CHAPTER IV

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY

This chapter presents the conceptual model and description of the theoretical framework used in the research. It defines the role orientations of responsibility, authority, equality and identity and the coordinates emerging in either social identity or work identity. It further states how the orientations and their role coordinates are manifested in role acts of decision making, exercise of authority, communication, evaluation and reward and punishment. It also states how the interaction of the role coordinates and role acts tend to influence manager's organization behaviour.
CHAPTER IV
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY

The concept of organization has undergone a great change since the beginning of industrialization. At first a universal concept of organizations and approach to its design seem to have existed. As indicated in Chapter III, "Social and Work Organizations: A Historical Perspective", this universal concept was inherent in the proto-type of primary social organizations such as, family and kinship. Industrialization only made designing an organization a matter of translating the proto-type of primary social organizations into work organizations. Urwick (1943), Lupton (1971) have stressed this aspect. According to them the design and nature of the organization was largely a technical matter in the initial stages. Allocation of tasks, control of work-flow, evaluation of performance, and determination of reward and punishment, and some attention to principles of motivation were the major constituents of the organization process.

Later the classical theorists focused on efficiency as the significant criterion of organization design and success. They emphasized modes of control, supervisory
span, clear job descriptions, formalised procedures, specialization and hierarchical structure. According to the classical approach, elimination of ambiguity, narrowing areas of discretion and reducing production to routine made for a successful organization.

Today's organizations have to cope with a greater variety and forces of impingement of the environment than the organizations of the earlier era. Today's environment is changing and getting over differentiated in all its elements such as technology, resources, markets and even people. The emergent contingencies cannot be tackled with the traditional concept of organizations.

Many organization theorists, to mention a few, Woodward (1958, 1968), Burns and Stalker (1961), Thompson (1967), Lawrence and Lorsch (1967, 1970), Perrow (1970) and Child (1972) have studied singly and sometimes jointly various dimensions of environmental change and its impact on the organization. They suggest that not all organizations are identical. Each has its own culture and climate. The awareness of the unique and individual aspects of different organization has led to the development of a
perspective for the study of organizations which can be called particularistic. This development is parallel to the development of micro-economic theory in Economics.

An organization is constituted by task, technology, structure and people. Leavitt (1965). Garg (1969) proposed to add ethos of the wider culture as another constituent. The structure, ethos and people are the constituents of the organization which are not a matter of technical efficiency alone. They are highly interlinked and operate through people. As such, individuals become essential resources of the organization. The determinants of an individual's behaviour in the organization may be ethos, structure and his own personality. Eventually, through formal or informal ways norms get established for his behaviour in the organization. They represent a whole set of expectations converging on the role that the individual has been given in the organization. Gilmer (1971) suggests that the kinds of role an individual plays is largely determined by social interaction. There are certain ascribed positions which an individual holds and he plays a role. Over this he has no control. There are, however, some achieved positions which are the result of his own effort.
The concept of role has assumed significance over the last few decades in sociology, psychology, social psychology, and cultural anthropology. The conceptual schemes for the analysis of the structure and functioning of social systems use the concept of role for explaining individual behaviour. The role concept is pivotal in Parson's (1951) and provides a link between culture and social structure. As an aspect of social structure Gould and Kolb (1964) define "role as a named social position characterized by a set of (a) personal qualities, and (b) activities, the set being normatively evaluated to some degree, both by those in the situation and others." To this definition Linton (1936) adds that status and role represent a conceptual elaboration of the ideal patterns which control reciprocal behaviour. According to him "status is a collection of rights and duties and role is the dynamic aspects of status; to put rights and duties into effect is to perform a role". pp. 113-114. This definition is also used by Parsons (1951), Radcliffe-Brown (1952) and by Merton (1957). Mead H. (1934) set forth a theory in which society, the development of personality, and communication are linked through role. To be able to communicate is in Mead's words to be able...
to 'take the role of the other' toward one's own vocalizations and behaviour. The concept role is used by Nadel (1957) in the same sense. Sarabin (1954) has propounded the dominant role theory for the study of the development of the individual's personality and his life style. According to him role is a patterned sequence of learned actions and deeds performed by a person in an interaction situation.

According to these theories role position is associated with expectations which are clearly defined structurally and understood. However, the behaviour of the incumbents of the same role positions may display a wide variance. In general, the variance in the behaviour of the incumbent's role position has been attributed to attitudes, values, personality characteristics and/or social phenomenon which intervene between the role positional expectation and role behaviour (Gross, Mason, McEachern, 1958).

