Organizational Behaviour Research: A Critical Analysis

Dr. Soumya Mishra

Assistant Professor, HR Faculty of Management Sciences Siksha 'O' Anusandhan University

Abstract: *The paper examines the current trend in OB research. It looks into the different dynamics in public and private sector, it analyses the transformational change in Indian organizations. It also reflects the future directions inresearch focus.*
Key Words: *Organizational Behavior, Management, Public and Private Sector, Transformational Change, Directions.*

Management can be defined as the process of reaching organizational goals by working with and through human and nonhuman resources to continuously improve value added to the world. Reaching organizational goals is an indication of effectiveness; not wasting resources along the way is an indication of efficiency; continuously improving output and process is an indication of innovation; and adding value to the world is an indication of focused stakeholder responsibility.

World class management reaches goals without wasting resources and generates competitive innovation while sustaining responsible commitments in the private, public, and/or nonprofit sectors domestically and globally. When the managerial process is well executed, it is a "visible hand" that plans, organizes, leads, and controls the use of resources to supplement, integrate, and enhance the positive effects of the "invisible hand". Well managed organizations have a competitive advantage over poorly managed ones for a number of reasons:

They influence their competitive external environments through more productive and focused activities, thereby providing a more stable horizon for planning and progress;

They monitor and coordinate internal resource usage through an organized process that leverages the full, rather than partial, impact of their assets;

They manage system changes more successfully by negotiating favourable contracts and creatively adapting to external forces;

They have a more flexible, committed workforce because their managers routinely exhibit the sound human relations practices that build a strong work community.

When management is poorly executed, however, organizational ineffectiveness, inefficiency, inertia, and/or irresponsibility are overt and covert. Overt ineffectiveness leads to loss of market share in the private sector and to loss of citizen confidence in the public sector. Overt inefficiency leads to increased operational costs in the private sector and to wasted tax dollars in the public sector. Overt inertia leads to obsolete products and services in the private sector and to bureaucratic mediocrity in the public sector. Overt irresponsibility leads to corporate sabotage in the private sector and to defensive uncooperativeness in the public sector. In many instances, the invisible hand in the private sector and government intervention in the public sector eliminate and/or control severe overt mismanagement.

Nevertheless, covert organizational ineffectiveness, inefficiency, inertia, and/or irresponsibility can be as subversively debilitating as overt inadequacies. For example, an organizational ethics consultant relates an incident involving a lumber company client in which in the firm had invested in new technologies, including a new lumber shredder, nicknamed "the hog", but was not experiencing the expected profits from effective sales volume increases and efficient processing cycle times. In other words, overt measures of performance could not account for the lower than expected results, nor could other mainstream management consultants. In conducting an ethical work culture assessment, the consultant heard the phrase "feeding the hog" and asked the employee respondent to explain the phrase. The employee informed the consultant that whenever managers abused employees, covert retaliation would take place in the following manner; subsequent to the abuse, an elaborate informal network became activated, and expensive grades of lumber (e.g., mahogany, cherry) would be rerouted to the lumber shredder and turned into fragments for the least expensive lumber product (e.g., particle board). In effect, "feeding the hog" was a covert expression of retaliation for unjust treatment lack of managerial responsible treatment.

In many organizations today, employees "feed the hog" in a variety of ingenious ways for example, actively engaging in subtle sabotage, withholding the committed performance necessary for world class competitive success. Managerial mistakes of commission and/or omission contribute to retaliatory sabotage activities by employees. When companies experience external competition from better managed companies, the knee-jerk response has been to engage in layoffs, downsizing, and restructuring to eliminate overt bottom line

symptoms of profit loss, rather than change management practices to address the enduring, covert causes.

Because in the United States many states have employment at will laws that, in effect, legally protect incompetent managers from being held accountable for managerial "malfeasance" (substandard performance of managerial roles), management mistakes have been perpetuated and a tradition of adversarial managerial/labor relations has become commonplace in many industries. With the advent of global competition, however, domestic managerial irresponsibility can not be concealed with impunity.

Furthermore, as awareness of professional standards and sanctions for managerial malfeasance increase, managerial incompetence is being criticized because of the widespread growth of professionalism across borders, industries, and occupations. Public expectations to professionalize managerial performance have escalated. The following dimensions of professionalism are pertinent to managerial practice.

- Specialized knowledge and skills
- Service orientation based on objective client/customer needs
- Decision making based on broad principles and theories
- Autonomy of judgment in performance
- Self-regulatory associations for establishing and enforcing performance standards.

Managers today who act unprofessionally that is, ignore objective client/customer needs or are unable to base decision making on broad principles and theories are vulnerable to public censure, loss of business, and ultimate dismissal. To enhance professional management practice, therefore, knowledge of management, ethics, legal, and communication theories is mandatory.

The competing values framework is a useful construct for understanding the meaning of management contains four theories on management, each of which has historical roots in the Western world and each of which is necessary for the dynamic, well rounded balance exhibited by excellent managers.

The relationships among the four theories can be seen in terms of two axes. The vertical axis ranges from flexibility at the top to control at the bottom, and the horizontal axis ranges from an internal organizational focus at the left to an external organizational focus at the right. Each theory fits into one of the four quadrants.

The rational goal theory, which Frederick Taylor introduced at the beginning of the 20th century, stresses the director and producer role responsibilities of setting goals, taking initiative, increasing productivity, and maximizing output by emphasizing goal clarification, rational analysis, and action taking. The internal process theory, which Max Weber and Henri Fayol developed in the first quarter of the 20th century, stresses the monitor and coordinator role responsibilities of information management, documentation control, efficient processing, and consolidated continuity by emphasizing process measurement, smooth functioning of organizational operations, and structural order. The human relations theory, which was made famous by Elton Mayo and the Hawthorne studies in the second quarter of the 20th century, stresses the facilitator and mentor role responsibilities of fostering openness, participation, team morale building, and commitment by emphasizing involvement, humane conflict resolution, and consensus building. Finally, the open systems theory, which was advocated by Paul Lawrence and Jay Lorsch in the third quarter of the 20th century, stresses the innovator and broker role responsibilities of cultivating organizational learning capabilities and developing the competitive power of continual creativity, political adaptation, and negotiated external resource acquisition by emphasizing external trend scanning, creative system change and development, and negotiated contractual agreements and networking (Taylor, 1911).

Each theory within the competing values framework construct consists of two roles to be mastered and is related in so far as the theories both contrast and complement each other. Thus, if one regards management as being defined by a single theory, management activity can be regarded as simple, repetitious, and unilinear; for example, if some coordinated monitoring of employees for internal control is perceived as good management, more of the same is even better and total employee control is best. Whereas if management is defined by the dynamic tension of multiple theories, management activity can be regarded as complex, creative, and holistic; for example, if some coordinated monitoring of employees for internal control is perceived as good management, total employee control may be regarded as undesirable because there is no counter balancing, dynamic tension allowing for employee innovative flexibility. To sustain the synergistic balance of outstanding management, all four theories need to be understood and mastered. Taken alone, no one theory or set of role competencies has the range of perspectives, the increased choice, and the potential effectiveness provided by considering them all as part of a larger integrated framework.

