CHAPTER IV

BHAVIOURAL ORIENTATIONS OF SENIOR CIVIL SERVANTS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The leadership studies initiated in 1945 by the bureau of business research at Ohio State University attempted to identify the behavioural orientations of leader behaviour. The inter-disciplinary team of researchers from Psychology, sociology and economics developed and used the Leader Behaviour Description Questionnaire to analyse the managerial behaviour of leaders in numerous types of groups and situations. The answers to the questionnaire were then subjected to factors analysis. The two dimensions of the managerial behaviour that has emerged in the analysis were labelled as 'Consideration' and 'Initiating Structure'. It was found that consideration accounted for 49.6% of the common factor variance. This consideration refers to the orientation and need for the managers of have friendly, trusting, respectful and warm relationships with the other members of the team. The other dimension which was labelled as 'initiating structure' accounted for 33.6% of the common factor variance. Initiating structure refers to managers endeavour to establish well defined patterns of organisation, channels of communication, standarized methods and ways of getting jobs done.

Combined, the consideration and initiating structure accounted for 83.2% of the common factor variance in this study. Blake and Mouton (1964)\textsuperscript{1} have

\begin{itemize}
  \item Blake, R.R. and Mouton, J.S.1964. The Managerial Grid. Houston, Texas: Gulf Publisher.
\end{itemize}
popularised these concepts in their managerial grid and used it to typify the various behaviours of managers in the organisational plane.

Blake and Mouton instead of using the words 'Initiating structure' and 'Consideration' they used the different words known as 'Concern for production and 'Concern for people'. 'Concern for' means the managers pre-disposition about something or attitudinal dimension. Therefore, the managerial grid is the attitudinal model that measures the values of feelings of a manager.

According to Simon (1957),¹ the character of an organisation is determined not so much by the structural form as by the behavioural orientation of its personal who support or distort, build, or undermine the Organisational objectives.

In this study it is seen that the bureaucrats perceive that they are expected to play nine roles which have been described in detail in the previous sections 3.3 and 3.4. These emerged nine roles should definitely be related to some unidentified behavioural orientations of the bureaucrats. The orientations identified by the Ohio State University Studies and Blake and Mouton² need not be same the orientations for the bureaucrats working in the bureaucratic environment which is vastly different from that of an environment prevailing in non-government organisations.

Hence, an attempt is made in this study to identify the predominant behavioural orientations of the bureaucrats.

---


2. OP. Cit.
4.2 CONCEPTUAL DISCUSSION ON BEHAVIOURAL ORIENTATIONS OF CIVIL SERVANTS

Anthony Downs (1967)\(^1\) has propounded that all the agents in bureaucratic set up—officials, politicians, citizens, bureau clients are ‘Utility maximisers’ and that they compare the utilities among various acts, and chooses the act or the combination of acts, that gives them the most total utility.

However, this assumption alone is not enough to predict the causative efforts of their behaviour. Utility maximation really means the rational pursuit of one’s goals. Therefore, in order to understand the bureaucrats behavioural pattern, we must know their goals also.

Anthony Downs (1967) further in his theory of typology of bureaucrats, has identified five major types of bureaucrats on the basis of the following nine listed goals which the bureaucrats set for themselves. The goals\(^2\) are:

a. Power

b. Money income

c. Prestige

d. Convenience (this is expressed by a resistance to changes in behaviour that increase personal effort and willingness to accept those that reduce personal effort).

---


2. Ibid.
e. Security (this is defined as a low probability of future losses in power, income, prestige or convenience).

f. Personal loyalty (this is personal allegiance to either the bureaucrats own work group or this bureau as a whole).

g. Pride in proficient performance of work

h. Desire to serve the public interest ('the public interest' is defined as what each bureaucrat believes the bureauought to do to best carry out its social functions).

i. Commitment to a specific programme of action (it refers to bureaucrats getting attached to a particular policy, for, it becomes a significant motivation per se in determining their behaviour).

The first five goals enumertaed above are considered by Anthony Downs as pure manifestations of 'Self-interest' and others could be thought of as a mixture of 'Self-interest' and 'altruism'.

On the basis of the above goals Anthony Downs (1967)\textsuperscript{1} classified bureaucrats into two main categories such as 'Purely self-interested officials' and 'mixed motive officials'. These two broad categories of bureaucrats are further differentiated as:

1. Climbers
2. Conservers
3. Zealots
4. Advocates
5. Statesman

\textsuperscript{1} OP. Cit.
'Climbers' and 'Conservers' belong to "purely self interested officials" category while the rest belong to the "mixed motive officials" category.

Anthony Downs has given a very descriptive definition of the behavioural pattern of these five types of bureaucrats on the basis of the mine goals referred above.

An analysis of those descriptions enable us to identify their possible behavioural orientations.

Bureaucrats who consider power, income and prestige as nearly all important in their value structures one classified as climbers. The most predominant among them would be 'seeking power' and 'status'. In order to achieve position with high power and status, these types will make all efforts to achieve promotions and to raise in the organisational hierarchy either by pleasing their superiors, so that his promotional chance are not jeopardised by them or by keeping their subordinates in good relationship. Further to achieve such 'positions' they may try to achieve the objective standards that are being used for appraising their promotional qualifications. Hence the possible behavioural orientations of these types of people can be termed as 'Power Orientation' and 'status orientation'.