The above statement suggests that a role incumbent in a role position makes choices, and acts upon situations
through the exercise of discretion. According to Gross, Mason, and McEachern (1958) the suggestion that "society or the group defines the obligations attached to a particular position leads to many issues. "Society" and "Group" are abstractions which are open to empirical investigation only through their members seeking an empirical demonstration of the expectations held for an incumbent of a specific position by a population of role definers. We are led to expect not a single expectation, but a number of expectations that may or may not be the same." pp. 4-5.

After the review of the Western literature of the conceptualization of role, Neiman and Hughes (1951) indicated that "Hypothesis involving the concept role are extremely rare in the literature. They further suggest that the concept role is at present still rather vague, nebulous and non-definitive". p.149.

Though the concept of role by its multiple implications may appear diffused, its linkages in the context of the culture are widely studied. Bennet and Tumin (1948) say, "By role, then, we have reference to what the society expects of an individual occupying a given status. This implies that any status is functionally defined by the role attached to it". p.96.
The above review of the definition of role and those of many others seem to suggest that a large number of theorists utilize the concept of 'role' its definitions, and meaning given either by Linton (1936), Mead (1937) and Sarabin (1961).

In the Chapter II "Theories of Transition of Societies", it has been pointed out that in the western literature the concept role has been used merely as a concept of the inter-phase between social and personality structure. The diffuseness of the concept as described here arises from the fact that the inter-phase between the social structure and the personality structure reflects the zone of conflict between the social 'musts' and the individual 'oughts', i.e. the ascriptive and the achieved aspects.

As indicated in Chapter II, based on their work in Indian organizations Garg and Parikh (1976)* suggest that the concept of role on the one hand includes expectations from multiple structural links established for the task. As such, the first set of contents of the role concept are task expectations. The second set of contents of the role concept in terms of organizations are the defined and concretised acts which an individual incumbent is supposed

* See Appendix.VIII.
to do to fulfil task expectations. In organization terms these two sets of contents are often coordinated in job descriptions.

The third, and perhaps the most significant set of contents of the role concept are emergent expectations that get generated and stabilized - but not necessarily articulated - through the process of working together over time. These expectations and their stabilization are constantly mediated by leadership styles and the so-called organization climate and culture. Their significance lies in the fact that they modify and sometimes vitiate the rationally determined task expectations and task acts. This modification may either be in terms of masking, diffusing and inhibiting some, or strengthening, encouraging and prioritizing some others.

However, these three sets of content of the role concept converge on to the individual who has to perform i.e., either play the role or make the role. In his choice he brings with himself certain orientations to role conceptualization and performance from his long period of socialization in non-work situations. These orientations emerge from his internalized affective-cognitive maps of
the social systems and the transactions between the self and the significant others. The internalizations of the social system accompany the introjections of the role model.

According to Garg and Parikh (1976)* the orientations are spreads and continua of the coordinates of the internalized social systems. These coordinates of the social system act as role coordinates. The total aspect of the internalization of the total system then resolves into a matrix of role coordinates and role acts. Thus, the role of an individual in an organization is a construct of an inter-phase between the internalized role coordinates and their orientations reflected in performance i.e., in the role acts. They identify five role coordinates:

1. Responsibility
2. Authority
3. Equality
4. Identity
5. Location

All of them converge into orientations around which the role concept of an individual crystallizes. These

* See Appendix: VIII.
reflect a continuum of 'opposites. These can be systematized as follows:

Table 4.1

Theoretical Framework:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Orientation</th>
<th>Orientation Continuum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Responsibility</td>
<td>Role Boundedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role Actualization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Authority</td>
<td>Single Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Authority Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Equality</td>
<td>Exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peer Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Relations System</td>
<td>Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identity Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Location</td>
<td>Socio-Psychological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meaning Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Socio-Temporal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of relating this construct of role coordinate to the theories of transition and change in
societies and work organizations Garg and Parikh (1976)* suggest that an individual operating with role boundedness, single person authority, exclusion, social relations and socio-psychological membership points in the continuum of the five orientations is reflecting the dominant rubric social identity. Similarly, when an individual operating with role actualization, multi person authority, inclusion, work relations and socio-temporal membership point in the continuum of the five orientations is reflecting the dominant rubric work identity.

1. Responsibility coordinate and role orientation

An individual's membership in an organization is always in terms of a position. It is the focal point of his interactions with other positions in the total system of interactions. Thus, the position defines the role space of a particular individual in the organization.

The position involves certain responsibilities with regard to organizational tasks and goals. The position involves three levels of responsibilities.

* See Appendix.VIII.
1. The task level responsibility

The goals and responsibilities are directly related to the sub-system of the total organization which is directly below the individual's role space and his position in the organization. In this sub-system, everybody else is in a lower position and the role space of each individual in the lower position is defined and bounded by the concerned role position above. The responsibility for this sub-system is defined as role task responsibility.

