIST AYUDHYA KINGDOM

Antonio A Imanuel

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to provide management analysis of the expansionist Ayudhya kingdom. At the peak of its military under King Naresuan the Great, the expansionist Ayudhya reached its widest sphere of influence and become the strongest kingdom in its region. Too many subordinate will lead to ineffectiveness. Span of control was used as a tool for the management analysis in this research over the Ayudhya kingdom. Most data used in this research were text. The researcher was the primary research instrument. Data used mostly from international journals, reports, related research, magazines and photos. Author also consider the context and culture. Analysis from perspective of management has been presented and discussed in this research. This study describes the expansionist Ayudhya to its maximum extent, which reach the climax in the era of King Naresuan the Great. The expansionist Ayudhya could be explained by some factors of span of control through management analysis. Such management theory was formally formulated by Lockheed in 1912, but the practice could be traced back to the Ayudhya kingdom.

Keywords: management analysis, span of control, expansionist, Ayudhya

I. INTRODUCTION

The awakening of the management thoughts in the last century, which focus on organizations was being contributed by the prominent management thinkers, such as Vytautas A. Graicunas, with "Relationship in Organization" (Graicunas, 1933), Peter F. Drucker, with "The Practice of Management" (Drucker, 1954), Bruce D. Henderson, with "Henderson on Corporate Strategy" (Henderson, 1979) and Michael E. Porter, with "Competitive Strategy: Techniques for Analyzing Industries and Competitors" (Porter, 1980).

Several studies to investigate the practice of management in history, which focus on organizations has been conducted, such as research by Collons (1971) which describe the practice of organizing and the inception of organization structure theories in by the Chinese as early as 1 A.D. Research of Petrie (1924: 21-22) pointed out that the Egyptians has already familiar with the organization and span of control.

Ayudhya was established as a small trading city state in the Southeast Asia (Wyatt, 1984: 63-65). Ayudhya starts to expand to its surrounding region and make them vassals. The expansive Ayudhya need to manage the kingdom, namely through organization management which lead to span of control problem. Span of control refers to the number of subordinates a supervisor has. The problem of span of control has long been recognized as being crucial to the effectiveness of an organization (Rogers, 1972: 1).

Several researches were done, namely by Chutintaranond (1990) which discusses the political system in Ayudhya by describing the policy and guidance to educate the people with the Palatine law in order to protect and secure themselves during the political instability in Southeast Asia. Imanuel, Triyuwono & Djamhuri (2015) discuss the role of accounting, which transform Ayudhya from small trading city state become a powerful force in Southeast Asia that recognized by European countries at that time.

Too many subordinate will lead to ineffectiveness (Hamilton, 1921: 229): "In charge of three private soldiers would be too idle; one lieutenant general in charge of six divisional generals would be too busy". This research objective is presenting an analysis from the perspective of management for the expansionist Ayudhya kingdom. This research is focused on management analysis: the span of control over the expansive period of Ayudhya. This study is expected to contribute in such management analysis and contribute in the current development of management research which focused on historical studies.

II. RESEARCH METHOD

2.1 RESEARCH DESIGN

Contrary with quantitative research that focuses to variables or hypotheses, this qualitative research focuses on the background and individuals as a whole (Bogdan & Taylor, 1975: 5). The post-positive paradigm assumes that research should not be value-free and unbiased, but be value-laden, subjective and inter-subjective or even value-driven. In post-positive paradigm, the researcher has a central role in the research process. The researcher participates in the research processes including instigating and also benefitting from the research (Guba & Lincoln, 1994 & McGregor & Murnane, 2010). This qualitative research was a study of the text with the researcher as a primary research instrument. Span of control was used as a tool for the management analysis in this research.

2.2 RESEARCH DATA

Most data used in this research were texts with the researcher as a primary research instrument (Moleong, 2005: 7). To increase the credibility and the validity of the result (Rothbauer, 2008: 892-894), data triangulation was done in this research. Data used

mostly from international journals, reports, related research, magazines and photos. Author also considers the context and culture in this study.

2.3 EXPANSIONIST AYUDHYA

Some authors used the term expansionist for referring to a person. Blount (1912: 160) used the term expansionist in explaining an American general Douglas MacArthur (1880-1964) who lead the US Army in defending Philippines from the invasion of Japan in The Pacific War in the World War II: "I have said General MacArthur was a [thoroughgoing] expansionist". Another author, Bax (1915: 373) also used the term expansionist in explaining Frederick the Great, Frederick II (1712-1786), King of Prussia during 1740-1786 from House of Hohenzollern: "Friedrich no sooner came to the throne than he started on an aggressive expansionist policy for Prussia".

Other authors, Keefe, et. al. (1971: 22) used the term expansionist to point out an entity. Describing the relation of Albania with Italian Fascism, fascist ideology which arose in the Kingdom of Italy under Benito Mussolini: "Excessive reliance on Fascist Italy during the 1920s and 1930s eventually led to annexation by that expansionist power". Wells (2007) also used the term expansionist for point out the European powers, among others, was British, Spain, Portugal, Dutch and France: "The end of the eighteenth century was a period of disrupting empires and disillusioned expansionists".

The usage of the term expansionist above could give an idea that expansionist refers to one who favors an expansion of national territory. In general, expansionism consists of policies of governments and states that involve territorial or economic expansion. Expansionism commonly refers to the doctrine of a state expanding its territorial base by means of military aggression. In this paper, the term expansionist was used to address the main topic in this research, the expansionist Ayudhya kingdom.