Conserves are seen by anthony downs as bureaucrats seeking maximising their security and convenience. Maximising convenience means reducing ones effort to the minimum possible level. Therefore they have asymaterical attitude towards change. In the words of Anthony downs (1967)¹ they are "timorous, self-effacing, extremely

1. OP. Cit.
cautious, plagued by inferiority feelings, or just indifferent about their occupations". Hence their behavioural orientations could be presumed as 'Passive Orientation'.

Zealots, Advocates and statesman comes under the classification of 'Mixed motive Officials' in the theory of Anthony Downs. According to him these types of bureaucrats seek goals connected with the public interest to some extent, since they are partly motivated by altruistic loyalty.

Among the above three types zealots are described as more optimistic than the other two types and are extra-ordinarily energetic and aggressive oriented. They are said to be willing to promote their sacred policies even in the face of seemingly overwhelming obstacles. Because of this trait seen in them, the behavioral orientation of these types could be presumed as "achievement orientation".

Advocates are also described in the said theory as optimistic and normally quite energetic. This type of bureaucrats are also stated to be 'other directed' in character than zealots. They are also described as quite aggressive in pressing for what they believe best suits their organisations and getting them materialized. They are also seen as pursuers of public interest and their operational conceptions of public interest vary in breadth of focus and are flexible in content both in time and under various circumstances. Hence for these types of bureaucrats we can presume that their basic behavioral orientation could be "Task Orientation" and "Service Orientation".

Anthony Downs describes 'Statesman' as bureaucrats who act as though pursuit of the public interest means promotion of very broad policy goals which they try to use as guidelines for decision making regardless of the particular position that
they occupy. These conceptions are broad in focus and quite stable in content. They are seen as to Persist in Maintaining a generalised out look even when their responsibilities are quite particular. Further it was found that they do not like conflict situations and seek to Reconcile clashes of particular view points through compromises based upon their broad general loyalties. The possible behavioral orientations of these types of bureaucrats could be termed as ‘Relationship orientation’.

Hence from Anthony Downs theory of typology of bureaucrats we can logically infer that the possible predominant behavioral orientations of bureaucrats could be

1. Power orientation
2. Status orientation
3. Relationship orientation
4. Task orientation
5. Diplomatic orientation
6. Passive orientation
7. Objectivity orientation
8. Achievement orientation
9. Service orientation

Another important study in the area of Typology of bureaucrats was the one done by Robert Presthus (1962). He has classified the bureaucrats into three types and labelled them as ‘Upward-mobiles’, ‘Indifferent’ and the ‘Ambivalent’. The upward mobile types are described to have ‘relationship orientation’, ‘status

orientation' and 'power orientation'. The types known as 'Indifferent' are said to have more 'Security' and 'withdrawal orientation'. The ambivalent are found to have 'Professional orientation' and 'Subjective orientations'.

In India the study conducted by Jayanth Kumar ray (1981) found that the senior administrators could be classified as Accommodators, Detractors, Promoters and Resisters on the basis of their administrative behaviour which naturally to a larger extent related to their behavioral orientations. Ray while making this classification has extensively used the sketches and the autobiographies written by 50 high ranking administrators. From these high ranking administrators he was able to collect 161 sketches which has formed the basis for his research. Outcome of the research was published as a book titled as "Administrators in a Mixed Polity".

It is seen from that work that the administrators working during the period from 1947 to the late 1960s have supplied nearly all these sketches. It is agreed that the Experiences of administrators-their self-portraits cannot add up to capsular formulations. But we also have to agree that they do provide the raw material for an understanding of behavioral orientations and resulting administrative behaviour of how persons in high positions in the State bureaucracy respond daily to an infinite variety of Circumstances. Administrators portraying the realities surrounding them are often able to supply valuable human documents. A study of those documents may not enable us to arrive at the final truth but definitely it is one of the means to understand the truth. Incidents in some of the sketches may strike one as trivial. But then

2. Ibid
perceptions of relative importance (or triviality) do differ and one must not fail to note that each of these incidents lights up the inner recesses of an administrator's being.

Ray (1981)\(^1\) in the referred study has started with there prepositions. Firstly, 'administrators' like all other agents in society are significantly - though not solely-motivated by their own self-interest\(^2\). Secondly "Administrators' in general have a complex set of goals including power, income, prestige security, convenience, loyalty to the institution, pride in excellent work and desire to serve the public interest\(^3\). Further one can suggest that 'administrators develop a sort of 'ethical pluralism' and relate their actions in specific situations to a set of standards which may include common good, lawfulness, consistency with precedents, survival, self-respect and group loyalties".\(^4\)

Adopting these insightful viewpoints of Anthony downs, (1967) fremont cast and rosenzweig (1970) to the sketches presented by the administrators, Jayantkumar Ray has tentatively classified them into four types such as Promoters, Resisters, Accommodators and Potractors. This work of Ray was not an empirical study and hence he himself has stated that there is a need for an empirical study to assess administrators perceptions and behavioral orientations.