2. The link level responsibility

Each role position is also interdependent in terms of its role tasks with other role positions at the same level in the organization. These role positions do various other kinds of role tasks and have their own sub-system. As these role positions at the same level have some interdependence they influence the performance of each other. Thus responsibility related to the role position has also link responsibility. Link responsibility means activating other role positions at the same level in the organization for mutual and cooperative actions for each other's effectiveness.
3. The corporate level responsibility

Each role position in an organization, besides the role task responsibility of the lateral or horizontal subsystem of the organization, has also some responsibility of the total system. This, in terms of work organizations, can be called corporate responsibility. It also includes the responsibility of the role position above one's role position. Corporate responsibility then, essentially implies responsibility toward superordinate goals, policies, orientations and processes of the total system. Essentially then, the individual in relation to the total organization has the role of being simultaneously representative of the self and the system within the system.

When a person excludes the link and corporate responsibility from his role space, and in turn invests a great deal of energy in role task responsibility alone, thus making himself indispensable he displays the role orientation converging to the role coordinate Role Boundedness. In this convergence he partakes the quality of the rubric of social identity.
If an individual includes the link and corporate responsibility of his role space, tends to actively reach out and invest energy in activating other role incumbents for interdependent tasks, whereby he accepts himself as a representative in the system he displays the role orientation converging to the role coordinate Role Actualization. In this convergence he partakes the quality of the rubric of work identity.

2. Authority Coordinate and Authority Orientation

An individual’s membership in an organization, besides being defined by his role position and its responsibility, is also defined by the influences and controls that converge on his role space from the significant individuals in his task system. From a system’s point of view these influences and controls can converge from higher, lateral and lower positions. In this sense, each role position is an integral part of the control and influence system of an organization.

In the traditional thinking among the laymen as well as in the thinking of classical social theories the controls and influences flow only from the superiors in the hierarchy. They are the only significant ones. This creates
dissonance. The processes of the social system are of one kind while the processes of work organizations and task systems are of another kind.

1. Social systems' view

In the traditional Indian society and its social system the definition of role space implied that the individual's role concept along with being a functional instrument in the system only includes a direct superior. All the people in the hierarchy above himself are significant people. Influence and controls on him can only converge from them. It implies an orientation to act upon the subordinates and to be acted upon by the superiors. Symbolically, the superiors and subordinates represent a class of objects and do not exist as distinct identities, though functional role differentiation exist and are recognized. It means then, that an individual in the social system can either be a subordinate to some and superior to some others.

2. The task system's view

In the modern complex work organizations of today the task, technology and structure demand that the
to seek:

a) legitimacy of one's own role and its significance through relationship with the most significant resource controller or authority figure.

b) validation of one's own role performance and its perceived congruence with the wishes and expectations of the significant other who is above the self.

c) affirmation of one's quality and social status through aprobation of one single person.

When an individual opens himself for regulation and influence from all relevant task related roles and accepts the legitimacy of multiple persons in the system with whom he has functional linkages to influence him, the process is labelled multi-person-authority orientation. It means that he seeks control on his performance to give significance to tasks and task roles. He accepts legitimate influence from lateral and lower levels as well. He sees himself as a resource for the system and not for an individual at the top. He sees himself as a source of coordination and integration across a large number of functional relationships across the role space. He accepts the managerial hierarchy as a
source of coordination and integration but includes himself as a significant individual who can call upon multiple resources and expertise of multiple people in the system for his role tasks. In this approach, he partakes the quality of the rubric of work identity.

3. **Equality coordinate and Peer Orientation**

Before an individual becomes a member of large and complex work organizations his social membership is restricted to family and kinship. The family and the kinship are by their very nature small organizations. As such, the role space of an individual is embedded in a small system of role positions. Generally, all the role positions are stratified on the criteria of age and relationship. As such, all role positions are either above or below one's role position. All the role positions above one's own role position may not have direct jurisdiction over one's role. Similarly, all the role positions below one's own may not be under direct command and jurisdiction of the self. However, in social situations the protocol behaviour reflects stratified and hierarchical relationship.
This prototype of experiencing a social system excludes equality among role positions. The individual is psychologically not prepared to handle equality. Even in the family and kinship system i.e. small organizations there are roles which are not clearly above or below. For example the role of the 'son' generally suggests equality among all role incumbents. All sons in relationship terms are equal, but the time reflected in age stratifies them in different role positions. This stratification is normatively enforced. However, the study of the dynamics of the family system, suggests that the enforced stratification is not accepted. The culture of deprivation, discrimination and rejection which siblings in the Indian family system display, suggests that though the stratification is arbitrary it is emotionally experienced by the individuals.