2.4 MANAGEMENT

Mary C. H. Niles points out what is good management are. She emphasizes on the human aspect of the organization in her explanation (Niles, 1956: 20): "Good management, or scientific management, achieves a social objective with the best use of human and material energy and time, and with satisfaction for the participant and the public".

Lawrence A. Appley, popular management specialist who expert in organizational theory, was agreed with Niles, points out the importance of people development. He adds the method in people development that was through personnel administration in his definition of management (Pigors & Myers, 1961: 9): "Management is the development of people and not the direction of things … management is the personnel administration".

The importance of people management and human aspects in the management was confirmed by Dalton E. McFarland. He emphasizes the need of cooperative human effort in the organization process. In addition, coordination also very important in such process. He defines management as (McFarland, 1970: 5): "Process by which managers create, direct, maintain and operate … through systematic, coordinated, cooperative human effort". Based on his management definition above, it clearly shows what is the most important to achieve the objectives of an organization, it is coordination.

Coordination and controlling has been an important point, since the founding of modern management methods by Henri Fayol (Witzel, 2003: 96), that shown in his definition of management (Fayol, 1949: 5): "To manage is … to command, to coordinate and to control". Such idea also being confirmed by George R. Terry (Terry, 1968: 4): "Management is a distinct process … [of] actuating and controlling".

2.5 SPAN OF CONTROL

Span of control is the term used in human resource management and organization management. Span of control refers to the number of subordinates a supervisor has. The theories were popularized by Vytautas A. Graičiūnas which used assumptions about mental capacity and attention span. Graičiūnas was a consultant for companies in Europe. Based on the common practice in such companies, the best practice, proved that a manager should not have more than 4 to 5 subordinates. It was documented in his writing titled "Relationship in Organization" (Graicunas, 1933, Bedeian, 1974 & Urwick, 1974).

Urwick developed span of control theory based on geographical dispersion and the need for face to face meetings. The optimum span of control depends on numerous variables, including organizational structure, available technology, the functions being performed, the competencies of the manager as well as staff (Urwick, 1956).

The earliest study to determine the optimum span of control was done by Lockheed Missiles and Space Company, a division of the Loughead Aircraft Manufacturing Company, an American aerospace company founded in 1912. Based on its extensive research, Lockheed has identified most influencing factors in determining the span of control (Stieglitz, 1964: 165): "1) Similarity of function; 2) Geographic contiguity; 3) Complexity of functions; 4) Direction and control; 5) Coordination; 6) Planning; 7) Organizational assistance".

Furthermore, Rogers (1972: 19-20) revisits the study of Lockheed, make an analysis, then develop such factors with detailed as follows (Rogers, 1972: 9-19):
1) Span of attention: according to Koontz & O'Donnell (1968: 251), span of attention is: "Number of things a brain can heed at any one thing".
2) Knowledge of the supervisor: knowledge of the supervisor talked about the knowledge limit of the supervisor. It is agreed that no supervisor will highly qualify in all facets of the organization, so that some managers will appoint experts or subordinate managers, which has qualification on it, and delegate some of it.

3) Personality and energy: the personality and energy of the superior affect the ability to manage. Some individuals which have an endless amount of energy will able to control more subordinate, vice versa.

4) Level of the organization: level of the organization refers to the management level in the modern management, which consist of top management, middle management and first-line management.

5) Delegation of authority: according to Dale (1969: 189): "Decisions should be made at the lowest competent level; that is, responsibility and commensurate authority should be delegated as far down in the organization as possible". By doing so, enabling him to expand his span of control.

6) Number of superior-subordinate relationships: this factor explains for the time consuming for personal contact to maintain relationships.

7) Similarity of functions: according to Gulick (1969: 7): "Where the work is routine, repetitive, measurable and homogeneous character, one man can perhaps direct several more workers … where the work is diversified, qualitative … one man can supervise a few".

8) Subordinate training: well-trained subordinates allow a wider span of control, vice versa. In addition, training subordinates require various resources, yet not always succeed.

9) Geographic dispersion: located in the same building, in the same or in several cities, or in many countries or regions will affect span of control. Such geographic dispersion dictates span of control.

According to Urwick (1938: 8): "No superior can supervise directly the work of more than five or, at the most, six subordinates whose work interlocks". While Hamilton (1921: 229): "The average human brain finds its effective scope in handling from three to six other brains. If he delegates to three heads he will be kept fairly busy whilst six heads of branches will give most bosses a ten hours' day". Furthermore, Petrie (1924: 21-22) states: "The Egyptians were aware of limit to the number of people one manager could supervise. There was a ratio of about ten servants to each supervisor".

III. ESTABLISHMENT AND ITS BUSINESS

Ayudhya was established by Thai people which migrate to south, to the Chaophraya valley. They lived in the lowland and several groups were made, as pointed out by Vallipodom (1981: 52-53): "For a long time before the 14th century, there had been the Thais who lived in the Chaophraya valley and divided themselves into various small principalities …. Ayutthaya was their capital". The people lived in the Chaophraya valley has worked in agriculture sector and when the harvest come, they trade it to the nearby cities. The King imposed taxes on every item traded (Jumsai, 2001: 14).