---

From the 161 sketches which has been referred in this book, it is inferred that a particular set of administrators who have been classified as "promoters" are seen as administrators who intend to safeguard the public interest and professional standards without visibly endangering their personal interest. From the incidents narrated by these ‘Promoters’, it is seen that they are interested in safeguarding public interest and public resources. They are also seen as a hard workers combined with sincerity. It is also seen that they resist the evil plans of the Politicians and they always prefer to be very much impartial in taking the administrative decisions. Further it is seen that they tend to defend their subordinates for their right actions. It is also seen that they do not hesitate to explain to the politicians fully and repeatedly the impropriety and the impracticability of some of the course of action as recommended by them, and that they do not fail to recommend unpleasant steps against erring colleagues. From these behavioral patterns it is logically inferred that the predominant behavioral orientations of these sets of officers could be presumed as "objectivity orientation".

The "resisters" are another set of administrators who tends to safeguard the public interest and professional excellence even at the sacrifice of their personal interest. They are seen as those who experience acute role conflict because of wide discrepancy between their ideal view about their role and the view of their role-senders i.e. political superiors. Form the sketches given by these Types of people, it is seen that this predominant behavioural orientation could be termed as "service orientation".

Administrators who have been classified as "accommodators" are seen from their sketches as administrators who accedes to the demands of politicians which may not be proper or lawful. However it is also seen that these sets of people do not take
any initiative either to serve their personal interest or to damage public interest and professional excellence when they accept such unfair demands of the politicians. From the views narrated by these sets of people it is inferred that their predominant behavioral orientation could be termed as "Passive orientation".

"Detractors" are the sets of administrators who are prepared to sacrifice professional ethics to please politicians and obtain selfish gains. These sets of people are comparable to "climbers" in Anthony Downs\(^1\) classification ie. those who are 'motivated solely by the desire to maximise their own personal power, income and prestige". They are seen as prepared to connive with their political bosses and their higherups. The behavioral orientations of these sets of officers are also referred in the report of Ayyangar commission (1967)\(^2\) constituted by the Govt. Of India.

"My analysis of the evidence would serve to show how when abuse starts from the top, demoralisation sets in the permanent services and even officers who by virtue of their status and position could normally be expected to take an objective view of matters coming up before them, succumb to the temptation of becoming subservient and willing tools for furthering the interests of those under whom they serve".

From the sketches given by these types of people, it is seen that their predominant behavioural orientation could be termed as 'Power orientation'.

---

Hence from the Jayantakumar Ray\textsuperscript{1} study we can presume that the possible behavioral orientations of the administrators could be

1. Objectivity orientation
2. Service orientation
3. Passive orientation
4. Power orientation

The above four behavioral orientations are also part of the already identified nine behavioral orientations of the bureaucrats inferred from the study of typology of bureaucrats by Anthony Downs\textsuperscript{2}.

The third important empirical study pertaining to the typology of bureaucrats is the one done by Dubashi\textsuperscript{3} (1964). He has classified bureaucrats into three main types known as ‘Shirkers’, ‘Exploiters’ and ‘workers’. On going through the findings of this study, it is possible to infer the predominant behavioral Orientations of these three types of bureaucrats.

The ‘shriker’ type of bureaucrats are very skillful in achieving their desired objective. They are said to be the experts in the art of "passing the buck" they are the people to seek credit without actually doing any work. They are characteristic in the special sense that they avoid work to find time to seek avenues of personal advancement. They are also referred as experts in the art of sycophancy. From such

\textsuperscript{1} Ray, J. OP. Cit.
\textsuperscript{2} Anthony Downs, OP. Cit.
\textsuperscript{3} Dubashi P.R. 1964 Bureaucrats - An empirical typology Indian Jurnal of public Administration Vol. X No.2 pp.230-234
a description we could logically infer that the most predominant behavioral orientations of shirkers types of bureaucrats could be presumed as 'diplomatic' and 'passive orientations'.

Exploiters are labelled as experts in the 'art of getting things done through other people'. They make it a point to get everything done by their subordinate and also their administrative processes will be directed in such a manner that the tasks that has been assigned to them will get done somehow or other. The behavioral orientation of these types of bureaucrats could be presumed as 'task orientation'.

'Worker' type of bureaucrats are seen as masters of the art of doing things no less than getting them done'. They are the people who are found too busy to find time for panegyrics and too honest to plagiarise. They are seen to be very quick in their disposal and they leave nothing untouched and touches nothing unadorned. They are bureaucrats who leave on every paper that comes for their consideration the impress of their thinking, the application of their mind, the stamp of their personalities. The research has indicated that they give decisive treatment to every case that comes to them and they are bureaucrats who wants to find meaningfulness for their existence in the administrative systems. The behavioral orientation of these types of there bureaucrats could be termed as 'service orientation' and 'Welfare orientation'.

Hence from Dubashi's (1964)\(^1\) study me could infer the prevelance of following behavioral orientations.