The individual when he enters work organization, specially the new large and complex organization, is confronted with the dynamics of large organizations. The very nature of the large organizations, the number of roles which do not fall below or above one's own role position multiply manifold. Adjacent roles emerge, and
does emerge the convergences of many roles to the same task area. The large organizations demand development of lateral interdependence as an attitude. The various role positions in the system have to operate simultaneously with competition and collaboration.

When an individual in an organization continues to operate from the prototype experiences of small organizations, continues to compete for ascendency in the eyes of the significant individuals in the system, operates with the feelings of discrimination and deprivation, gets enmeshed in interpersonal conflicts which remain unresolved and finally exercises exclusion on the adjacent and lateral roles of the task system the individual is operating with the exclusion point of peer orientation. In terms of his role concept the role coordinate of equality is negatively operating. In this approach the individual is partaking the rubric of social identity.

When individuals in large organizations surrender the prototype of small organizations and begin to collaborate in optimising the resources of the system, collaborate and cooperate for task competence and achievement, move
toward recognition of interdependence, learn to manage differences and as such, learn to handle conflict, task based conflict constructively for the good of the task system, they are operating with the inclusion point of peer orientation. In terms of their role concept the role coordinate of equality is positively operating. In this approach the individual is partaking the rubric of work identity.

4. **Relational Coordinate and Identity Orientation**

Relational coordinate and identity orientation as one of the elements of role concept arises from the theoretical concept of identification. The Dictionary of Social Sciences describes the concept identification as "Identification denotes the tendency to imitate and/or the process of imitating the behaviour of an object. It may also denote the process of merging emotionally, or the state of having so merged, with the same object". (Gould and Kölb 1964) p. 314. Differential meaning and definition have been given by (N. Sanford, 1955, pp. 106–118, J.P. Seward, 1954; p.202, and G.W. Allport 1954. p. 293).
The term identification has come to denote certain relationships of a person to social roles and social groups. According to Johnson (1960) "One is said to identify with a social role if one not only internalized the role but adopts it as one's own, striving to attain the necessary skills and to conform with the role norms. One is said to identify with a social group if one internalizes the role system of the group and considers oneself a member of it". p.128.

To Gould and Kohl (1964) it denotes the relationship of a person to social roles and social groups. According to them the concept stands for "a process of learning, or the resultant state of having learnt, when the learner is unaware of the conditions which motivated his engaging in the process". p.345. Following Erikson's approach to the concept of identification it also implies achieving an integration of the demands of the psychobiological development and the demands of the socio-psychological environment in terms of resolving the endemic conflicts of role-taking and acquiring a psychosocial identity.
In the context of the theoretical framework of the role coordinates the identity orientation implies identification and internalization of a membership in a role system. The components of this identification implies:

1. Emotional roots of the individual's sense of belonging and his sense of membership with the group, culture and ethos.

2. Emotional roots of the individual's sense of meaning and his sense of reality relations with the environment, group, culture and ethos.

The prolonged per view of socialization in a family, its kinship and its values, norms and beliefs tend to lay down deep roots of identity orientation with the primary group which in the agrarian ethos across the world was a prototype as well as a micro-model for the larger social system. As long as there was a continuum between the primary family system and the work system the identity orientation was anchored in the processes and models of the social organization.

The development of complex and modern organizations has broken this continuum between the family and work system. The prototype of identity orientation and the
micro-model of relational linkages as available in the agrarian culture are no more operative as effectively.

When an individual continues to have emotional roots of sense of belonging, sense of membership, sense of meaning, and sense of reality relations, dominated by the primary familial and kinship proto-type orientations and micro-models of relational linkage, the process is labelled as social identity orientation.

When an individual learns to internalize the process of deriving his emotional sustenance from sense of belonging, sense of membership, sense of meaning, and sense of reality relationship from secondary system of productive, task transactions, the process is labelled as work identity orientation.

In the social identity orientation then, the social task of maintenance of a relationship, fulfilling relational expectations and operating with a view to enhancing the value of the group rather than the self and the task becomes important. The social obligations play a significant role in the life space. The individual is caught between loyalty, obedience on the one side and appraisal of the emergent reality demanding modification of the behaviour on the other side.
In the work identity orientation the technological task and the task of the system acquires primacy. A wide variance in the events and quality of relationships between inter-connected roles becomes acceptable. The focus is not on maintaining relationships between role incumbents, but on maintaining of negotiability and interdependence for task considerations. The focus is on functionality first and sociability next. The individual's criteria are not personal loyalty, obedience and fulfilment of social obligation. His criteria are review of the emergent reality, task needs and a development of a viewpoint which will optimise negotiability, interdependence and effectiveness.