IV. SURROUNDING MANDALAS

The mandala is a model which was popularized by historian Oliver W. Wolters to describe the political powers in Southeast Asia, which consist of *mueangs*. Each city state connected and interact with the hegemony system by giving tribute. Each city state is influencing and being influenced, invaded and being invaded by each nearby city states. The objective in Mandala was to gain recognition as Overlord or *Chakravartin* (Wolters, 1982: 27, Chutintaranond, 1990 & Shu 2011, 2012).

4.1 KHMER EMPIRE

In the early kingdoms era as pointed out by Wolters, central part of mainland Southeast Asia was dominated by Khmer, with Angkor as the center of its power (Dellios, 2003). According to Sdok Kok Thom inscription, before the establishment of Khmer, King Jayavarman II was a local ruler on Indrapura. In 802 King Jayavarman II declares independence from foreign domination, which noted by scholars as the beginning of the Khmer era (Cœdès, 1968: 97 & Higham, 2014: 353-354).

According to Vickery (2001), under King Indravarman I (reigned 877-889), Khmer expands through extensive building projects with the wealth gained through trade and agriculture. King Yasovarman I (reigned 889-915), established Yasodharapura as a new capital. Angkor reached its peak in the 11th to 13th centuries. It was the largest urban center in the world during that time (Evans, et. al., 2009). Under King Suryavarman II (reigned 1113-1150) the largest temple of Angkor, Angkor Wat, was built (Cœdès, 1968: 110 & Higham, 2014: 354-358).

However, since the 14th century, Khmer suffered a steady decline. The main aspect was due to religious conversion from Hinduism to Theravada Buddhism. The input of Buddhist ideas conflicted with the state order that was built under the predominant Hinduism. Another factor was vassal revolts and of course, then followed by foreign invasions (Stark & Allen, 1998 & Stark, 2006: 144-167).

Since the establishment of Ayudhya, the Angkorian hegemony in the central part of mainland Southeast Asia was diminishing. The fast growing Ayudhya as a center of economic activities, make it become Angkor's rival (Cœdès, 1968: 222-223 & Wyatt, 1984: 63-65). Angkor was besieged by the King Uthong of Ayudhya in 1352, and following its capture the next year. In 1357, King Suryavamsa Rajadhiraja of Khmer regained the throne (Cœdès, 1968: 236), but in 1393, King Ramesuan of Ayudhya besieged Angkor again, capturing it the next year. Finally, in 1431, King Ponhea Yat of Khmer abandoned Angkor (Cœdès, 1968: 236-237) which marked as the beginning of the era of "Dark ages of Cambodia".

4.2 SUKHOTHAI KINGDOM

In the central part of mainland Southeast Asia, beside Khmer, there is also Sukhothai, which founded in the 13th century. Historians have stated that the secession of Sukhothai from Khmer began as early as 1180 during the reign of Pho Khun Sri Naw Namthom who was a local ruler of Sukhothai and the peripheral city of Si Satchanalai until it was conquered by Lavo. Therefore, scholars agreed that King Sri Indraditya (reigned 1238-1270) as the founder of the Phra Ruang dynasty, which recorded as the first dynasty of Sukhothai (Cœdès, 1921).

Under the reign of King Ram Khamhaeng (reigned 1279-1298), Sukhothai expanded as far as Lampang, Phrae, and Nan in the north, and Phitsanulok and Vieng Chan (Wiangchan) in the east, Mon in the west, and Nakhon Si Thammarat in the south. Many of them were attacked and pay tributes (Hall, 1955: 187-192 & Day, 1991: 5).

Sukhothai suffers significant declines after the death of King Ram Khamhaeng. There were many local rulers which revolt against Sukhothai, namely Uttaradit, Muang Sua (Luang Prabang), Vieng Chan (Wiangchan), Mon and Suphanburi which liberates themselves. In 1321, Lan Na takes Tak from Sukhothai to its control (Wyatt, 1984: 50-60).

In 1349, Ayudhya invade and put Sukhothai under tribute (Cœdès, 1968: 222), later in 1378, King Mahathammaracha I of Sukhothai agreed to be a vassal state of Ayudhya (Chakrabongse, 1960: 29-30). The throne of Sukhothai passed to King Ramesuan in 1446, which later King Ramesuan was also crowned as the King of Ayudhya in 1448 thus began the personal union between the Sukhothai and Ayudhya. In 1583, King Naresuan of Ayudhya (reigned 1590-1605) held the ceremony of swearing allegiance with the people of Sukhothai to fight Mon people, then relocate all of the men from Phitsanulok, Sukhothai, Phichai, Sawankhalok, Kamphaeng Phet, Phichit and Prabang in 1584 to Ayudhya in order to attack Bago (Wyatt, 1984: 50-60, & Day, 1991: 4-7), which noted as the merging of Sukhothai to Ayudhya.

4.3 LAN NA KINGDOM
Important city state in the northern part of Southeast Asia was Lan Na which founded by King Mengrai (reigned 1296-1317). King Mengrai was able to consolidate quite wide area in the north and enjoyed its peak. However, after the death of King Mengrai, Lan Na suffers declines (Wyatt, 1984: 50-60 & Day, 1991: 4-7).