1. Diplomatic orientation

1. Dubashi, P.R. OP. Cit.
2. Passive orientation
3. Task orientation
4. Service orientation
5. Welfare orientation

Hence from the descriptions of the behavioral patterns of various types of bureaucrats enumerated in the above said three major empirical works, the following behavioral orientations are inferred and taken as appriori factors in this research which aims to find out the predominant behavioral orientation of bureaucrats of the state of Tamilnadu in India.

a. Relationship orientation
b. Task orientation
c. Service orientation
d. Status orientation
e. Power orientation
f. Diplomatic orientation
g. Passive orientation
h. Objective orientation
i. Achievement orientation

The above said appriori factors are defined below.

a. **Relationship orientation**

The (absolute) extent to which bureaucrat is emotionally committed and willing to invest effort in keeping congenial relationships with others in the organisational set up. This orientation if present will make the individual to take more care about the
feelings of the people in the organisation. Bureaucrats having this orientation are likely to give more importance to the subordinates personal needs.

b. **Task orientation**

The (absolute) extent to which a bureaucrat is emotionally committed and willing to invest effort in achieving the targets that has been set-forth for them. This orientation is likely to make the bureaucrats to give more importance to production and technical aspects of the jobs and would make him to treat the subordinates as tools to accomplish the goals of the organisation. Further, it is likely to make the bureaucrats to place more importance to the aspect of ‘Getting the job done’ than any other aspect of the organisational processes.

c. **Service orientation**

The (absolute) extent to which a bureaucrat is emotionally committed and willing to invest effort in being useful to others in the discharge of the official functions.

d. **Status orientation**

The (absolute) extent to which a bureaucrat is emotionally committed and willing to invest effort in seeking positions which will be looked by others with awe and admiration. The bureaucrat who has got this orientation is likely to be highly status conscious and his organizational role is likely to be projected as through it is something covetable.
e. **Power orientation**

The (absolute) extent to which a bureaucrat is emotionally committed and willing to invest effort in seeking positions of authority with the basic intention of controlling resources.

f. **Diplomatic orientation**

The (absolute) extent to which a bureaucrat is emotionally committed and willing to invest effort in such a manner that he successfully avoids conflicts with others in the bureaucracy. The presence of this orientation would make the bureaucrat to play his organisational role in such a manner that he does not cross swords either with the politicians or with the people for whom he serves in the organisation. In the administrative set up the presence of this orientation in a bureaucrat would make him to adapt to the needs and desires of the politicians and at the same time to safeguard the interest of the people in general.

g. **Passive orientation**

The (absolute) extent to which a bureaucrat is emotionally committed in not initiating action or exerting influence in any significant way. The presence of this orientation would likely to make the bureaucrat not to confront his superiors in the bureaucratic set up and would make no attempts to correct even if a wrong is committed. At the same time the bureaucrat having this orientation is not likely to play a supportive role to the wrong processes.
h. **Objectivity orientation**

The (absolute) extent to which a bureaucrat is emotionally committed and willing to invest effort in being highly objective in the discharge of official duties. The presence of this orientation would make the bureaucrat not to allow his subjective feelings to creep into his organizational decision making processes.

i. **Achievement orientation**

The (absolute) extent to which a bureaucrat is emotionally committed and willing to invest effort to achieve the goals that has been set forth for him in the administrative set up.

It is around these above referred appriori factors, the Behavioral orientation questionnaire (Appendix V) was designed.

### 4.3 BEHAVIORAL ORIENTATION OF CIVIL SERVANTS - EMPIRICAL DATA DISCUSSION

#### 4.3.1 Factor Analysis

It is from the studies of the Anthony downs, Jayanthkumar Ray, Dubhashi and Robert Presthus we have inferred certain possible behavioral orientations of the civil servants and from that we have postulated certain apriori factors. To find out whether they are in tune with the actual behavioral orientations of the civil servants a questionnaire has been designed around these factors (Annexure V). After testing the validity and reliability of this questionnaire, the same was administered to the senior civil servants. The responses obtained has been empirically analysed. Hereagain the
The technique of factor analysis has been used. The aim again being to extract the relevant factors of total populations and, secondly, to reduce the number of variables into important factors. The analysis was based on the data of total population (N=329) on all the 45 variables considered in this study. The factor structure of the total population was explored. 5 factors were extracted from the 45 variables, taken in this study.

The 45 x 45 inter-correlation matrix and unrotated factor matrix have been shown in Appendix VI and VII respectively. Appendix VIII presents the varimax rotated factor matrix giving communalities, Eigen values and the percentage of variance.

In this section the results of the factor analysis for the behavioural orientations of the senior civil servants (Indian Administrative Service Officer as well as Non Indian Administrative Service Officers) are presented.

For Interpretation of factors, the variables which have got loading above 0.35 were considered. The variables under each factor were noted in order of magnitude, keeping in view the nature of the highloading variables, the factors were interpreted and named.

The first factor extracted a variance of 34.8 percent of the total variance. It could be seen from the table 4.1, given below that this factor gets significant loadings on 10 dimensions of behavioral orientation scale. All these variables have got positive factor loadings.
The variables such as achieving objectives, results realisation, job completion, achieving targets, timely completion and results over means very clearly indicate the predominant prevalence of an orientation towards achieving the objectives. Even among the 10 variables which got included in this factor, the variable against Sl.6 i.e. keeping people happy has got the lowest loading. It also shows the orientation of achieving the results by people keeping happy. Hence this factor is termed as 'Achievement Orientation'.

The Second factor extracted a variance of 14.5 percent of the total variance. 2 variables got listed under this factor with the significant loading as shown in the table. 4.2.
The included variables such as rationality and fearlessness indicate the prevalence of objectivity and hence this factor is termed as 'objectivity orientation'.