5. Location Co-ordinates and meaning orientation

An individual's membership in an organization besides being defined by responsibility, authority, equality and relational coordinates and their orientation is also defined in terms of how he locates himself in the organization.

By birth he is born in a family and a kinship. This is the organization of which he has an involuntary membership. Through socialization he gets attached to this
group and can continue to locate himself as the member of this group. He may refuse to extend membership and resist integration with larger systems of the society. He can remain related in a symbiotic fashion to his primary group.

The phenomenon whereby an individual remains rigidly located with his familial, kinship and such involuntary group, and continues to use it as basic reference group for giving himself meaning and determine his life style, the process is labelled as, the socio-psychological meaning orientation.

In and around his family and kinship group there are other groups forming a living community such as that of a neighbourhood, a community, a village, a region etc. When the individual can dissolve the symbiotic membership with the involuntary groups and extend to include himself into voluntary secondary groups around the socio-temporal existence, the process is labelled as his accepting a socio-temporal meaning orientation.

The location coordinate is a little confusing in the sense that the familial and kinship group which can be treated as primary involuntary groups can through
symbolic extensions may include the language, the religion and the ethnic lineage. Thus, the socio-psychological community, its membership and meaning, and its use as a reference group may have a much wider distribution across the world to which the individual belongs.

The socio-temporal community from which the individual can derive meaning, and which he can use as a reference group can become over-localized around task and work situation. Similarly, in a highly immobile society, the socio-psychological community may be highly localized.

The essential difference between the socio-psychological meaning orientation and socio-temporal meaning orientation is the comparative significance attached to involuntary and voluntary groups in deriving meaning from the membership.

The Dimension of Role Performance

The emergence of work organizations as distinct entities compared to the social organizations has not only brought about major shifts in the constituents of the role concept in terms of role coordinates but also introduced greater differentiation in the domain of role
performance. Studies by Minzberg (1973) and Likert (1961) who have studied managers in action have identified a variety of role acts. Garg and Parikh (1976)* in their formulation of the original framework identified six categories of managerial actions. These six categories listed below subsume the classifications of managerial actions by Minzberg (1973) and others:

1. Decision making
2. Exercise of authority
3. Communication
4. Evaluation
5. Reward and Punishment, and
6. Scanning and control**

1. Decision Making

The standard convention is to reserve the term decision maker for one who has formal responsibilities for formulating the policies of an organization. Bernard (1938), Simon (1960), Gilmer (1961), Dubin (1962), Cyert and March (1963), Horowitz (1964), Normann (1971), Roberts (1971), Crozier (1975) and others have carried out significant studies on the multiple aspects of such decision making.

** This category of role act has been dropped from research by the author.
* See Appendix VIII.
On the whole, decision making studies are studies that focus on all factors relevant to a policy choice and not just on the formal-legal relationships of decision makers. In particular, they tend to include an analysis of the informal relationships among decision makers, the role of actors outside the organization, and all the non-rational as well as rational considerations that influenced the behaviour of all who were involved in making the decision. However, in the organization context, decision making is also a role act of a manager as in his day-to-day work he makes decisions on the various problems he confronts. These problems may be of allocation of resources such as man, material, finance, and time as resource, problems of prioritising multiple demands, problems of mobilising people, problems of maximisation of output, and problems of utilisation of inputs and of ensuring appropriate benefit for the organization vis-a-vis the environment. It is this aspect of decision making that is being considered as a part of the role act. Essentially, this involves the interpretation of policy and utilisation of the discretionary element of the role.
As suggested earlier, besides the various factors studied by the earlier researches, the configuration of orientations that an individual manager internalizes during his primary socialization and arrives at in integration of the role coordinates, has a very significant impact on his role in the work organization. If this configuration is closer to social identity, the nature, the quality, the process, and the act of decision making will have one kind of focus. If the configuration of orientation is closer to the work identity, then the nature, the quality, the process and act of decision making will have another kind of focus.

To illustrate: In all organizations decisions have to be made on the basis of a given task, structure, people and technology. The individual manager in his role must make the decisions on operational issues of the task. However, if the manager is utilising his integration of the processes of the social identity, he repeatedly refers the decisions to the higher authority. He continues to seek affirmation and sanction from the higher authority.
He finds it difficult to respond on his own to the immediacy of the problem. He is afraid to take risks and on the whole he does not utilise the discretionary element available to him in his role position. He thus continues to operationalize his role from the processes of social identity and ignores the demands of the task and structure of the work organization.