Each theory has a perceptual opposite. The human relations theory, defined by flexibility and internal focus, stands in stark contrast to the rational goal theory, which is defined by control and external focus. In the first, for example, people are inherently valued; in the second, people are of value only if they contribute greatly to goal attainment. The open systems theory, defined by flexibility and external focus, runs counter to the internal process model, which is defined by control and internal focus. Whereas the open systems theory is concerned with adapting to the continuous change in the environment, the internal process theory is concerned with maintaining stability and continuity inside the system.

Parallels among the theories are also important. The human relations and open systems theories share an emphasis on flexibility. The open systems and rational goal theories share an emphasis on external focus. The rational goal and internal process theories emphasize control; the internal process and human relations theories share an emphasis on internal focus.

Management excellence is achieved by mastering all eight managerial roles and balancing the competing roles in an appropriate manner. In fact, the capacity to draw on and use competencies from all four management theories builds the behavioural complexity of managers and enhances their performance. Behavioural complexity includes cognitive complexity and is the ability to act out a cognitively complex strategy by playing multiple, even competing, roles in a highly integrated and complementary way (Hooijberg & Quinn, 1992; Quinn, Spreitzer, & Hart, 1992). Several studies suggest a link between behavioural complexity and effective managerial performance. In a study of 916 CEOs, Hart and Quinn (1993) found that the ability to play the multiple and competing roles produced better firm performance. The CEOs with high behavioural complexity saw themselves as focusing on broad visions for the future (open systems theory) while also providing critical evaluation of present plans (internal process theory). They also saw themselves tending to relational issues (human relations theory) wile simultaneously emphasizing the accomplishment of tasks (rational goal theory). The firms with CEOs having higher behavioural complexity produced the best firm performance, particularly with respect to business performance (growth and innovation) and organizational effectiveness. The relationships held regardless of firm size or variations in the nature of the organizational environment.

In a study of middle managers in a Fortune 100 company, it has found behavioural complexity, as assessed by the superior of the middle manager, to be related to overall managerial effectiveness of the manager, as assessed by the subordinates. In a similar study, behavioural complexity was related to managerial performance, charisma, and the likelihood of making process improvements in the organization.

I.   Management Challenges in the Private and Public Sectors

The challenges in handling behavioural and moral complexity occur in the private and public sectors domestically and globally. At least six substantive differences, however, are found in the goals and processes used by private and public sector managers.

The first substantive difference between private and public sector managers is the former's goal of optimizing market value. Optimizing market value is the raison d'etre of the private sector manager and may include increasing investor wealth, expanding market share, generating profits, and/or providing high quality low cost goods and services for those with investment and purchasing power. The public sector manager's goal is to optimize public value by enacting mandated standards (what is required by the letter of the law and elected officials) and by exploring innovative ways to define and serve the long range public interest (what is permitted by the spirit of the law and appointed officials). Public sector managers who increase public value by operationalizing only what is legally required or what democratically elected authorities mandate tend to be more bureaucratic (Wilson, 1989). Their managerial orientation is downward toward the reliable control of organizational operations, rather than either outward toward the achievement of innovative public service results or upward toward renegotiated policy mandates that may be too restrictive. Public sector managers who increase public value by envisioning new general (as opposed to special) interests and renegotiating existing policies to improve them tend to be more entrepreneurial. Both private and public sector managers can sub-optimize market and public value, respectively, by being either excessively risk averse or risk loving.

The second substantive difference between private and public sector managers is the former's priority of individual ownership interests and consumer sovereignty over collective public interests and citizen sovereignty. Protecting and expanding the exclusive bundle of divisible rights associated with individual proprietary ownership (e.g., the right to use and enjoy one's home) is more important to private-sector managers than addressing the indivisible rights/needs of society at large; for example, no one owns clean air or national defense, but they are collectively owned and experienced in a way that private property rights do not adequately protect, by providing inclusive assistance to owners and non-owners alike. Private sector managers/owners are "individual economic masters" by virtue of legal property rights that protect what they have earned, been given, or inherited, whereas public-sector managers are "collective political servants" entrusted by their public masters, through democratic processes, with the authority to administer to their long-range common needs. Public managers are to serve natural individuals (persons) and artificial individuals (businesses) in such a way that common needs are met now and in the future. Public managers appeal to the priority of the collectively chosen public ends and democratic processes when they use the coercive power of taxation to deprive individual owners of their accumulated wealth and individual consumers of their purchasing power.

In addition, the private-sector managers ultimately accede to consumer sovereignty because products/services will be removed from the market when consumers decide not to buy them in sufficient quantities. On the one hand, profit is the reward that accrues to private-sector managers who satisfy customer

demands repeatedly by efficiently beating competitors. Conversely, public-sector managers ultimately accede to citizen sovereignty because they can be voted out of office or not reappointed if they are perceived as detracting from public value. On the other hand, political power is the reward that accrues to public-sector managers who accurately perceive and respond to constituency interests, who are skillful at compromise and negotiation, and who can persuade people that they can be entrusted with power to use for the public interest.

The third substantive difference between private and public sector managers is the former's reductionist economic value system. In the private sector, managers assume that the worth of a person's labour, the worth of a particular product/service, and/or the worth of a share of stock can all be reduced to tangible economic exchange values (e.g., everything and everyone has a price). Furthermore, they expect that human and nonhuman resources will go where the price, wage and salary, or return on investment are highest until supply equals demand so that resources are efficiently allocated by the impersonal, invisible hand of the market to produce the greatest wealth for society. The public sector manager assumes that the worth of individual labour, the worth of a particular product/service, and/or the worth of an investment is determined by diverse values and cannot be reduced without significant loss in value diversity to economic exchange values. The visible, personal, democratic process, rather that market exchanges, is expected to provide the way to aggregate the irreducible diversity of people's values to make trade off decisions; for example, voting is required to decide whether to reduce smokestack emissions or pave new highways when a limited public budget precludes both being accomplished and when no common values system is acceptable, realistic, and appropriate in a multicultural political arena.

The fourth substantive difference between private and public sector managers is the former's source of power in meeting the current economic wants and anticipated needs of the buying public. Most private sector managers as sume that, by producing whatever the buying public demands, they are providing what all members of society want, when in fact the wants of large segments of the enfranchised, non-buying public (the poor and the disadvantaged) are not necessarily met because they cannot participate in the market place. The source of power for the public sector manager, however, is in meeting the current political demands and anticipated needs of the enfranchised public (those eligible to vote, with or without purchasing power), where citizen sovereignty is accorded a higher moral priority than consumer sovereignty :

When groups have neither purchasing power nor voting power, non-profit-sector managers expand their domain of influence by serving them, often relying on voluntary labour and tax-deductible charitable donations. The Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action (ARNOV) and Yale University's Program on Nonprofit Organizations (PONPO) provide in depth research and education in this area and timely updates through the periodical Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly.

The fifth substantive difference between private and public sector managers is that the former experience urgent market pressures to accord operational priority to efficiency or "go out of business". Private sector managers must rapidly improve the quantity and quality of goods/services to secure market share/profitability and simultaneously reduce costs and cycle time to avoid bankruptcy. The public sector manager does not experience these in tense market pressures for operational improvement because government organizations/agencies rarely go out of business. Rather, the public sector manager accords more operational priority to fairness in processes and outcomes so that all the enfranchised can democratically participate. In fact, rapid operational efficiency in formulating and implementing public policy may give the appearance of procedural unfairness, so most seasoned public managers move at a slower, less efficient but more inclusive pace to avoid the appearance of impropriety by "rushing to judgment".