Four variables got listed under the III factor which extracted a variance of 10.9 percent of the total variance. The significant loading of these 4 variables are given in table 4.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>No. of the variable in questionnaire</th>
<th>Name of the Variable</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Others acknowledgement</td>
<td>0.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Positional authority</td>
<td>0.356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Lack of executive power</td>
<td>0.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Power over participation</td>
<td>0.360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
bureaucrats occupy. The variable 31 which has been negatively constructed also got the positive loading which indicates that bureaucrats do not like themselves to get posted to positions which don’t have executive authority. Hence this factor is termed as ‘Power Orientation’.

Only 2 variables got listed under the IV factor. It has extracted a variance of 8.6 percent of the total variance. The significant loadings of these 2 variables are given in the table 4.4

**TABLE - 4.4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>No. of the variable in questionnaire</th>
<th>Name of the Variable</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Being useful</td>
<td>0.541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>0.489</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variables such as being ‘useful’ and helping for development indicates the desires of the bureaucrats to be useful to others in discharging their organisational duties. Hence this factor is termed as ‘Service orientation’.

The fifth factor had extracted a variance of 6.6 percent of the total variance. The 5 variables which got clustered under this factor along with their significant loadings are given in the table 4.5.
TABLE 4.5

Significant Loading of variables on Varimax Factory - V

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Sl. No. of the variable in questionnaire</th>
<th>Name of the Variable</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>0.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Winning others</td>
<td>0.437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Skill of execution</td>
<td>0.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Diplomatic</td>
<td>0.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Kind and helping</td>
<td>0.437</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The inclusion of variables such as ‘winning others’ skill of execution and ‘diplomatic’ under the factor V indicates civil servants need for influencing others in getting the job done and in achieving the objectives. Hence it is termed as ‘influence orientation’.

From the factor analysis it is seen that the following factors has emerged as possible behavioral orientations of civil servants.

1. Achievement orientation
2. Objectivity orientation
3. Power orientation
4. Service orientation and
5. Influence orientation

It is heartening to note that out of fine emerged orientations, three were much expected from them, by the role senders to the civil servants.
The presence of 'Achievement orientation' is the one expected and wanted by the first Prime Minister of free India, Pandit Jawarharlal Nehru. He has observed 'Your whole approach should be what I would prefer to call 'result orientation'. If you are result oriented, I think work will be swifter and more integrated for the purpose of fulfilling our task.¹

Prof. Appleby (1961) has also said "Persons in high position must have a sense of Achievement"². The emergence of this orientation also vibes with the findings of Lloyd Warner³ (1963) and others who conducted the thematic apperception test with federal managers in USA. They found that the government administrators personality on the whole is oriented towards achievement of results.

The emergence of objectivity orientation as a factor is in tune with one of the basic characteristics of bureaucracy as enumerated by Weber, (1946) "bureaucratization offers above all optimum possibility for carrying through the principle of specialising administrative functions according to purely objective considerations ......... 'Objectivity orientation' of Bureaucrats would enable

---


them to discharge the business according to the calculable rules and without regard for persons”

However, the emergence of this factor is contradictory to the earlier findings of Pai Panandikar and Kshirsagar (1971) who has observed that ‘... the Civil servants in India is strikingly low on ‘rationality’ and that the civil servant’s personal and familial relations exert considerable influence on the performance of official duties of the civil servants’. Venkatraman (1986) Former President of India has observed that ‘in my viewo of basic orientation of bureaucrats should be objdivity of outlook and the second shall be service orientation’.

Alexander (1983) has opined that ‘the main duty of the civil servant is to present before the Minister clear options for a decision. In this task he should follow the highest standards of objectivity with out being influenced by his individual views or preferences’.

In the light of these observations, it is heartening to note the emergence of objectivity orientation as an separate identifiable factor.

---


Among all the emerged five orientations, the only negative orientation that has become to light is the power orientation. Here the word 'Power' means the desire of the bureaucrats to be in positions where in they can have control on the resources and to demand submissions from subordinates and admiration from others.

Gopala Krishnan¹ (1994) observed that the latest policy of liberalisation of the economy of forces the civil servants to give up their power orientation. Otherwise heopines that the new economic policy would be of no use to our country.

The emergence of service orientation as a factor is in connosence with what Jawarhalal Nehru² (1955) has expected from the services. He has observed 'What is the purpose of services? we have to be a clear about that. The services as their name implies, are suposed to serve obviously. Serve who? ... Society, the people and the country. I say this because the test always has to be how far the services, whether as whole or any individual members of them, are serving the larger causes that society has, that the nation has". Further the presense of this orientation also fulfils the expectation of retired bureaucrats such as Satish Chandran³ (1988) who has observe "the objectives of the civil servie is to ensure that the benefits of the developmental activities are not only secured with economy and efficieicncy but reach the designated target grous. For which they must have the service orientation".

1. Gopalakrishnan, M. (Formerly Principal Chief Secretary, Andra Pradesh) Civil Service - than and now, THE HINDU dt. 1.3.1994, P.17.
The emergence of influence orientation vibes with the dire need of the bureaucratic systems, wherein the positional authority of the bureaucrats fails to get the desired behaviour from the subordinates. This orientation indicates the need for tactful handling of the organisational processes and getting the desired performances from the subordinates by making them to reduce their resistance to the authority and thereby getting their compliance for the desired course of action.