The fast growing Ayudhya lead to high tension rivalry with Lan Na, which marked with King Intharacha of Ayudhya (reigned 1408-1424) invasion to Lan Na and seizing Chiang Rai in 1411. There were numerous wars between Ayudhya and Lan Na during the 15th century (Nawadei Yadu-baung-gyok, 1964, Tun, 1994 & Surakiat, 2005). In 1513, Lan Na attacked and conquered Kamphaeng Phet from Ayudhya (Campos, 1940). The hostility continues until both of them being invaded by Taungoo (Stuart-Fox, 1998: 83, 2006: 72-73).

In 1545, King Chairachathirat (reigned 1534-1546) of Ayutthaya invaded Chiang Mai, then sacking Lampang and Lamphun in 1546. Since 1584 when Sukhothai has joined Ayudhya, Ayudhya launch several campaigns to Taungoo, including attacking its vassals. In 1590, King Naresuan was crowned as King of Ayudhya. A few years later, Ayudhya regains its independence from foreign domination. Ayudhya conquer Taungoo regions, including Dawei (Rajanubhab, 2001: 65-144) and Mottama, then again put Lan Na as its vassal in 1602 (Rajanubhab, 2001: 145-179).

4.4 LAN XANG KINGDOM
Another important city state in the northern part of Southeast Asia was Lan Xang which founded by Fa Ngum (1316-1393, reigned 1353-1372). Following the establishment of Ayudhya in 1351 by King U-Thong and the decline of Angkorian hegemony, Fa Ngum campaigns on northern parts of Khmer. After seizing the fertile northern Mekong valleys, including Muang Sua (Luang Prabang), Vieng Chan (Wiangchan) and its peripheral cities, in 1354, Fa Ngum established Lan Xang (Cœdès, 1968: 225, Stuart-Fox, 1998: 38-43 & Simms & Simms, 1999: 30-35).

In 1418, King Lan Kham Deng of Lan Xang (1375-1428, reigned 1416-1428) dispatched an army of 30,000 with 100 elephant cavalry to assist Lê Lợi for the restoration of Đại Việt. The army dispatched was bribed by Ming to strengthen the Ming domination in the area of Đại Việt (Simms & Simms, 1999: 47-48 & Stuart-Fox, 2006: 20-21). Such incident marked as the beginning of hostilities between Lan Xang and Đại Việt (Imanuel, 2016).

Clashes between Lan Xang and Đại Việt continues. There were many fights between local leaders of both parties. From 1428 to 1440, Lan Xang suffers internal succession disputes, seven kings who ruled Lan Xang was dead in assassinations or intrigues guided by Maha Thevi (Stuart-Fox, 1993 & Simms & Simms, 1999: 48-50). In 1448, subsequent to the disorder of Maha Thevi, some areas in the eastern parts of Lan Xang were annexed by Đại Việt (Stuart-Fox, 1998: 65). In 1471 King Lê Thánh Tông (reigned 1460-1497) of Đại Việt invaded and destroyed Champa. Subsequently, in response to continued attacks from the west of the highland areas of Nghệ An and Thanh Hóa, the frontier of Lan Xang, in 1479, King Lê Thánh Tông waged war against Lan Xang. A powerful army invaded Lan Xang (Simms & Simms, 1999: 51-52) and sacking Muang Sua (Luang Prabang). Such invasion also threatening Lan Na, thus, Lan Na joined with Lan Xang in repelling Đại Việt. Since then, Lan Na has become a close ally of Lan Xang (Stuart-Fox, 1998: 66-67, 2006: 21-22).

During 1540s, Lan Na was being invaded by both Ayudhya and Taungoo. Cornered in such difficult situation, Lan Na was luckily got reinforcements from Lan Xang. In 1546, Setthathirath, son of King Photisarath of Lan Xang, was crowned by the high rank officials and Buddhist monks as King of Lan Na. In 1548, King Photisarath of Lan Xang has died, and the throne as passed to his son Setthathirath, which made Setthathirath as King of Lan Xang also King of Lan Na (Wyatt, 1984: 78 & Wyatt & Wichienkeeo, 1995: 118-119).

Under King Bayinnaung (reigned 1550-1581), Taungoo expand its territories to east. King Mekuti of Lan Na was surrendered in 1558 (Wyatt, 1984: 80). King Bayinnaung of Taungoo launched several attacks to Ayudhya and put it as a vassal state (Rajanubhab, 2001: 27-64) and in 1574 invaded Vieng Chan (Wiangchan), then expands to Mekong valley area (Wyatt, 1984: 83), which later, it reaches its greatest extend. Subsequent to the death of King Bayinnaung of Taungoo in 1581, many of Taungoo's vassals had revolted, including Ayudhya (Rajanubhab, 2001: 65-144) and Lan Xang. Due to there was no focal ruler from 1583 to 1591, a civil war transpire in Lan Xang (Simms & Simms, 1999: 85-88).

4.5 MALAY PENINSULA KINGDOMS

One of the oldest kingdoms in the southern part of mainland Southeast Asia was Langkasuka, which believed to have been founded in the 2nd century (Ooi, 2004: 764-765 & Guy, 2014: 28-29). In its early phase, Langkasuka suffers pressure from the expansion of Funan to further southern region (Cœdès, 1968: 51-78).