The sixth substantive difference between private and public sector managers is that, for the latter, government, whether federal, state, or local is the principal institution for shaping collective conduct. For public sector managers, government lends legitimacy to policies by making them regulatory or legal obligations that command the loyalty and compliance of all citizens, not only the buying public. Only government can legitimately imprison violators of its policies. For private sector managers, business is the major productive institution in the world. While taking consumer preferences into account, businesses actively determine the allocation of society's resources and rewards for the production of private goods and services (Hofstede, 1980).

In addition to the six substantive differences, public sector managers are expected to champion the public interest by uniquely emphasizing four standards that sustain public trust : (a) avoidance of conflicts of interest, (b) maintenance of impartiality, (c) avoidance of the appearance of impropriety, and (d) submission to extensive public disclosure to ensure fitness for public office.

II.   Avoidance of Conflicts of Interest
Public managers have a special obligation to put the public interest ahead of personal/special interests. A public manager has a conflict of interest when any financial social or political relationship or transaction may compromise or give the appearance of compromising his or her objectivity, independence or honesty with respect to duties. No public manager owns his or hr office; the manager is a trustee, not a proprietor, in the use

of authority for the common good. So, the use of the public office (as if one owns that office) by a public manager for personal gain for oneself or favored others – whether by bribery, extortion, nepotism, gifts, or other forms of favouritism – is unethical domestically and usually illegal (Common Cause, 1989; General Accounting Office [GAO], 1987). For example, although nepotism is contrary to U.S. public service conflict of interest standards, a parent hiring a child to work in a family owned business is accepted, even expected, in the private sector.

Federal, state, and local political scandals continue to incite the public clamor for compliance with higher standards that prevent conflicts of interest in public managers. Conflict of interest prohibitions are central to new federal standards of conduct. Ranging from affirmative ideals to unequivocal restrictions and on to the criminal code, these standards include (a) the more positive, prescriptive Code of Ethics for Government Service (P.L.96-303) enacted in 1980; () detailed prescriptions administratively adopted by executive orders; (c) regulations from the U.S. Office of Government Ethics (OGE) and individual agencies; and (d) criminal conflict of interest statutes in 18 U.S.C. 901-209. The legal compliance emphasis at the federal level is evident from two facts; (a) In 1989, 76% of all designated agency ethics officers (DAEOs), whose primary duties include training and counseling public agency employees in conflict of interest matters, were in legal offices; and (b) the official title of the widely distributed 1986 OGE training publication was How to Keep Out of Trouble. Many states likewise have conflict of interest codes that extend to state and country public managers (e.g., California, Massachusetts, Alaska), as do municipalities (e.g., Los Angeles, Minneapolis, San Antonio), but their content and enforcement lack uniformity. Among the commonly restrained conflict of interest activities from the 1990 report of the Council on Government Ethics Laws and the New York State Commission on Government Integrity are: (a) using public position for personal benefit, (b) providing benefits to influence official actions, (c) using confidential government information, (d) accepting gifts from internal or external officials, (e) representing private clients before public bodies, (f) competitive bidding, (g) accepting fees or honouraria, outside employment, or business activities, and (h) revolving door post employment influence restrictions.

III. Maintenance of Impartiality

Public managers must avoid bias, prejudice, or favoritism in decision making. Because competing claims make impartiality problematic, ethical public managers retain objectivity and eliminate prejudice in action by steering away from any avoidable influence that may cloud vision, bias decision, or appear as if it may. In a survey of members of the National Association of State Budget officers, impartiality was the most frequently cited ethical concern of public managers. This is where formal and informal standards of professional associations are key in imparting to domestic and international public managers, from top federal administrators to state purchasing managers or elected officials or police chiefs, the importance of objectively serving the public interest. Among the relevant public professional associations whose codes advocate impartiality from their respective memberships are the following; the American Society for Public Administration (ASPA), Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA), National Association of Countries Code of Ethics for Country Officials (NAC), National Association of Purchasing Management (NAPM), International City Management Association (ICMA), International Personnel Management Association (IPMA), International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP), and International Association of Purchasing Management (IAPM).

Of particular importance to public managers is the pressure to abandon the impartiality standard because of political party affiliation. Terms such as party boss and machine polities conjure up negative images of public managers without integrity who choose to toe the party line and donate time, money, and even votes to partisan campaigns that may or may not be in the public's long term interest. The intensity of political party affiliation pressure is usually not experienced by the private sector manager. The move to make some managerial positions part of the civil service system, and thereby interpose merit over partisanship, mitigates party pressures on some public managers.

Avoidance of the Appearance of Impropriety

Public managers are expected to attend to the public perception of how their activities and decisions reflect on their office and to preclude adverse publicity. It is not enough for managers just to uphold the law and be ethical. Public service must look right, smell right, feel right; in short, it must avoid the appearance of impropriety. Avoidance of negative publicity is particularly meaningful in public service, where obligations are linked to public confidence and trust. Some public managers interpret this standard to imply that looking good is as important as doing good (Greenberg, 1996). Avoiding the appearance of impropriety for public managers usually means anticipating not only what a reasonable person would reasonably regard as impropriety but also what the most suspicious person would construe as impropriety in the community setting.

For this reason, public sector managers are often more circumspect than private sector managers about initiatives for generating revenue for public offers, whereas a private sector manager would prioritize and be rewarded for revenue generating projects that enlarge the economic pie for everyone, a public sector manager

would prioritize and be rewarded for the public perception of the equitable distribution of a limited economic pie because the enlargement of the economic pie by his or her office might invite the appearance of impropriety (e.g., economic self-advancement). The goal, of course, is economic growth with equity, but the negative publicity resulting from the perception of inequitable distribution of benefits and burdens is much more likely to adversely affect public sector than private sector managers. This standard is not intended to be a substitute for ethical action, however, instead and ideally, it points to the public manager's obligation to reinforce public perception of legitimate authority exercised on behalf of the public interest that is above suspicion.

Despite criticisms and cautions, this standard drives public service. In no small measure, it even defines it. This standard is geared to maintaining public confidence in public service and therefore, voluntary compliance. In many instances, in the absence of negative publicity or scandals, public managers are re-elected or reappointed at such a high rate that incumbency in the public sector carries far more weight than in the private sector.

Submission to Extensive Public Disclosure

Public managers usually must be able to withstand more intense public scrutiny into their private lives than private managers. The rationale behind this level of private disclosure is that the right of the electorate to know that a person is fit for public service is a more compelling interest than respecting the right of privacy for the average person. When the right of the people to be informed about public leadership does not intrude upon constitutionally protected, intimate, personal matters, which are unrelated to fitness for public office, the public manager or candidate is expected not to complain that his or her privacy is paramount to the interest of the people.

In addition to detailed financial disclosure requirements, many public managers must expose themselves to continual probing of their past official actions and any current public activities, as well as any private conduct that might raise issues of questionable character for an official entrusted with public resources. The visibility of public managers triggers their vulnerability to extensive scrutiny and the threat of unfavourable disclosure; public scrutiny intensifies the higher one climbs in government service. Part of this public scrutiny is media attention from investigative journalists. Although these journalists have their self-censorship standards of fair play they experience the urgent market pressures for breaking a story, exposing a personal scandal, or at least not being "scooped" by other media.