When a manager, besides making routine decisions of his task, involves himself in acquiring relevant knowledge through interaction with colleagues, uses the discretionary elements of his role position, responds to the immediacy of the task demands, does not wait to refer and seek prior approval for task related decisions, is willing to take risks and act judiciously, he is acting with the orientation reflected in work identity. Furthermore, acting with work identity may even imply that a manager can, with his judicious appraisal, perhaps take short range and limited decisions beyond the interpreted policy, with the hope that he can communicate his rationale and get legitimization later.
2. **Exercise of Authority**

Just as decision making is an act of solving a problem, exercise of authority is an act of implementing decisions and regulating the operations of an organization.

In the organization setting an individual manager, in his role position, carries out the role act of decision making and by implementing the decisions carries out his role act of exercising authority. Both may overlap, but they are distinct categories of role acts. Conceptually, then, the role act of exercise of authority has reference to (1) initiation and origination of action towards achievement of organization tasks, and (2) implementation and coordination of action on decisions arrived at role or organization level. A manager exercises his authority by determining how the decisions will be implemented. He determines the nature of interaction his juniors will have with him. Essentially, exercise of authority is that set of role act which is related to setting and maintaining boundaries of interaction with one's own role space and the role space of others, both below and above him.

Once the decision is made, exercising the authority may take many forms. The organization invests certain
degree of authority in the role to implement the decisions. In this sense, Kakar’s (1971) definition seems apt. He defines authority as "relationship between the two individuals, one superior and the other subordinate, the fact of their superior and subordinacy lying not in their individual character but in the positions they occupy in the formal hierarchy of work organization", p. 481. Kakar (1971) further classifies authority which emphasizes the inter-personal, dynamic aspect of authority relationship and the interaction patterns of superiors and subordinates into a) parental, b) impersonal, and c) fraternal. The parental category can be further sub-divided according to the dominance of either paternal assertive or that of the maternal nurturant modes in the behaviour of the superior (Hodgson, Levinson, Zaleznik, 1975).

Authority can be exercised in many ways. If it focuses on the relationship with the subordinates in maintaining the nature of interaction and defining the boundaries, if it focuses on the implementation process by the subordinates, on the basis of receiving affirmation from the authority and the role position of the superior, and is converted into a position of power and significance,
then this role act is dominated by the rubric of the social identity. Authority is then used here as a recognized right to power. In Kakar's (1971) term, it is parental assertive, and in Weber's (1947) term it is traditional or charismatic.

When the role act of exercising authority is characterized by focusing on the dominant aspects of the task and its effective achievement through a) keeping the boundaries of relationship between superiors and subordinates flexible, and b) by defining the hierarchy and role positions as collaborative systems for implementation of task, rather than as sources of status, the manager is then acting with the rubric of work identity. In Kakar's (1971) terms it is fraternal authority.

3. Evaluation

The third role act of an individual manager is that of evaluation. An individual manager in his role position performs the role act of evaluation. It has an underlying process which, besides evaluating the quantitative measure of output, production and performance, focuses on the processes of the individual and organization which enhance the overall functioning and effectiveness of the organization.
Each manager in his role is constantly evaluating the personnel with whom he works. He needs to utilise and deploy manpower resources properly, efficiently and effectively for the task of the organization. Similarly, he does a constant evaluation of the situation and opportunities that arise in his interphase with the environment.

A manager evaluates many different aspects like the loyalty of employees, a subordinate's ability, obedience, conformity, target fulfilment, or output. He may compare one subordinate with another. On the whole, if the large part of the focus of the role act of evaluation is on the subordinate's behaviour and his conformity to that of the norms and goals of the superior, then the manager is operating with the rubric of the social identity. Here the manager does not evaluate the organization's overall operation.

When a manager evaluates people in terms of the tasks rather than relationships, evaluates the availability of organization resources along with his own role in the achievement of the task, he is evaluating people with the rubrics of work identity. In this mode of evaluation,
he has the opportunity to generate feedback and to re-
design his own managerial style for more effective work.

In Indian organizations evaluation is largely
focused on the transactional elements between the indivi-
duals, i.e. the transactions between the superior and
subordinates. A realistic appraisal and assessment of
the limitations and strengths of the organization proce-
dses and superior's own acts is rare.

4. Communication and information dissemination

Organizational communication has been a subject of
many researches. Multiple level definitions exist.
According to Cook, Campbell and Pugh (1970), the defi-
nitions can be classified in two categories: a) One is
concerned with interpersonal communication (Barnlund,
1968; Weiner and Mehrabian; 1968). b) The other broadly
focuses on the information exchange within and between
organization units.