Based on Chinese inscriptions and paintings, Langkasuka contacted Liang in the 6th century (Jacq-Hergoualc'h, 2002: 162-163), later, contacted Song, Yuan and Ming (Wade, 2013: 60-63). There were limited resources which recorded about Langkasuka. Some of them are recorded Langkasuka had come under the control of Śrīvijaya and suffers several attacks from the Chola dynasty of Southern India. Due to the attacks from the Chola, weakening Śrīvijaya control, and no focal ruler, Langkasuka was dissolved and divided into small city states (O'Reilly, 2007: 53-54), which including Ligor, Narathiwat, Pattani, Kelantan, Kedah, Patalung, Trang, Chumporn, Krabi, Kanchanadit, Kraburi, Pahang and Junk Ceylon (Rajani, 1974), later followed by the establishment of Malacca Sultanate (Abshire, 2011: 19-24).

There were a series of raids launched by the Chola in the 11th century that weakened the city states in the Malay Peninsula, which were tributary states of Srivijaya. Later on in the 13th century, Śrīvijaya received high pressure from Majapahit which launched several attacks to Śrīvijaya. In the situation of weak control from Śrīvijaya, the absence of power in the Malay Peninsula, many Arabs traders which carry Islamic culture, Parameswara who was also known as Sultan Iskandar Shah (reigned 1400-1414) establish Malacca Sultanate in 1400 (Abshire, 2011: 19-25).

There were many contacts done by Malacca to Ming during its early establishment as a trade port. Malacca contacted Ming at 1403, 1405, 1411 and 1414. The relationship between Malacca and Ming were further strengthened by several envoys in 1420, 1421 and 1423 (Perpustakaan Negara Malaysia, 2000 & Wade, 2005: 311-881).

Malacca, which strategically located in Malacca strait, makes it as an ideal international port which frequently visited by Borneo, Java, Ayudhya, Ming, Arabs and even European countries. It has Tanasserim (Mergui) and Junk Ceylon in the west and Songkhla and Ligor in the east (Stratch, 2004), which noted by Jumsai (2001: 15): "Apart from Ayudhya, Bangkok and Mergui as chief ports, the towns of Pattani, Singora, Kedah, Ligor and Junk Ceylon were well-known to the European traders as important sea port".

Ayudhya sees Malacca strait as an excellent trade port. Ayudhya attacks and occupies Tenasserim in 1460 and Tavoy in 1488 (Campos, 1983, Wyatt, 1984: 86 & Day, 1991: 8). Another several attacks also being launched to gain the prominent trading route, Malacca strait, but failed due to strong ties between Malacca and Ming. The strong ties and excellent location make it as the center of trade and commerce over the eastern part of the world. This golden era was ended when it suffers a series of attacks and fall to the Portuguese in 1511 (Ricklefs, et. al., 2010: 162-166).

V. EXPANSION TO MAXIMUM EXTENT OF AYUDHYA KINGDOM

5.1 THE EXPANSION OF AYUDHYA

Ayudhya was established by Thai people. They lived in the Chaophraya valley and worked in agriculture sector. When the harvest comes, they trade it to the nearby cities. Through trading, Ayudhya received tax and levies that could fulfill the need of the court, namely to finance the body guards, patrimonial armies, mercenaries and officials. Ayudhya began its expansion by conquering Sukhothai, Kamphaeng Phet and Phitsanulok. Ayudhya besiege Angkor in 1352 (Cœdès, 1968: 236), and fully absorb it in 1431 (Cœdès, 1968: 236-237). Ayudhya invade and put Sukhothai under tribute in 1349 (Cœdès, 1968: 222), once again put it as a vassal state in 1378 (Chakrabongse, 1960: 29-30) and personal union between the Sukhothai and Ayudhya in 1488 by King Ramesuan (Wyatt, 1984: 50-60, & Day, 1991: 4-7).

Ayudhya invade Lan Na and seizing Chiang Rai in 1411 (Nawadei Yadu-baung-gyok, 1964, Tun, 1994 & Surakiat, 2005), invaded Chiang Mai in 1545, sacking Lampang and Lamphun in 1546. Finally put Lan Na as its vassal in 1602 (Rajanubhab, 2001: 145-179). Ayudhya often threaten Lan Xang through several attacks in the 1540s (Wyatt, 1984: 78 & Wyatt & Wichienkeeo, 1995: 118-119).

Ayudhya also put vassal Malay Peninsula kingdoms, namely Ligor, Narathiwat, Pattani, Kelantan, Kedah, Patalung, Trang, Chumporn, Krabi, Kanchanadit, Kraburi, Pahang and Junk Ceylon (Rajani, 1974). It also attacks and occupies several areas of the Malacca Sultanate, Tenasserim in 1460 and Tavoy in 1488 (Campos, 1983, Wyatt, 1984: 86 & Day, 1991: 8).

Campos (1983) pointed out that Ayudhya already become powerful in the region: "Diogo Lopes de Sequeira was sent in 1508 by King Manoel to visit Madagascar, Ceylon and Malacca …. At Malacca twenty·seven of the men that had landed … send a letter to Albuquerque, dated 6th February 1510, in which he said that the King of Malacca was at war with the King of Siam, who had vast territory and many ports".

Military oriented King Naresuan the Great lead Ayudhya to further expand the territory. Under King Naresuan the Great, Ayudhya defeats Toungoo (Wyatt, 1984: 100). King Naresuan the Great has a significant role in the expansion of Ayudhya (Wyatt, 1984: 100), especially for the liberation of Ayudhya from Toungoo (Winichakul, 1994: 62). At that time, Ayudhya was described by European traders as a very dense city with 600,000 residents with 500 monasteries. At that time, the King could gather 200,000 infantries, 20,000 cavalries and 20,000 elephant troops. Ayudhya also has 200,000 ships with sizes varying from large to small are that usually gather at the river when there is a procession of the King (Jumsai, 2001: 12).