Today, so much is in the public record that it is difficult to distinguish privacy from anonymity. Computer systems, public information, and freedom of information statues join together as the speed, capacity, and standards of public disclosure change. The quality of deliberation in a democracy is debased, however, when sensationalist exposes of private activities displace reasonable discussions of issues of public concern. Furthermore, when ethics is used as a negative political weapon and cynically abused for partisan purposes, public managers and employees, their morale, and the image of public service are wounded in the crossfire. For this reason, until a material boundary of privacy for public managers is determined (e.g., a statute of limitations or amnesty on prior wrongdoing), they must be hardy enough to endure the additional public scrutiny to which they will be subjected. So, although private and public sector managers have different demands, they still must be able to handle behavioural and moral complexity.

Too often, however, private and public sector managers are overdeveloped, underdeveloped, or involved in adversarial relations when mutually beneficial development and partnership would further both their domestic and global objectives. The nature and extent of business/government relations is always controversial and varies globally. Whether government plays a big or small role as a percentage of national gross domestic product (GDP) depends on the country in question.

Relative to those of many other industrialized countries, the U.S. government plays less of a role in economic activity. Between 1974 and 1992, roughly 30 million private sector jobs were created in North America. The number of European Union (EU) private sector jobs was less than 5 million for the same span. New low cost competition from Asia and Eastern Europe has highlighted competitiveness gaps in Europe, where businesses have been losing market share and have often reacted by transferring production elsewhere. Restructured U.S. industries and the competitive dollar add new challenges for the EU.

A consensus of long term forecasts for key European economies reveals expectations that average growth rates in the EU economies will be subpar, at little more than 2% through the year 2006, according to Consensus Economies Inc., a London forecasting firm. European nations face dwindling tax returns as their economies stagnate under the strain of high taxes and an average unemployment rate of nearly 11% of the workforce. The result is that, bogged down by big budget deficits, high unemployment, and anemic growth, European governments are attempting to fast forward their overhaul of the social welfare state - a political model that, though sustaining low risk prosperity for European citizens, has become unfundable.

The worldwide trend toward privatization after the Cold War in both developed and developing countries continues to highlight the importance of private sector managers in the economic development of the

world. Global privatization is one attempt to institutionalize the operational efficiencies of private sector management when public sector management proves to be inadequate. In turn, when private sector management ignores social responsibilities to achieve profitability efficiently, public sector management intervenes and redresses the imbalance.

Recent politico-economic experience in the former Soviet Union and the Eastern Bloc countries demonstrates the need to simultaneously develop efficient private sector managers who are responsive to market pressures and effective public sector managers who are responsive to democratic pressures in order to add value to the political and economic spheres. The absence of strong private and public sector managers accountable to market and democracy pressures has contributed, for example, to the gross neglect of ecological responsibilities prevalent in the region. In Eastern Europe, official government bureaucrats did not develop the public management skills to anticipate and respond to vocal democratic pressure to preserve natural resources for future generations because they were protected by the Soviet military and Communist Party allegiance. Western European private and public sector managers were more ecologically responsible because they were never free from market and democratic pressures. Today, Western private sector managers are flooding into the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) and Eastern Europe to enhance market efficiencies, but the relative underdevelopment of comparable sophisticated pubic mangers in the region has led to a disastrous lack of adequate public infrastructure – for example, substandard law enforcement that jeopardizes basic public safety; inadequate roads, transportation, housing, health care, food distribution, and telecommunications that erode economic opportunity and quality of life. The dual need, therefore, for competent private and public sector managers warrants mutual understanding and partnership to undertake and sustain value added enterprises in any society. Although substantive differences are found between private and public sector managers, in important ways the domestic and global interests are best served by the balance and dynamic tension between the two as they resolve behavioural and moral complexity problems.

Ethics can be defined as the systematic attempt to make sense of individual, group, organizational, professional, social, market, and global moral experience in such a way as to determine the desirable, prioritized ends that are worth pursuing, the right rules and obligations that ought to govern human conduct, the virtuous intentions and character traits that deserve development in lie, and to act accordingly. Put more simply, ethics is the study of individual and collective moral awareness, judgment, character, and conduct.

Sometimes the term morality is used interchangeably with ethics in everyday conversation, but at other times it can be conceptually distinguished from ethics. The morality of a society is related to its mores – the customs accepted by a society or group as being right and wrong as well as the those laws of a society that add legal prohibitions and sanctions to many activities considered to be immoral. Morality, therefore, ca be defined as the customary, socio-legal practices and activities that are considered importantly right and wrong; the rules that govern those activities; and the values that are embedded, fostered, or pursued by those conventional, socio-legal activities and practices.

IV.   Organizational Behaviour

The last two decades have seen considerable amount of research interest in the fields of organizational behaviour. There has been renewal of focus as well as new proves into fields such as organizational health, organizational diagnostics and organizational development. Organizational behaviour research has gathered momentum as a result of changes taking place in the life of organizations widespread societal change is radically altering the traditional face and place of work in different parts of the world. The nature of work, the work force, and the work place have undergone and will continue to undergo enormous change, bringing both upheaval and opportunity for those involved in organizations.

The focus of today's organizations has shifted from manufacturing to service. Services are defined as all those economic activities in which the primary output is neither a product nor a construction. The service sector now accounts for more than 68% of the nation's gross national product (GNP) and 71% of its employment in United States. Value is added to this output by means like convenience, security, comfort, and flexibility. Service organizations have grown so rapidly in number and size that they accounted for nearly 90% of all new, non-farm jobs created in the United States between 1953 and 1984 (Grover, 1987). Unfortunately, the growth of service organizations have not been accompanied by comparable gains in productivity. According to the Committee for Economic Development (1987), non-manufacturing, non-farm productivity showed zero growth between 1973 and 1985, while manufacturing productivity grew 2.2%. In recent years, concerns about national productivity has inevitably emphasized improving performance in the service sector, and psychologists have undoubtedly focused increased attention on this sector as well (Aswathappa, 2007).

The challenge for organizations today is to institute a new organizational culture that reflects shared values, regardless of previous organizational affiliation, or geographic location. While managing change, organizations will have to become more psychologically minded; that is, they will have to understand the personalities of their subordinates better, particularly the unconscious factors in motivation (Newstrom, 2008).

There are many different ways of viewing organizations and the patterns of behaviour that occur within them. Increasingly, organization development (OD) professionals regard organizations as complex and open social systems that receive input from the larger environment; subject that input to various processes of transformation; and thus produce output.

As a system, an organization is composed of interdependent parts. Change in one part of the system produces changes in other parts. An organization also has the property of equilibrium; the system generates energy to move toward a state of balance among its parts. Ina addition, an organization needs to maintain favourable ratios of input and output with the environment in order to survive over time (Katz & Kahn, 1978).

Although the system perspective is useful, it alone may be too abstract to be useful. In response, a number of organizational theorists have attempted to develop more pragmatic theories or models based on the system paradigm. Nadler's (1983) approach, which he calls the congruence model of organizational behaviour, represents such an attempt. Nadler's model depends on the relationships between input, transformation, and output. In this framework, the principal inputs to the system of organizational behaviour are the following:

Environment, which provides constrains, demands, and opportunities;
- Resources available to the organization;
- History of the organization; and

Organizational strategy, which may be the most crucial input because it consists of key decisions regarding the match of the organization's resources with the constraints, demands, and opportunities in the environment and within an historical context.