In the following paragraphs, the definitions of the five emerged orientation are given.

**Achievement Orientation**

The (absolute) extent to which the bureaucrat is emotionally committed and willing to invest effort to achieve the target that has been set forth for the system. This includes achieving organisational objectives, realising results and timely completion of activities, for which they are responsible. Bureaucrats having this orientation are likely to give more emphasis to achievement of results than to the means adopted for the same. This orientation is the same as the one referred by Mc Clllel and in his achievement motivation theory.

**Objectivity Orientation**

The (absolute) extent to which a bureaucrat is emotionally committed and willing to invest effort for being rationale and fearless in taking decisions pertaining to organisational processes. Bureaucrats having this orientation are not likely to allow their subjective feelings to influence them in their decision making processes. The resulting behavioural style will reflect bureaucrats interest for facts and figures and his
organisational decisions will be based on prevailing facts and figures irrespective of his personal likes and dislikes.

*Power Orientation*

The (absolute) extent to which a bureaucrat is emotionally committed and willing to invest effort to be in positions of authority. Bureaucrats having this orientation are likely to long for a position wherein they are likely to be acknowledged by the others with whom they would be coming into the contact with. Lack of executive power is the one that such bureaucrats would not be able to put up with. The presence of this orientation, will make the bureaucrats to seek positions of authority, because such positions will give them an opportunity to command the resources. This orientation is the same as the power orientation defined by Mc Cleland in his Motivation theory. Its presence in a bureaucrat would tend him to look at the service as a source of power through which he could enjoy the authority of controlling the people and the processes that takes place in his organisation. It is a desire to dominate others and to be in a position where others would seek him for powers that he can vest.

*Service Orientation*

The (absolute) extent to which a bureaucrat is emotionally committed and willing to invest effort to help others to realise their goals. This will include being useful to others and contributing something for the development of individuals and the society in general. This orientation, would tend a bureaucrat to give more importance to provide service to others through his organisational roles. This orientation would make the bureaucrat to look at their cadre as an instrument to
provide useful service to the society at large. Such bureaucrats organisational decisions would be based on to what extent the decision will be useful for the society at large.

**Influence Orientation**

The (absolute) extent to which a bureaucrat is emotionally committed and willing to invest effort in making others to reduce their natural resistance to authority and motivating them to perform their activities with zeal and enthusiasm. This will include winning others successfully, executing the job, being kind and nice to others and diplomatic in interpersonal relations.

**4.3.2 Inter-Correlation Between Factors Related to Behavioural Orientation of the Civil Servants (Officers of Indian Administrative Service and Non Indian Administrative Service)**

Behavioural orientations are many within an individual and hence the behaviour of an individual could never be predicted on the basis of any particular behavioural orientation. In this study the possible behavioural orientations of the civil servants are found to be achievement orientation objectivity orientation, power orientation, service orientation and influence orientation. To understand the nature of relationship between these emerged orientations inter-correlation test was carried out both for the Indian Administrative Service as well as for Non-Indian Administrative Service Officers. Since the behavioural orientations are all orthogonal factors, their relationships with one another is possible and understandable. The findings are given in the following paragraphs.
From the table 4.6 it could be seen that the Achievement orientation is found to correlate effectively with all other orientations. Likewise, objectivity orientation is also found to be significantly related to all other orientations. Further, it is seen that the objectivity orientation is inversely related to the service orientation which shows the higher the service orientation will reduce the objectivity orientation of the bureaucrat and vice-versa. It is true that these two orientations could not be simultaneously present with in an administrator at any given point of time. It is also seen that power orientation negatively correlates with service orientation and objectivity orientation. It clearly shows that the presence of power orientation with in a bureaucratic would not enable him either to be objective in the organisational processes or being useful to the others.

**TABLE - 4.6**

*Inter-correlation between factors related to behavioural orientation of Senior Civil Servants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Achievement Orientation</th>
<th>Objectivity Orientation</th>
<th>Power Orientation</th>
<th>Service Orientation</th>
<th>Influence Orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Orientation</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.0901*</td>
<td>0.3414**</td>
<td>0.228*</td>
<td>0.3953**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectivity Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>-0.0987*</td>
<td>-0.0886*</td>
<td>0.1690**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>-0.1206**</td>
<td>0.2593**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.1506**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.2 Inferential Statistics

In continuation of the factor analysis results 't' test was carried out to test the significance of the differences between the groups of Indian Administrative Service and Non-Indian Administrative Service officers on all emerged five factors related to the behavioural orientations. The findings are given in table 4.7.

**TABLE 4.7**

Mean, SD and CR Value of Indian Administrative Service Officers and Non-Indian Administrative Service Officers on Factors Related to the Behavioural Orientations of Civil Servants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor No.</th>
<th>Name of the Factor</th>
<th>Indian Administrative Service Officers N=155</th>
<th>Non-Indian Administrative Service Officer N=174</th>
<th>CR Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Achievement Orientation</td>
<td>26.14</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>31.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>Objectivity Orientation</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td>7.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>Power Orientation</td>
<td>10.75</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>11.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>Service Orientation</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>Influence Orientation</td>
<td>16.03</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>17.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** = P < 0.01 Level
* = P < 0.05 Level
It may be seen from table 4.7 that the officers of the Indian Administrative Service cadre and officers of Non-Indian Administrative Service cadre differed on factors "Achievement Orientation" (Factor-I at $P < 0.01$ level), "Power Orientation" (Factor-III at $P < 0.01$ level) "Service Orientation" (Factor-IV at $P < 0.05$ level) and "Influence Orientation" (Factor V at $P < 0.01$ level). The mean scores refered in Table 4.7 are pictorially given in chart No.4.  