Under King Naresuan the Great, Ayudhya reach its maximum extent and become the most powerful kingdom in the Southeast Asia by controlling the territory of Khmer, Sukhothai, Lan Na, Lan Xang, Pegu and the entire Malay Peninsula kingdoms (Thongsin, 2002, Dellios 2003 & Shu 2011, 2012) and become one of the strongest kingdoms in the world (Jumsai, 2001: 12): "At zenith of power, under Naresuan the Great …. There was never a rich and strong country rivaling the power of Ayudhya during those days. … Compare with London or Paris at the time … Ayudhya was much greater".

5.2 FURTHER EXPANSION EFFORTS AFTER THE DEATH OF KING NARESUAN THE GREAT

Subsequent to the death of King Naresuan the Great, Ayudhya suffers an internal problem, many kings ruled but only short lived. During the period, king who ruled a bit long was King Ekathotsarot (c. 1556-1620; reigned 1605-1620) and King Songtham (1590-1628; reigned 1620-1628). Ayudhya also suffers pressures from Taungoo (Rajanubhab, 2001: 180-202). In 1613, King Anaukpetlun of Taungoo invaded and regained Tenasserim. Since 1614, King Anaukpetlun of Taungoo launched a series of invasion to Lan Na and put it as its vassal in 1618 (Rajanubhab, 2001: 197-199).

During the reign of King Ekathotsarot, Ayudhya embassy reached the Dutch city of The Hague in 1608, and met Maurice of Nassau, Prince of Orange. Following the embassy, a treaty with the Dutch has been signed in 1617 by King Songtham. The English first arrived in India in 1612. Ayudhya immediately contact English then gave it a place for trading in Ayudhya. All foreign trading was done through the King's government. Ayudhya also do trading with Ming, Malay Peninsula kingdoms, Japan, Vietnam and other Southeast Asia states (Chakrabongse, 1960: 53-56).

VI. DISCUSSION

Span of control discussion mostly was dominated by the discussion of the number of subordinate (Hamilton, 1921: 229): "In charge of three private soldiers would be too idle; one lieutenant general in charge of six divisional generals would be too busy". Instead of only focusing on one factor, the discussion in this research will focus in several span of control factors identified by Rogers (1972: 9-19), the first discussion relates to the delegation of authority and similarity of functions. Ayudhya has orderly "peerage" which similar to European hereditary titles but more complex. As discussed earlier, too many subordinate will lead to ineffectiveness (Hamilton, 1921: 229). At the height of Ayudhya in the era of King Naresuan the Great, it has the rising number of *Phan*, *Muen*, *Khun*, *Luang*, *Phra* and even *Phraya*. Such "peerage" help the King in the state operational, however, since there are many levels, decision-making authority has to pass through more layers.

The second discussion will be geographic dispersion. The control in Southeast Asia was explained in the Mandala political model (Wolters, 1982: 27 & Chutintaranond, 1990). The relationship between mandalas is the tributary system which applied at that time (Shu, 2011, 2012). In such model, Ayudhya *mueang* in the Mandala political model has several subordinates, vassals, tributary cities which each of them has "stratified city class". The vast areas under control of Ayudhya in the era of King Naresuan the Great also a rising number of *Mueang*, *Chiang*, *Wiang* and *Nakhon* thus makes the span of control problem. Subordinates of Ayudhya was on its surrounding, including Khmer, Sukhothai, Lan Na, Lan Xang and Pegu thus make it easier to control. The Malay Peninsula kingdoms was on the south of Ayudhya still could be considered near from Ayudhya although it was the farthest vassal that has loosest control. Thus often been threatened by China (Perpustakaan Negara Malaysia, 2000 & Wade, 2005: 311-881) and by Portuguese (Ricklefs, et. al., 2010: 162-166).

The third factor, knowledge of the supervisor and personality and energy also being discussed. Ayudhya reached its widest sphere of influence under King Naresuan the Great which often marked as the Golden Age of Ayudhya (Imanuel, Triyuwono & Djamhuri, 2015). The "capable boss" King Naresuan the Great was often referred as the main reason that Ayudhya could achieve its maximum extend. Wyatt (1984: 100) explained: "It is difficult to imagine that the history of Ayutthaya would have been the same without King Naresuan, for he is one of those rare figures in Siamese history who, by virtue of dynamic leadership, personal courage and decisive character, succeeded in Herculean tasks that have daunted others before him". It is also agreed by Chakrabongse (1960: 53-54): "Besides being gifted in military prowess, Naresuan, who was highly intelligent, gained a great deal of general knowledge of the times". It was confirmed in further expansion efforts after his reign, which seems has no luck. Subsequent to the death of King Naresuan the Great, Ayudhya suffers an internal problem (Rajanubhab, 2001: 180-202). Furthermore, it lost control over Tenasserim in 1613 and Lan Na in 1618 (Rajanubhab, 2001: 197-199).