In general, the output of the system is the organization's effectiveness at performing in a manner consistent with its strategic goals. Specifically, the output includes not only organizational performance as a whole but also its major contributors, which are group performance, individual behaviour, and affect. The organization is viewed as a mechanism that takes inputs (strategy and resources in the context of history and environment) and transforms them into outputs (patterns of individual, group, and organizational behaviour).

The major focus of organizational analysis, therefore, is this process of transformation. According to the congruence model, the organization is composed of four major components:
- The tasks of the organization, or the work to be done and is critical characteristics;
- The people who are to perform organizational tasks;
- The formal organizational arrangements, which include various structures, processes, and systems that are designed to motivate individuals and to facilitate task completion, and

The informal organizational arrangements, which include patterns of communication, power, and influence as well as values and norms that are neither planned nor written but tend to emerge over time and that ultimately characterize actual functioning.

The basic hypothesis of the model is that an organization is most effective when its major components are congruent with one another. Organizational problems such as ineffectiveness stem from poor fit or lack of congruence among organizational components. For example, the skills and abilities of the individuals who are available to do the necessary tasks must be congruent with the demands of those tasks; at the same time, the regards that the work provides must be congruent with the needs and desires of the individuals.

The approach to organizations is a contingency approach. There is no one best organizational design or style of management or method of working rather, different patterns of organization and management are most appropriate in different situations. The model recognizes the fact that individuals, tasks, strategies, and environments may differ greatly from organization to organization.

Organizational models that do little more than describe or depict are frustrating, both from the perspective of research about organizations and from that of consultation to organizational clients. Burke and Litwin (1989) realized the need for a model that predicts behaviour and performance consequences, one that deals with cause (organizational conditions) and effect (resultant performance). Their model is based on sound research, theory, and organizational consulting experience.

Some organizational models that are largely descriptive do stipulate certain boundaries. Weisbord (1976), for example, states that the role of the leadership box in his six box model is to coordinate the remaining five. The Nadler-Tushman (1977) model is one of congruence. These authors that for effectiveness, the various boxes composing their model should be congruent with one another; for example, organizational arrangements (structure) should be congruent with organizational strategy. Nevertheless, most, if not all, of these models contain no causal features.

Contingency models of organizations do have certain causal aspects. Organizational effectiveness is, in part, contingent on the degree of match between the organization's external environment (whether static or dynamic) and the organization's internal structure (either mechanistic or organic). But contingency models tend to present too many contingencies and few methods for sorting out their interrelationships.

In contrast, the Burke-Litwin model is more than merely descriptive and congruent; it serves as a guide not only for organizational diagnosis but also for planned, managed, organizational change. They have offered a

causal model of organizational performance.

The original thinking behind the model came from George Litwin and others during the 1960s. In 1967, the Harvard Business School sponsored a conference on organizational climate, and the results of this conference were published in two books. The concept of organizational climate that emerged was that of a psychological state strongly affected by organizational conditions, such as systems, structure, and managerial behaviour. Tagiuri and Liwin (1968) emphasized that there could be no universal set of dimensions or properties for organizational climate. They argued that one could describe climate along different dimensions depending on what kind of organization was being studied and what aspects of human behaviour were involved. They described climate as a molar, synthetic, or changeable construct. Further, the kind of climate construct they described was relatively malleable; it could be modified by managerial behaviour and by systems and be strongly influenced by more enduring group norms and values.

This early research and theory development regarding organizational climate clearly linked psychological and organizational variables in a cause-effect model that was empirically testable. Using the model, Litwin and Stringer were able to predict and to control the motivational and performance consequences of various organizational climates established in their research experiment.

The concept of organizational culture is drawn from anthropology and is used to describe the relatively enduring set of values and norms that underlie a social system. These underlying values and norms may not be entirely conscious. Rather, they describe a "meaning system" that allows members of a social system to attribute meaning and value to the external and internal events that they experience. Such underlying values and meaning systems change only as continued culture is applied to generations of individuals in that social system.

The distinction between climate and culture must be very explicit because the Burke Litwin model attempts to describe both climate and culture in terms of their interactions with other organizational variables. Thus, the model builds on earlier research and theory with regard to predicting motivation and performance effects. In addition, the variables that influence and are influenced by climate need to be distinguished from those influenced by culture. Therefore, there are two distinct sets of organizational dynamics. One set primarily is associated with the transactional level of human behaviour or the everyday interactions and exchanges that create the climate. The second set of dynamics is concerned with processes of human transformation (sudden "leaps" in behaviour) that are required for genuine change in an organization's culture. Efforts to distinguish transactional and transformational dynamics in organizations have been influenced by the writings of Burns (1978) and by experiments in modern organizations (Kroonz & Weiheirich, 2008).

Burke and Litwin's (1989) model has been refined through a series of studies directed by Burke (Bernstein & Burke, 1989; Michela, Boni, Manderlink, Bernstein, O'Malley, Burke, & Schechter, 1988). Recent collaboration has led to the current form of the model, which attempts the following:

- To specify the interrelationships of organizational variables; and
- To distinguish transformational and transactional dynamics in organizational behaviour and change.

In accordance with accepted thinking about organizations from general systems theory (Katz & Kahn, 1978), the external environment box represents the input, and the individual – and organizational – performance box represents the out put. Feedback loops go in both directions. The remaining boxes of the model represent the through put aspect of general systems theory.

The model could be displayed differently; external environment could be on the left and performance on the right, with all throughput boxes in between. The model also could be inverted with performance on the top and external environment on the bottom. However, the model as pictured makes a statement about organizational change: organizational change stems more from environmental impact than from any other factor. Moreover, with respect to organizational change, the variables of strategy, leadership, and culture have more "weight" than the variables of structure, management practices, and systems. In other words, having leaders communicate a new strategy is not sufficient for effective change. Cultural change must be planned as well as aligned with strategy and leader behaviour. How the model s displaced does not dictate where change could start; however, it des indicate the weighting of change dynamics. The reader can think of the model in terms of gravity, with the push toward performance being in the weighted order.

The concept of transformational change in organizations is suggested in the writings of Bass (1985), Burke (1986), Burns (1978), McClelland (1975), and Tichy and Devanna (1986). Transformational refers to areas ink which alteration probably is caused by interaction with environmental forces (both within and without) and which require entirely new sets of behaviour on the part of organizational members.

These variables are very similar to those originally isolated by Litwin (1968) and later by Michela et al (1988). They are transactional in that alteration occurs primarily via relatively short term reciprocity among people and groups. In other words, "you do this for me and I will do that for you".

Each category in the model can be described as follows :

External Environment: Any outside condition or situation that influences the performance of the

organization. These conditions include market places, world financial conditions, political/governmental circumstances, and so on.

Mission and strategy: What employees believe is the central purpose of the organization and how the organization intends to achieve that purpose over time.

Leadership : Executive behaviour that encourages others to take needed actions. For purposes of data gathering, this box includes perceptions of executive practices and values.

Culture : "The way we do things around here". Culture is the collection of overt and covert rules, values, and principles that guide organizational behaviour and that have been strongly influenced by history, custom, and practice.

Structure : The arrangement of functions and people into specific areas and levels of responsibility, decision – making authority, and relationships. Structure assures effective implementation of the organization's mission and strategy.

Management Practices : what managers do in the normal course of events to use human and material resources to carry out the organization's strategy.

Systems : Standardized policies and mechanisms that facilitate work. Systems primarily manifest themselves in the organization's regard systems and in control systems such as goal and budget development and human resource, allocation.