In all the above said four behavioural orientation factors the officers belonging to the Non-Indian Administrative Service cadre have scored higher averages than that of the officers belonging to the Indian Administrative Service cadre.

The Non-Indian Administrative Service Officers are the officers who have entered the services at lower rungs of administrative hierarchy. By sheer experience over a period of time they have attained the senior positions in the bureaucracy. Hence their experience at the cutting edge level of the various organisations, might have made them to pick these orientation with more intensity.

To know exactly the nature of differences between the directly recruited and rank conferred Indian Administrative Service officers with respect to these five behavioural orientations, again, CR values has been found and presented in table 4.8.
BAR CHART SHOWING MEAN DIFFERENCES OF BEHAVIOURAL ORIENTATIONS OF SENIOR CIVIL SERVANTS

CHART - 4.1
Mean, SD and CR Value of Direct Recruited and rank conferred Indian Administrative Service Officers on Factors Related to the Behavioural Orientations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor No.</th>
<th>Name of the Factor</th>
<th>Direct Recruited Indian Administrative Service Officer N=126</th>
<th>Rank conferred Indian Administrative Service Officer N=29</th>
<th>CR Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Achievement Orientation</td>
<td>25.24</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>30.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>Objectivity Orientation</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>7.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>Power Orientation</td>
<td>10.64</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>11.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>Service Orientation</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>7.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>Influence Orientation</td>
<td>15.74</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>17.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** = P < 0.01 Level
* = P < 0.05 Level

It is evident from the Table 4.8 that the two groups of Indian Administrative Service Officers differed only on the factors of Achievement orientation (Factor-I at P < 0.01 level), "Service Orientation" (Factor IV at P < 0.01 level) and "Influence orientation" (Factor-V at P < 0.01 level). The mean scores referred in table 4.8 are pictorially presented in chart No.4.2. In all the above said three factors it is seen the direct recruited officers of Indian Administrative Services has scored lowers averages than the officers belonging to rank conferred officers of Indian Administrative Services.

It is quite natural that the rank conferred Indian Administrative Service Officers have scored higher averages than the directly recruited Indian Administrative Service...
BAR CHART SHOWING MEAN DIFFERENCES OF BEHAVIOURAL ORIENTATIONS OF IAS OFFICERS
Officers in the above mentioned three behavioural orientations because of the same reason that have been given for the differences between Indian Administrative Service and Non-Indian Administrative Service Officers. In the case of the rank conferred Indian Administrative Service Officers also, they have entered the Government services at the lower rungs of the hierarchy and because of their early experiences at the cutting edge level they might have felt the need for having these orientations to a higher degree within themselves so as to fulfill the organisational commitments effectively.

4.3.4 Discriminant Function Analysis

To know more exactly the discriminating factors as far as behavioural orientations are concerned between the Indian Administrative Service and Non-Indian Administrative Service officers discriminant function analysis was carried out and Wilks Lambda and RAO’s V were used. The findings are given in table 4.9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor No.</th>
<th>Name of the Factor entered in the analysis</th>
<th>Wilks Lambda</th>
<th>Sign level</th>
<th>Rao’s V</th>
<th>Sign level</th>
<th>Change in Rao’s V</th>
<th>Sign level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Achievement Orientation</td>
<td>0.696</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>142.693</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>142.693</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Objectivity Orientation</td>
<td>0.693</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>145.088</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>2.395</td>
<td>0.1218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wilks Lambda, Rao’s V and Significance Level of the Discriminant Function Analysis Between Officers of India Administration Service (N=155) and Officers of Non-Indian Administrative Service (N=174) on the five factors related to behavioural orientations

Eigen Value = 0.444
Percentage of variance = 100
Canonical Correlation Coefficient = 0.554
Table 4.9 indicates that out of five factors, only 2 factors were included in the analysis and out of which only the factor-I was found to be significantly discriminating between the two groups. Further factors i.e. factor-III, IV and V which did not seem to discriminate significantly were not included in the Discriminant Function Analysis. It is evident from the result that only the factor i.e. Achievement orientation (Factor-I at 0.01 level) alone discriminate significantly between the groups of officers of Indian Administrative Service and Non-Indian Administrative Service, when all the factors were entered into step wise method. This is because the Non-Indian Administrative Service officers while they were working at the cutting edge level in the administrative structures they might have had close interactions with the people in discharging their duties. Hence during that period they might have experienced and seen the interest of the served in getting the results from the administrative bureaus. It is because of their field experience they might have inculcated within themselves more Achievement orientation’.