VII. CONCLUSION

Analysis from perspective of management has been presented and discussed in this research. This study describes the expansionist Ayudhya to its maximum extent which reach the climax in the era of King Naresuan the Great. Several efforts to further expand the territory has been done afterwards, but has no luck. Pressures from the surrounding mandalas arose which lead to the vassal kingdoms broke away. The expansionist Ayudhya could be explained by some factors of span of control through management analysis which highlights from the: delegation of authority and similarity of functions; geographic dispersion, and; knowledge of the supervisor and personality and energy. Such management theory was formally formulated by Lockheed in 1912, but the practice could be traced back to the Ayudhya kingdom.

REFERENCES

Abshire, J. E. (2011). *The history of Singapore*. Santa Barbara, California, USA: Greenwood Publishing Group.

Bax, E. B. (1915). *German culture: Past and present*. London, England: Allen.

Bedeian, A. G. (1974). Vytautus Andrius Graicunas: A biographical note. *Academy of Management Journal*, 17(2), 347-348.

Blount, J. H. (1912). *The American occupation of the Philippines, 1898-1912*. New York City, New York, USA: G. P. Putnam's

Sons.

Bogdan, R. & Taylor, S. J. (1975). *Introduction to qualitative research methods: The search for meanings*. Hoboken, New Jersey, USA: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Campos, J. de. (1940). Early Portuguese account of Thailand. *The Journal of the Siam Society*, 32, 1-27.

Campos, J. de. (1983). *Early Portuguese accounts of Thailand*. Lisbon, Portugal: Camara Municipal de Lisboa.

Chakrabongse, P. C. (1960). *Lords of life*. London, England: Alvin Redman Limited.

Chutintaranond, S. (1990). "Mandala", "Segmentary state" and politics of centralization in medieval Ayudhya. *The Journal of the Siam Society*, 78, 88-100.

Cœdès, G. (1921). The origins of the Sukhodaya dynasty. *The Journal of the Siam Society*, 14(1), 1-7.

Cœdès, G. (1968). *The making of South East Asia*. Berkeley, California, USA: University of California Press.

Collons, R. D. (1971). Factory production-1 A.D. *Academy of Management Journal*, 14(2), 270-273.

Dale, E. (1969). *Management: Theory and practice*. New York City, New York, USA: McGraw-Hill.

Day, D. (1991). *Thailand and the Kingdoms of Siam*. Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia: Tropical Press.

Dellios, R. (2003). Mandala: From sacred origins to sovereign affairs in traditional Southeast Asia. *Centre for East-West Cultural and Economic Studies*, 8(10).

Drucker, P. F. (1954). *The practice of management*. New York City, New York, USA: Harper & Row.

Evans, D., Pottier, C., Fletcher, R., Hensley, S., Tapley, I., Milne A. & Barbetti, M. (2007). A comprehensive archaeological map of the world's largest preindustrial settlement complex at Angkor, Cambodia. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. Washington D.C., USA, 14277-14282.

Fayol, H. (1949). *General and industrial management*. London, England: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons Ltd.

Graicunas, V. A. (1933). Relationship in organization. *Bulletin of the International Management Institute*, 7, 39-42.

Guba, E. G. & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research, in Denvin, N. K & Lincoln, Y S. (Ed), *Handbook of qualitative research*, 105-117. Thousand Oaks, California, USA: SAGE Publications.

Gulick, L. (1969). *Notes on the theory of organization*. New York City, New York, USA: Augustus M. Kelley Publisher.

Guy, J. (2014). *Lost kingdoms: Hindu-Buddhist sculpture of early Southeast Asia*. New Haven, Connecticut, USA: Yale University Press.

Hall, D. G. E. (1955). *A history of South-East Asia*. London, England: Macmillan.

Hamilton, I. (1921). *The soul & body of an army*. London, England: Edward Arnold & Company.

Henderson, B. D. (1979). *Henderson on corporate strategy*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA: ABt Books.

Higham, C. (2014). *Early mainland Southeast Asia*. Bangkok, Thailand: River Books Co., Ltd.

Imanuel, A. A. (2016). Management consultants in the restoration of Đại Việt. *International Journal of Business and Management Invention*, 5(11), 37-43.

Imanuel, A. A., Triyuwono, I. & Djamhuri, A. (2015). The role of accounting in the golden age of Ayudhya kingdom. *IOSR Journal of Economics and Finance*, 6(1), 39-45.

Jacq-Hergoualc'h, M. (2002). *The Malay Peninsula: Crossroads of the maritime Silk-Road (100 BC-1300 AD)*. Leiden, Netherland: Brill Publishers.

Jumsai, M. L. M. (2001). *History of Thailand and Cambodia*. Bangkok, Thailand: Chalermnit.

Keefe, E. K., Elpern, S. J., Giloane, W., Moore Jr., J. M., Peters, S. & White, E. T. (1971). *Area handbook for Albania*. Washington D.C., USA: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Koontz, H. & O'Donnell, C. (1968). *Principles of Management*. New York City, New York, USA: McGraw-Hill.

McFarland, D. E. (1970). *Management: Principles and practices*. London, England: Macmillan.

McGregor, S. L. T. & Murnane, J. A. (2010). Paradigm, methodology and method: Intellectual integrity in consumer scholarship. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 34(4), 419-427.

Moleong, L. J. (2005). Metodologi penelitian kualitatif (in Indonesian). Bandung, Indonesia: Remaja Rosdakarya.

Nawadei Yadu-baung-gyok, (1964). *Nawadei Yadu-baung-gyok; The total collections of Nawadei's Yadu*. Rangoon, Myanmar: Hanthawaddy Press.