Climate : The collective current impressions, expectations, and feelings of the members of local work units. These, in turn, affect members' relations with supervisors, with one another, and with other units.

Task Requirements and Individual Skills Abilities : The behaviour required for task effectiveness, including specific skills and knowledge required for people to accomplish the work assigned and for which they feel directly responsible. This box concerns what is often referred to as job-person match.

Individual Needs and Values : The specific psychological factors that provide desire and worth for individual actions or thoughts.

Motivation : Aroused behavioural tendencies to move toward goals, to take needed action, and to persist until satisfaction is attained. This is the net resultant motivation; that is, the resultant net energy generated by the sum of achievement, power, affection, discovery, and other important human motives.

Individual and Organizational Performance : The outcomes or results, with indicators of effort and achievement. Such indicators might include productivity, customer or staff satisfaction, profit, and service quality.

Organizational Climate – as the concept originally evolved in the 1960s at the Harvard Business School and other centres of behavioural research- was a description of the immediate, short term impact o the organizational environment on individual and group behaviour. Of course, climate has long term consequences, but these consequences develop as a result of a series of continuing, day to day interactions and exchanges (transactions).

The idea of climate evolved from the efforts of Litwin and others to describe the relatively fluid qualities of human behaviour. Managers could establish a particular climate with a whole variety of consequences for motivation and organized performance.

In the causal model, day to day climate is a result of transactions related to issues such as :

Sense of Direction: The effect of mission clarity or lack thereof;

Role and Responsibility: The effect of structure, reinforced by managerial practice;

Standards and Commitment: The effect of managerial practice, reinforced by culture;

Fairness of regards: The effect of systems, reinforced by managerial practice;

Focus on customer versus internal pressures or standards of excellence: The effect of culture, reinforced by other variables.

In contrast, organizational culture is those underlying values and systems that are difficult to manage, to alter, and even to be realized completely (Schein, 1985). Culture is not used to describe another way of understanding the short term dynamics of the organization. Rather, it provides a theoretical framework for developing into that which is continuing and relatively permanent. Change can be arranged or may come about as a result of uncontrolled outside forces but will involve substantial upheaval in all transactional – level systems and will take time.

Instant change in culture seems to be a contradiction in terms. By definition, those things that can be changed quickly are not the underlying reward systems but the behaviours that are attached to the meaning systems. It is relatively easy to alter superficial human behaviour, it is quite difficult to alter something unconscious that is hidden in symbols and mythology and that acts as the fabric that helps an organization to remain whole and functional.

To change something so deeply imbedded in organizational life requires transformational experiences and events. New meaning is given to one's perceptions by such life changing circumstances (Mc- Shane et al.,2009). Cataclysmic environmental changes shaped human evaluation and produced the kind of internalized

culture that people experience. Similarly drastic environmental changes have shaped or will shape the culture or organizations such as Chrysler and General Motors.

Culture has enormous inertia. It takes drastic circumstances for leaders to question long held assumptions. Walter Wriston, former chairman of Citicorp, is reported to have said, "You know when you change; when you run headlong into a brick wall, that's when you change!" Transformational experiences and events often result from environmental change, but other events may be critical – for example, the appointment of a new leader. Such transformational processes can provide the basis for "sudden leaps" in organizational behaviour and performance because they provide new meaning to events such as cultural change and its interactions with other variables.

OB work in India has been sizeable, to date there being nearly a thousand publications in this young social science. An impressive variety of organizations and organizational issues has been studied. Besides, OB researchers in India have utilized a variety of research methods. However, a major lacuna is the low responsiveness of OB to social realities and priorities (Khandwalla, 2013).

Within reason, OB research in a developing society should have a social focus. It should address itself to the consequences for organizational behaviour of such pervasive social realities as scarcity, poverty, inequality, democratization and politicalization, black money and corruption, modernization, comprehensive economic planning, pervasive state regulation of social and economic activities, competition, technological change, nepotism and kinship orientation, the spiritual heritage of India, etc. There has been little empirical research of the organizational consequences of these Indian realities. Such research would provide a much deeper understanding of the foundational forces shaping the design, functioning, and performance of Indian organizations, and the aspirations and behaviour of people working in these organizations.

The social relevance of OB can be enhanced if there is a sharper research focus on those strategic organizations and individuals that directly impact socio economic development (Khandwalla, 1987). Strategic organizations are organizations that assume responsibility for society's development or the development and growth of the sectors in which they operate, such s the Union Cabinet, various ministries, the Planning Commission, mission oriented organizations like the Industrial Development Bank of India, the IIMs, the IITs, public enterprises, development oriented programmes like the Integrated Rural Development and development oriented private enterprises and voluntary organizations, etc. Strategic individuals, such as chief executives, shape the growth and development of strategic organizations, or are directly involved in fulfilling the missions of these organizations, such as extension workers and village level workers (VLWs) of health and family planning programmes. The small volume of research on the functioning and performance of strategic organizations, especially of public enterprises development programmes, and development administration indicates pervasive management incertitude and staggering operating problems. Similarly, the extant research on strategic individuals and teams is small; but the available research indicates a depressing picture of poor work attitudes or inappropriate task orientation. Work attitudes of such strategic individuals as university teachers, village level workers, block development officers, extension supervisors, health and family planning workers, and scientific personnel are poor, among the four orientations judged crucial for the administrators of developmental agencies of the government, social change and citizen participation orientations are the weakest. Any help that OB can provide, through research, training strategies, etc. could strengthen the capacity of these strategic organizations and individuals to discharge their developmental functions more effectively.

Besides the social relevance angle, even from a narrower academic perspective, notwithstanding the buoyancy in OB work in India, major gaps remain:

There is a glaring gap in the links between macro-OB variables and micro-OB variables. There are virtually no empirical studies of how the organization's growth, diversification, and competitive strategies affect work attitudes, conflict, and the leadership at lower levels of the organization and vice versa. There is only one study of how top management goals affect lower management work attitudes (Khandwalla and Jain, 1984), or of the way the style of top management affects motivational climate at lower levels. A lot more work is surely needed. There is no point promoting the NT leadership style or participative decision making or job enrichment or employee oriented supervision at middle or lower levels of the organization if they are not congruent with the goals, strategies, policies, and management ideologies of the top management. They would have virtually no chance of getting institutionalized. Equally, it would be interesting to learn how the cultural norms and operating practices at lower levels affect the strategy management style, etc. of the top management. There is an urgent need for OB researchers, especially those in micro-OB, to keep broader models of organizational functioning in mind. Such models specify links between macro and micro organizational variables, so that leadership or managerial values or work motivation and attitude studies are not conducted without a due consideration of such macro variables as organizational goals, operating environment, strategy, top management style, organizational structure, etc.

The linkages between macro-organizational variable are still much too obscure. Much more vigorous effort to uncover these linkages is surely needed to provide a sounder basis for identifying options in

organizational design. It is equally important to examine how goals, strategies, policies, ideologies, structures, etc, evolve. To date, the literature on organizational evolution is growing but still modest (Bhattacharya, 2013).