The Eigen value is 0.444 shows the discriminating power of function. The canonical correlation coefficient of 0.554 showed that there was high degree of association between the two sets of score i.e. discriminant function and the dependent variable. (i.e. behavioural orientation of civil servants) and high correlation value shows that the discriminant function discriminated between the said groups quite effectively. Having known the discriminating factor for the behavioural orientations between the Indian Administrative Service and Non-Indian Administrative Service officers, an attempt is also made to known the principal discriminating factors for the same behavioural orientations between the directly recruited and rank conferred
Indian Administrative Service officers, using the same Wilks Lambda and Rao's V. The findings are given in table 4.10.

TABLE 4.10

Wilks Lambda, Rao's V and Significance Level of the Discriminant Function Analysis between direct recruited (N=126) and rank conferred officers of Indian Administrative Service Officer (N=29) on the five factors related to behavioural orientations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor No.</th>
<th>Name of the Factor entered in the analysis</th>
<th>Wilks Lambda</th>
<th>Sign level</th>
<th>Rao's V</th>
<th>Sign level</th>
<th>Change in Rao's V</th>
<th>Sign level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Achievement Orientation</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>41.911</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>41.9111</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Service Orientation</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>58.365</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>16.454</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Influence Orientation</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>63.449</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>5.084</td>
<td>0.0242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eigen value = 0.415  
Percentage of Variance = 100  
Canonical Correlation Coefficient = 0.541

Table 4.10 shows the results of discriminant function analysis of the behavioural orientations between the two groups i.e direct recruited and rank conferred officers of Indian Administrative Service. From among the total of five factors taken for the study only three factors are included in the analysis, they are Factor-I IV and V. These factors have contributed significantly for the discrimination between the two groups. The three factors are Achievement Orientation (Factor-I at P<0.01 level) Service orientation (Factor V at P<0.02 level), and influence orientation (Factor V & P<0.01 level) Eigen value of 0.415 shows the discriminating power of the function.
The canonical correlation coefficient of 0.541 shows that there was high degree of association between the two sets of scores i.e. discriminant function and the dependent variables i.e. behavioural orientations of Indian Administrative Service officers. This correlation shows that the discriminant function discriminated between the two groups quite effectively.

The rank conferred Indian Administrative Service officers as mentioned earlier, because of their field experiences at the cutting edge level in the administrative hierarchies might have picked more result, service and influence orientations. Hence there factors play predominant role in discriminating between rank conferred officers of Indian Administrative Service and directly recruited officers of Indian Administrative Service. It is true that the rank conferred Indian Administrative Service officers would definitely be having more influencing orientation than the directly recruited Indian Administrative Service offices but for which they would not have risen to the Indian Administrative Service cadre.

4.4 CONCLUSION

From the studies available on the typology of bureaucrats we have inferred nine orientations as possible predominant orientations among the bureaucrats. However, our empirical study has shown the presence of only five behavioural orientations. These five orientations are termed as Achievement orientation, objectivity orientation, power orientation, influence orientation and Service orientation.

Achievement orientation shows the bureaucrats willingness to invest effort to achieve target that has been set for them. Likewise the objectivity orientation
shows their willingness to invest effort in being rationale and fearless in taking
decisions pertaining to organisational processes. The power orientation refers to the
interest of the bureaucrats to occupy positions of authority from where they could
command the resources. The service orientation refers to their interest in investing
effort to help others to realise their goals. This will also include their need for being
useful to others and contributing something for the development of individuals and
the society in general. The influence orientation refers to the extent to which the
bureaucrat is emotionally committed and willing to invest effort in making others to
reduce their natural resistance to the authority and motivating them to perform the
activities with enthusiasm. This orientation includes the desire of winning others
successfully and making them to do their jobs without the feeling of they being
authoritatively asked to carry out the same.

The emerged behavioural orientations are also found to effectively correlate
among themselves. It is seen that the objectivity and service orientations are inversely
related. It means that these two orientations could not simultaneously cause a
behavioural pattern to emerge from the bureaucrats. It is true that the helping and
serving activities of the bureaucrats many time may not stand the test of objectivity.
Objectivity may be one of the important characteristics of bureaucracy as enumerated
by Max Webber. However in developing society abstract objectivity many time may
not be supportive for the bureaucrats to play their developmental role.

Among the Indian Administrative Service Officers themselves the rank conferred
Indian Administrative Service Officers are getting differentiated from the directly
recruited officers of Indian Administrative Service on the basis of three behavioural
orientations. They are achievement orientation, service and influence orientations. It
is seen that the rank conferred Indian Administrative Service Officers seems to have these three orientations at a more higher level within themselves than that of directly recruited Indian Administrative Service Officers. Hence the null Hypothesis IV stands rejected. Further it is seen from the study that the officers of Indian Administrative Service and officers of Non-Indian Administrative Service are getting differentiated among themselves as far as two behavioural orientations are concerned. They are achievement and objectivity orientations. (Hence the null hypotheses V stands rejected). To be very specific the officers of Non-Indian Administrative Service seems to have these two orientations at a higher level than that of the Officers of Indian Administrative Service.

Since Non-Indian Administrative Service Officers and the rank conferred officers of Indian Administrative Service have started their official career at the lower rungs of the administrative hierarchy they might have got more opportunities to interact with the public at the grass root level. Their understanding of the field realities would definitely be much less of distortions and might vibe more closely with the realities. It is because of this these types of bureaucrats might have these orientations at a higher level than the directly recruited Officers of Indian Administrative Service.