Niles, M. C. H. (1956). *The essence of management*. Bombay, India: Orient Longman.

Ooi, K. G. (2004). *Southeast Asia: A historical encyclopedia, from Angkor Wat to East Timor* Volume 1. Santa Barbara, California, USA: ABC-CLIO.

O'Reilly, D. J. W. (2007). *Early civilizations of Southeast Asia*. Plymouth, England: Altamira Press.

Perpustakaan Negara Malaysia (2000). *Nation's history - Ancient Malay government*. Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia: Perpustakaan Negara Malaysia.

Petrie, W. M. F. (1924). *Social life in ancient Egypt*. London, England: Constable & Co. Ltd.

Pigors, P. & Myers, C. A. (1961). *Personnel administration: A point of view and a method*. New York City, New York, USA: McGraw-Hill.

Porter, M. E. (1980). *Competitive strategy: Techniques for analyzing industries and competitors*. New York City, New York, USA: Free Press.

Rajani, M. C. C. C. (1974). Background to the Sri Vijaya story-Part I. *The Journal of the Siam Society*, 62, 174-211.

Rajanubhab, H. R. H. P. D. (2001). *Our wars with the Burmese*. Bangkok, Thailand: White Lotus Co. Ltd.

Ricklefs, M. C., Lockhart, B., Albert, L., Reyes, P. & Aung-Thwin, M. (2010). *A new history of Southeast Asia*. Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rogers, J. E. (1972). *Span of control: An analysis of the influencing factors*. Carlisle, Pennsylvania, USA: United States Army War College.

Rothbauer, P. (2008). *Triangulation*. Thousand Oaks, California, USA: SAGE Publications.

Shu, M. (2011). Hegemon and instability: Pre-colonial Southeast Asia under the tribute system. *Advanced Studies Bulletin*, 4, 45-62.

Shu, M. (2012). Balancing in a hierarchical system: Pre-colonial Southeast Asia and the tribute system. *Waseda Global Forum*,

8, 227-256.

Simms, P. & Simms, S. (1999). *The kingdoms of Laos: Six hundred years of history*. London, England: Curzon Press.

Stark, M. T. & Allen, S. J. (1998). Transition to history in Southeast Asia. *International Journal of Historical Archeology*, 2(3), 163-174.

Stark, M. T. (2006). *From Funan to Angkor: Collapse and regeneration in ancient Cambodia; After collapse: The regeneration of complex societies*. Tucson, Arizona, USA: University of Arizona Press.

Stieglitz, H. (1964). *Optimizing span of control*. New York City, New York, USA: McGraw-Hill.

Stratch, W. J. (2004). *Constantine Phaulkon and Somdet Phra Narai*. master theses. University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii, USA.

Stuart-Fox, M. (1993). Who was Maha Thevi? *The Journal of the Siam Society*, 81, 103-108.

Stuart-Fox, M. (1998). *The Lao kingdom of Lan Xang: Rise and decline*. Bangkok, Thailand: White Lotus Co. Ltd.

Stuart-Fox, M. (2006). *Naga cities of the Mekong: A guide to the temples, legends, and history of Laos*. Singapore: Media Masters.

Surakiat, P. (2005). Thai-Burmese warfare during the sixteenth century and the growth of the first Toungoo Empire. *The Journal of the Siam Society*, 93, 69-100.

Terry, G. R. (1968). *Principles of management*. Homewood, Illinois, USA: Richard D. Irwin Inc.

Thongsin, A. (2002). *The Kra canal and Thai security*. master theses. Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, California, USA.

Tun, T. (1994). Hanthawady Sinbyushin: An autobiography. *Golden Myanmar*, 1(4), 13-15.

Urwick, L. F. (1938). *Scientific principles and organization*. New York City, New York, USA: American Management Association.

Urwick, L. F. (1956). The manager's span of control. *Harvard Business Review*, May-June 1956, 39-47.

Urwick, L. F. (1974). V. A. Graicunas and the span of control. *Academy of Management Journal*, 17(2), 349-354.

Vallipodom, S. (1981). *The contradictions in Thai history* (in Thai). Bangkok, Thailand: Muang Boran Press.

Vickery, M. (2001). Resolving the chronology and history of 9th century Cambodia. *Siksacakr: The Journal of Cambodia Research*, 3, 17-23.

Wade, G. (2005). *Southeast Asia in the Ming Shi-lu*. Singapore: Asia Research Institute and the Singapore E-Press.

Wade, G. (2013). *Ghosts of the past in southern Thailand: Essays on the history and historiography of Patani*. Singapore: National University of Singapore Press.

Wells, H. G. (2007). *A short history of the world*. New York City, New York, USA: Cosimo, Inc.

Winichakul, T. (1994). *Siam mapped - History of the geo-body of a nation*. Honolulu, Hawaii, USA: University of Hawaii Press.

Witzel, M. (2003). *Fifty key figures in management*. London, England: Routledge.

Wolters, O. W. (1982). *History, culture and region in Southeast Asian perspectives*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.

Wyatt, D. K. & Wichienkeeo, A. (1995). *The Chiang Mai chronicle*. Chiang Mai, Thailand: Silkworm Books.

Wyatt, D. K. (1984). *Thailand a short history*. Chiang Mai, Thailand: Silkworm Books.

Antonio A Imanuel
Faculty of Economic and Business
University of Brawijaya, Malang, Indonesia