Despite the relative abundance of micro-OB research, thee still are large areas of darkness; political behaviour within the organization, inter group and intra group conflict and cooperation, decision making the process by which the group norms, cultures, and motivational climates evolve, the precise causal linkages between leadership, organizational climate, and work attitudes, creative and resourceful behaviour at lower levels, crisis management, etc. Such interesting Western paradigms as personality pathology, learned helplessness, transformational leadership, social information processing, etc, need to be utilized in Indian micro-OB research. Equally, there is a need to explore the determinants and organizational consequences of Indian conceptualizations like extension, work dedication, social achievement, socialized commitment, and pioneering innovating motives, dual socializations into traditional values and modern work attitudes, the psychology of poverty and inequality, etc.

There is still an over reliance on he questionnaire survey as a research tool. Fortunately, the range of research methods being used is getting broader. However, a research tool that has vast potential but has been neglected is the so-called natural experiment. In a modernizing society, organizations frequently undertake a wide range of changes of structure, technology, management techniques and systems, strategy, mission and goals, policies, etc. These provide a great opportunity to the organizational researcher for exciting studies of organizational dynamics. The researcher needs to contact the management before the change takes place to negotiate a research agreement to make measurements before, during, and after the change, and to feed back the findings to the management. The opportunities for this in governmental and public enterprises are particularly rich. This sort of research could not only provide deep insights into the organizational dynamics associated with a variety of changes, but would also led to the utilization of research by the organization. It would also be useful if consultancy agreements incorporate a provision for before, during, and after measurements of organizational phenomena. Over time,, such a provision would improve consultancy practice. Organizational researchers also need to use multiple methods in research, a sort of triangulation strategy, so as to improve the validity of their findings (Bhandarkar, 2012).

V.   Future Directions

Finally, it is useful to bear in mind what practitioners want from OB, so that OB research becomes responsive to client needs and a healthy collaboration develops between the generators of knowledge and is users. Several distinguished practitioners from the government, industry, and voluntary organizations spelled out their expectations from OB at a recent international conference at IIMA on Organizational and Behavioural Perspectives for Social Development. Some of these are listed below:

- Identification of highly motivated individuals for developmental tasks.
- Inter institutional coordination for fulfilling developmental missions.
- Functioning autonomy for systems embedded in bureaucratizes.
- Introduction and institutionalization of needed innovations in bureaucratic and political systems.
- Motivation of staff in large bureaucratic systems or in systems operating in difficult terrains.
- How can training be made need based and job related, and how can training be prevented from becoming a mere ritual?
- Selection of staff, especially of key people.
- Improving the performance of the large mass of "average" employees.
- Identification of the factors affecting the success or failure of the chief executive.
- Helping family run business to professionalize their managements.
- Helping organizations to cope with such environmental changes as the consumer movement, pollution control, etc.
- Helping organizations to determine appropriate structures for themselves, especially the level of centralization and decentralization differentiation, etc.
- Helping them to get to these appropriate levels.
- Management of trade unions and industrial relations.
- Management of innovation and creativity.
- Productivity improvement.
- Helping managers to play multiple roles effectively.
- Collaboration between OB experts and industry practitioners.
- OB in India has passed many milestones; it has yet many miles to go!

The most common organizational pattern in India is the bureaucratic patterns but research on bureaucracy is done mainly on government systems and other patterns refer to business and industrial organizations. The two have followed separated directions and methodology and it would be useful to survey

research on bureaucracy and industrial organizations separately. Very few organization studies have included private bureaucracy.

Studies on bureaucracy can be classified into five categories as follows:

- Problems of organizing work, delegation, authority, power, measuring organizational effectiveness and reforms.
- Studies on administration of specific situations such as development, disaster, programmes and the like.
- Background, attitudes, values and orientation of bureaucrats.
- Relations between politicians and administrators.
- Policy issues and decision making in government.

There are few field studies on this subject except for the ones on the working of district administration. Most writing on work organization are reports of committees and commissions appointed by the Central or the State Governments, the most detailed among these being the report of the administrative Reforms Commission (ARC, 1968). At the field levels, various aspects of the Panchayati Raj (Gaikwad, 1978) have been another area of interest to many researchers.

The structure and design of the government organizations are studied mainly from the point of view of new tasks taken over by the government. The problems are posed by an increase in the volume and the variety of work. A number of experiments have been tried. The magisterial functions have been separated from the District Collector, the development functions have also been separated and placed with the Zilla Parishad in some places; the functions of animal husbandry, health, public works, agriculture, small industry, etc. pose many problems of coordination, control and responsibility for results. The representative organization has also added a new dimension to public administration. Some studies have used concepts from corporate management to speculate on what the organization looks like. There are new patterns of Panchayati Raj which give more powers to elected bodies, as in Karnataka, but systematic studies of these patterns are yet to become available.

Development administration has attracted the largest number of studies. It is generally felt that the administrative system is too rigid to cope effectively it ht he requirements of developmental tasks. The inadequacy lies in terms of values needed to relate to people, attitudes, orientation and responsiveness to developmental tasks.

Responses of administration to natural calamity such as famine and floods are few but comprehensive. The studies show that bureaucracy is able to handle situations of emergency imposed by natural disasters effectively. The machinery is well geared to set quickly the remedial measures into motion and mobilize resources needed for the purpose. It is, however, found that expenditure incurred and projects undertaken to generate employment are rarely linked to long term development plans of the region. They are ad hoc.

Yet another category of writings in public systems consists of functional subjects. These areas include centre state relations, public financing, personnel administration, public accountability and the like. Most of these writings are either reports of committees or commissions or descriptive in nature, or based ion personal experience of individuals or a critique of the prevailing situation.

In the 60s and the 70s, a large number of studies have been carried out about the background, attitudes, values and motivation of senior civil servants. The underlying assumption appears to be that orientation of individual in key positions would determine the quality of administration. Such simplistic assumptions ignore the organizational processes and the organizational culture. The material that reflects on the organizational processes and culture are autobiographical accounts of retired civil servants.

There are only a limited number of studies on this important subject. Many writings on the subject either speculative or based on personal experiences of individuals. This area is considered important by many writers but studies on the subject are rarely undertaken. Even biographical references are unspecific and merely hint at areas of conflict between the two.

The last category of studies concerns evaluation of public policy, strategy or programmes. In the 60s and the 70s, efforts were made to study the apparatus of policy formulation in Government of India. In the last 20 years, researchers have shown increasing interest in two kinds of evaluation studies-one, relating to overall policy, and two, relating to appraisal of specific programmes and schemes of the Central and State Governments. The policy studies are carried out predominantly by economists industrial policies, agriculture policies, fiscal policies, etc. Most of these are based on secondary data.

Most of the evaluation studies such as that of poverty programmes, rural employment programmes, small scale sector, support price, etc. are carried out by the Planning Commission, the Ministries, or by the individuals mainly from secondary data. Some of these have led to a review of policy in certain areas.

The quality of policy review and evaluation studies is uneven and often lacks sound conceptual base. Rarely do they take the total system view, or rely on primary data. In many cases, specific conclusions follow the bias of the writer. Comprehensive and serious studies in this area are few. They need a perspective of inter relationship and of totality.

In summary, organization studies have not significantly changed in their coverage during the last 20 years. The public system relies heavily on experience and wisdom as observed in the formation of committees and commissions, than on rigorous research methodology. With rare exceptions, the study of government systems lacks almost completely the action research approach for study of organizations. There are many problems in taking up field based studies in government organizations. There are many problems in taking up field based studies in government organizations. Except for institutions or individuals with high reputation, access to data is difficult. Most civil servants have little faith in research and rely ore on personal experience than data. The outside inputs to government decision making comes mainly from recommendations of special committees, rather than from research (Mishra, 2011).