Likert (1967), Schein (1965) and Dance (1970)
reviewed 95 definitions of communication but were unable
to find a cohesive definition. Historically, the atten-
tion on communication began with Barnard (1938). This
was followed by Bavelas (1950) and Leavitt (1951) who discussed communication in organization and the structural aspect. Etzioni (1964), Woodward (1965) and Katz and Kahn (1966), saw it as an intervening variable between management style and job satisfaction. Blau and Scott (1962), Secord and Backman (1964), Thompson (1967), Kelly (1969), Whyte (1969), and Haney (1973) also explored different aspects of communication.

In the present theoretical framework the concept communication and information dissemination are treated as role acts and are differentiated from each other. The rationale for this is that within the territories of one's own role a manager is responsible both for organizational goals and tasks. His link to the tasks are through the role acts of decision making and exercise of authority. His link to the goals of the organization are through the role acts of communication and information dissemination.

In terms of role acts of communication and information dissemination the manager comprehends the organization policies, strategies and objectives. He positions his approach to his role tasks within the contexts of
organization policies, strategies and objectives as he understands them. The manager performs the role act of communication when he channelise his interpretation of the task realities of the organization to the relevant people.

Therefore, Communication is that role act which deals with the strategy of the organization, i.e., the socio-psychological facts, and their underlying attitudes and policies of the organization. Communication is that process which focuses on a perspective which then becomes the guideline for effective decision making. It deals with business variables.

A manager is the receiver of all factual detail of actions in the system around him. His role position is the focal point of the hard core factual information. Information dissemination then is that role act of a manager whereby he keeps the organizational hierarchy, peers and subordinates briefed as to what is happening in his sub-system at any point of time, with regard to agreed upon organizational tasks and utilisation of resources.
Thus, information deals with the physical facts of the organization, the knowledge of which will help bring into awareness the internal and external reality of the organization which contributes to effective decision making and evaluation of business variables.

When the individual manager in his role act of communication focuses only on imparting information and does not involve the subordinates and colleagues in the processing of the physical facts to formulate strategies or decisions, when he does not utilise the knowledge, experience and ideas of his subordinates and colleagues, and only passes instructions, he is operating with the rubric of the social identity.

Whereas, when the manager promotes a dialogue between himself, his subordinates and his colleagues, encourages the use of initiative, utilises expertise on the problems of the task, when he shares the overall goals and objectives of the sub-system and shares his own projections and integrates others in his planning of the task, he is operating with the rubric of the work identity.
5. Reward and Punishment

Gould and Kolb (1964) define reward "as any stimulus which increases the probability of occurrence of, or strengthens a response (or class of behaviour) upon which it was contingent". p. 604. Different definitions with different focus are given by (Thorndike 1905; Hull 1943; Woodworth 1951; Skinner 1953; and Hartley and Hartley 1952).

Punishment is defined by Gould and Kolb (1964) as "any aversive stimulus which has the immediate effect of reducing in strength (or in probability of occurrence) the response upon which it was contingent. It is a painful stimulation received by the organism for doing something, the punishment being an incentive, to stop or suppress that response". p.565.

Punishment is best understood in relation to reward. However, "it is not simply the opposite of reward in its effect upon an individual. Whereas reward permanently increases the probability of occurrence of a particular response, punishment has only a temporary, repressive effect upon a particular response". (Gould and Kolb, 1964) p. 565.
In the setting of work organization the role act of reward and punishment are significant elements of the role position. Reward can be for the task performed, keeping the time boundaries under crisis, maintaining the quality, acquiring a large sales order, and such other business tasks. These are concrete elements which are visible and can be measured. Underneath operates the process whereby an individual's social skills, his ability to personalise his relationship with the significant people in the organization, his loyalty, conformity and adherence to rules and regulations, and more significantly, to the superior can be rewarded. In this case, the task performance and other such task related issues get ignored. If this is the focus of reward, then it implies that the manager is governed by the rubric of the social identity.

Punishment may be meted out to an individual for the behaviour which is dysfunctional to the task such as, absenteeism, procrastination, lack of collaborative and cooperative group behaviour, etc. However, in actual practice, the above kind of behaviours may be ignored. Behaviour seeking active participation in organization processes such as, goal setting, reviewing and planning
may be discouraged. This discouragement acts as a punishment. In the process the manager is again operating from the rubric of the social identity. In such a situation the role acts of reward and punishment are based on personal and social relationship rather than on task, achievement and merit. This also fall under the rubric of social identity.

When a manager rewards functional behaviour which enhances the effectiveness of the task, when he encourage collaborative and cooperative group behaviour among colleagues, when he has consultative and participative processes with subordinates, and encourages reviewing goal setting and planning, he is rewarding behaviour which forms the configuration of the rubric of work identity. He is also encouraging the growth and development of work identity in others.