During the 50s and the 60s, very few organization studies are reported. Except Ganguly's study (1964), most other reports were accounts of consulting. During the 70s and the 80s, scholars have shown an increasing interest in the subject. Many studies follow the action research methodology, and some others follow either the case study or the survey methodology. The studies can be classified into three categories as follows:

- Dealing with structure, design of work, problems of delegation, coordination, control, etc.
- Dealing with behaviour in organizations.
- Dealing with problems of change, rehabilitation and adaptation.

In the 50s and the 60s, most studies are undertaken by consulting organizations from abroad or India. While a few studies are published and are based on ideas developed at the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations in London (Rice, 1958; 1963), many other reports are based, generally, on concepts derived from industrial engineering and remain captive reports with client organizations.

In the 70s and 80s, many writings on the subject are available including some theoretical papers. Three predominant approaches are noticeable:

(a) Socio-technical systems approach to organizing work;
(b) Autonomous, self-regulating small group structures, and
(c) Enhanced self-awareness on the part of the leader in order that he can provide effective direction to the organization. Variant patterns of this consist of collective and complementary leadership, or cluster of mutually supporting leadership to complex organizations.

The socio-technical approach has been used for reorganization of many large organizations in India during the last 20 years. These approaches have been derived from open system theories developed in the late 40s in the UK by a group of social scientists working at the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations, London.

The writers who have contributed the most in the design of work have generally followed the action research, case study or the controlled experimental methodology. Many of the contributions result from consulting involvement or change experiments. These situations offer a valuable opportunity for the study of organizations. The other feature of contributions in this area is that a small number of people has been engaged in these studies and their contribution dominates this field during the period of this review. They are mainly from the Institutes of Management at Ahamedabad and Calcutta, Delhi University and the Administrative staff College, Hyderabad. Later, new centres developed in Delhi and other places (Dayal, 1992).

The largest numbers of studies in this area are reportedly by behaviour scientists, industrial psychologists and scholars in related areas. Literature in this area is reviewed extensively and need not be reviewed again except to indicate the trends and the overall emphasis in research. The major concern has been the concepts relating to motivation, job satisfaction, attitudes, job values, authority and role and role relationships. In more recent years, interest in concepts of power and stress has emerged. Once other area of interest in the late 70s and the 80s has been the impact of Indian culture on management practices. Two predominant approaches are noticeable; first, going back to religious and ancient writing, derive what is considered the "Indian" way of ding things, and determine how best culturally rooted patterns can be transferred to modern organizations, the second approach has its orientation in sociological and anthropological literature. How do early experiences of growing up influence adult patterns, and in what ways are these patterns dysfunctional in the context of the demands made on people in modern organizations? There are very few empirical studies in this area.

Most writings in the area are based on action research and consulting; apart from a few comparative studies on rehabilitation literature on adaptation such as hi-tech industry is normative (Dayal, 1988).

The organizational change literature is primarily derived from action and case research. These accounts have been either provided by the researchers or interested students of organizational change. Organizational change involves subjects of change in examining their own problems, and in the redesign of the work system along with changes in the role and role relationships. The work n rehabilitation is impressive but confined to a limited number of studies in Indian.

The study of change, rehabilitation and adaptation is best suited to the action research methodology and the insights reported on the dynamics of organizational change are useful. What has emerged from these studies is summarized below:

1) Most organizations show a mismatch between the technology of work and the social organization resulting in poor control, diffused areas of responsibility, stress and strains in inter-departmental relations, etc.

2) The level of trust at the interpersonal level in organizations is difficult to establish. Most managers demand loyalty to the individuals and not necessarily to the task or the organization and this is reflected in the network of relationships in an organizations and constant changes in these relationships become necessary with a change of organizational leaders.

3) The giving and taking of responsibility is difficult for the giver and the taker alike. The reasons for this phenomenon may be due to both cultural origin and practices followed by organizations.

4) Most people have a need for structure and prefer role boundary to be defined, though, individually, few respect the boundary.

5) People are comfortable with hierarchy. Group work is rare and has to be consciously developed.

Some issues of considerable significance that require continuing attention are :

1) Are there certain behaviour characteristics that militate against the requirements of modern organizations? For example, if cooperation and interdependence at peer level are important requirements of tasks in modern organizations, are there any culture-oriented aspects that prevent group formation?

2) Is there nay Indian style of management and if yes, how suited is it for the requirements of modern industry?

3) Are there new patterns of organization that would have to be developed, and if so, what and how best do new roles and role relationships develop?

4) What are the characteristics of Indian work ethos and what aspects of the organizational management contribute to it the most? What interventions, if required, would help organizations change work ethos?

5) What motivates Indian employees and how should it be internalized in the work system.

6) How do people acquire power in organizations and how should it be used for growth and not for raising conflict?

7) What are the most effective coping mechanisms to deal with stress in organizations?

All these observations call for a renewal of focus on OB research in India. Both work culture & motivation need to be enhanced for facilitating the process towards organizational effectiveness and achieving corporate excellence.

Reference

[1]. Bandopadhyay, S. (1998). Leadership. Indian Management, 4, 23-26.
[2]. Beehr, T.A. & Bhgat, R.S. (1995). Human Stress and Cognition in Organizations: An Integrated Perspective. New Delhi: Wiley.
[3]. Dash, M. & Mishra, P.K. (2006). Dynamics of Information Technology and Human Resource in Industrial and Financial Organizations, Unpublished Doctoral Thesis in Business Management, Utkal University, India.
[4]. Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture's Consequences: International differences in work related values. Beverly Hill, CA: Sage.
[5]. Jain,S. (1991). Quality of Work Life. Delhi: Deep & Deep.
[6]. Dayal, J.M. (1996). Organizational Culture and Employee Performance. Administrative Quarterly, 3, 191-206.
[7]. Dutaray, D. (1991). A model of change in Organizational Health to improve QWL. Social Science International, 7(2), 6-11.
[8]. Misha, P.K. (2011). Organizations Revisited. Social Science International, 27, 2,111-20.
[9]. Aswathappa, K. (2007). Organizational Behaviour. Delhi: Himalaya Publishing House.
[10]. Newstrom,J.W. (2008). Organizational Behaviour. Human Behaviour at Work. Delhi: Tata Mc-Graw Hill Publishing Company Limited.
[11]. Mc-Shne,S., Vonk Glinow, M.A. & Sharma, R.R. (2009). Organizational Behaviour. Delhi: Tata Mc-Graw Hill Publishing Company Limited.
[12]. Koonz, H. & Weihrich, H. (2008).Essentials of Management. Delhi: Tata Mc-Graw Hill Publishing Company Limited.
[13]. Taylor, F.W. (1911). Scientific Management. New York: Harper.
[14]. Burke,W.W. & Litwin, G.H. (1989).A causal model of organizational performance. In J.W. Pfeiffer (Ed.) The 1989 Annual: eloping Human Resources. San Diego, CA: Pfeiffer & Company.
[15]. Katz, D. & Kahn, R.L. (1978). The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: John Wiley.
[16]. Bhattacharya, J. (2013). Turning problems in to opportunities. Indian Management, 52, 7, 28-33.
[17]. Bhandarkar, A. (2012). Making People Work. Indian Management, 51, 12, 86-90.
[18]. Khandwalla, P.N. (2013). Management Challenges. Indian Management, 52, 2, 21-26.