When a manager discourages isolationism, single handed achievement, rigidity of rules and regulations, withholding of information and data, non-utilisation of discretionary element, and use of relationships as source of power, he is operating within the rubric of work identity. He is also encouraging the development of work identity in others.
Reward and punishment then, is that role act and process by which the organization and the manager create and maintain organization culture, heighten morale, create credibility of organizational policy, and create a sense of well-being, certainty and security for the employees. It is suggested that operation within the rubric of social identity may be a viable process for small organizations. For modern complex organizations the role act and process of reward and punishment emanating from the rubric of work identity would be more congruent.

6. Scanning and control

Social science research in organization focuses largely on mechanisms of control either through the organization structure or through superviscry style. Studies have been done by (Blan 1955; Blan and Scott 1955; Etzioni 1961; Chandler 1962; Rosengren 1970; ScheenHerr 1971; and Khandwalla 1973, 1974). The traditional view has been that of Taylor (1911) and Weber (1947) where work was accomplished through strict adherence to routines and enforced by extrinsic control. However, in today's modern and complex organizations,
the nature of task, structure, technology and people's attitudes, values and expectations have to be considered. As such, the role acts of scanning and control take on a different dimension.

An individual manager can transform the role act of scanning and control of tasks to scanning and controlling people. He may mobilize himself and the organization processes around him to control the perceived behaviour and interactions of people. The focus of scanning then shifts to the subordinate's output, his break times and his social relations (with whom he meets and whom he talks). The focus is to scan with whom he socializes and then exercise control so that the subordinate is kept preoccupied with work or is guided to the 'right' people. This mode of scanning and control forms the rubric of social identity. The dominance of the rubric of social identity makes a manager give more significance to the personal aspect of the subordinates rather than task considerations.

When a manager is alert and responsive to the changing environment and changing internal realities of
the organization, aware of the changing attitudes and expectations of the new entrants and emerging new tasks, is sensitive and open to the pulse of the organization and prone to create innovative ways, adopt alternative modes to cope with change, he is operating from the rubric of work identity in his process of scanning and control.

The difference between the two rubrics of social identity and work identity, in terms of scanning and control, is that in the case of the rubric of social identity he is a 'watch-dog' of people, of social relationships, of social tasks and personal role boundaries. In the case of rubric of the work identity he is a 'watch-dog' of the climate of task and their achievement.

On the whole, the six role acts of the manager are inter-dependent and are inter-related. Conceptually, they can be paired. The role acts of decision making and exercise of authority are two sides or parallel aspects of managerial roles in terms of task performance. The role acts of communication, information dissemination and evaluation are two sides or parallel aspects of managerial roles in terms of enhancement of goals of the organization. Similarly, the role acts of reward and punishment, and
scanning and control as paired activities reflect the boundary maintenance of the managerial roles. However, each role has its own specific focus in the organization and each role act when carried out has implications, either functional or dysfunctional, for the individual and the organization both.

The theoretical framework as such resolves into the following matrix which according to Garg and Parikh (1976) schematically represents an affective-cognitive map of the role inter-phase between the individual role coordinates and the role performance demanded by the work organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role concept</th>
<th>Role coordinates</th>
<th>Role performance</th>
<th>Role acts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2
Theoretical Framework: Matrix of Role Concept and Role Performance

1. Responsibility
2. Authority
3. Equality
4. Identity
5. Location*

* The Location role coordinate and Scanning and Control role act were dropped from the final study. Further elaboration is given in the section, Methodology.
The present research takes the theoretical framework as given to test the degree and quality of shift in the role coordinates of an Indian manager. The rationale for the use of the theoretical framework lies in the fact that the theoretical framework is based on the systematisation of the work of Sarg and Parikh with some fifteen organisations and about six hundred managers over seven years. The grounding of the framework then, is in the empirical but qualitative clinical data generated for diagnosing various organisations on the one hand and the data that emerged during the implementation of O.D. recommendations on the other hand. Furthermore, the theoretical framework was used by them as the basic construct to work with nearly two hundred managers in training programmes such as Role Stress and Organizational Conflict, and similar other in-company training programmes. The programmes were experience-based training programmes. They generated both personal and organizational data which were in high congruence with the assumptions of the theoretical framework.

The present research then, takes the next step of using the theoretical framework in a more systematic manner to generate empirical quantitative data. It is the first
attempt to identify concrete contents in forms of statements representing the quality of coordinates and acts that they found expressed during diagnostic and implementation phase of the O.D. programmes.

The author of the present research having been a co-worker during the seven years of the development of the theoretical framework and having been the joint author of many of the technical notes and reports submitted to the organization, individually felt the need and the necessity of giving the framework a more scientific and instrumental formulation. The research reported here reflects this attempt in terms of identifying research problem and designing the research methodology discussed in the next Chapter.