Ishwar Dayal attempts a 20-year survey of studies of organizations in India focusing on two broad classifications: research on bureaucracy and on industrial organizations.

This is a survey of studies of organizations in India during the last 20 years broadly covering organizational structure, work design, behaviour in organizations, and change. The most common organizational pattern in India is the bureaucratic pattern but research on bureaucracy is done mainly on government systems and other patterns refer to business and industrial organizations. The two have followed separate directions and methodology and it would be useful to survey research on bureaucracy and industrial organizations separately. Very few organization studies have included private bureaucracy (Singhi, 1974).

Bureaucracy

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

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

Organizing Work

There are few field studies on this subject except for the ones on the working of district administration (Chaturvedi, 1988; Lakhina, 1984; Dayal, et al. 1974). Most writings on work organization are reports of committees and commissions appointed by the Central or the State Governments, the most detailed among these being the Report of the Administrative Reforms Commission (ARC, 1968). At the field level, various aspects of the Panchayati Raj (Gaikwad, 1978) have been another area of interest to many researchers.

The structure and design of the government organizations are studied mainly from the point of view of new tasks taken over by the government. The problems are posed by an increase in the volume and
the variety of work. A number of experiments have been tried. The magisterial functions have been separated from the District Collector; the development functions have also been separated and placed with the Zilla Parishad in some places; the functions of animal husbandry, health, public works, agriculture, small industry, etc. pose many problems of coordination, control and responsibility for results. The representative organization has also added a new dimension to public administration. Some studies have used concepts from corporate management to speculate on what the organization looks like (Dayal, et al. 1974; Chaturvedi, 1988). There are new patterns of Panchayati Raj which give more powers to elected bodies, as in Karnataka, but systematic studies of these patterns are yet to become available.

Administration of Specific Situations

Development administration has attracted the largest number of studies (Pai Panandiker and Kshirsagar, 1978; Pai Panandiker, Bishnoi and Sharma, 1983; Jain and Chaudhury, 1982; Bhattacharya, 1979; Roy, 1975). It is generally felt that the administrative system is too rigid to cope effectively with the requirements of developmental tasks. The inadequacy lies in terms of values needed to relate to people, attitudes, orientation and responsiveness to developmental tasks.

Responses of administration to natural calamity such as famine and floods are few but comprehensive (Mathur and Bhattacharya, 1975; Subramanian, 1974). The studies show that bureaucracy is able to handle situations of emergency imposed by natural disasters effectively. The machinery is well geared to set quickly the remedial measures into motion and mobilize resources needed for the purpose. It is, however, found that expenditure incurred and projects undertaken to generate employment are rarely linked to long-term development plans of the region. They are ad hoc.

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

Background of Civil Servants

In the 60s and the 70s, a large number of studies have been carried out about the background, attitudes, values and motivation of senior civil servants (Subramanian, 1971; Mathur, 1972; Bhambhri, 1972; Gopalakrishnan and Joshi, 1973). The underlying assumption appears to be that orientation of individuals in key positions would determine the quality of administration. Such simplistic assumptions ignore the organizational processes and the organizational culture. The material that reflects on the organizational processes and culture are autobiographical accounts of retired civil servants (Jha, 1986; Bonarjee, 1970; Panjabi, 1965).

Relations between Politicians and Administrators

There are only a limited number of studies on this important subject (Kothari and Roy, 1969). Many writings on the subject are either speculative or based on personal experiences of individuals. This area is considered important by many writers but studies on the subject are rarely undertaken. Even biographical references are unspecific and merely hint at areas of conflict between the two.

Public Policy

The last category of studies concerns evaluation of public policy, strategy or programmes. In the 60s and the 70s, efforts were made to study the apparatus of policy formulation in Government of India (Paranjape, 1970; Shakti, 1974; Dayal, et al 1976). In the last 20 years, researchers have shown increasing interest in two kinds of evaluation studies—one, relating to overall policy (Ganapathy, et al. 1985), and two, relating to appraisal of specific programmes and schemes of the Central and State Governments. The policy studies are carried out predominantly by economists — industrial policies, agriculture policies, fiscal policies, etc. Most of these are based on secondary data.

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

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

*Most of these studied are published in journals/publications such as the Economic and Political Weekly, Bombay; Yojana, New Delhi; and Management in Government, New Delhi.
In summary, organization studies have not significantly changed in their coverage during the last 20 years (Dayal, 1976). The public system relies heavily on experience and wisdom as observed in the formation of committees and commissions, than on rigorous research methodology. With rare exceptions, the study of government systems lacks almost completely the action research approach for study of organizations. There are many problems in taking up field based studies in government organizations. Except for institutions or individuals with high reputation, access to data is difficult. Most civil servants have little faith in research and rely more on personal experience than data. The outside inputs to government decision-making comes mainly from recommendations of special committees, rather than from research.

**Industrial Organizations**

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

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

**Design of Work**

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

In the 70s and the 80s, many writings on the subject are available (Das, 1971; Dayal and Thomas, 1968; De, 1971) including some theoretical papers (Dayal, 1970; Khandwalla, 1984; Chattopadhyay, 1975; De, 1984). Three predominant approaches are noticeable:

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

The socio-technical approach has been used for reorganization of many large organizations in India during the last 20 years. These approaches have been derived from open system theories developed in the late 40s in the UK by a group of social scientists working at the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations, London (Trist and Bamforth, 1951; Rice, 1958, 1963; Trist, *et al.* 1963).

The Indian experience has been reported by many writers (Balachandran, 1987; Dayal, 1987; De, 1984; Dayal and Thomas, 1968). The autonomous small group work is derived from socio-technical systems but emphasis is derived from research on small groups (Sharma, 1978; Singh, 1979; Singh, 1981). The significant contribution to self-awareness is emphasized by Kakar (1971, 1974), and leader cluster and collective responsibility by Chowdhury and Sarabhai (1974).

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

**Behaviour in Organizations**

The largest number of studies in this area are reportedly by behaviour scientists, industrial psychologists and scholars in related areas. Literature in this area is reviewed extensively (Khandwalla, 1987; Saiyadain, 1988) and need not be reviewed again except to indicate the trends and the overall emphasis in research. The
major concern has been the concepts relating to motivation, job satisfaction, attitudes, job values, authority and role and role relationships (Sarveswara Rao, 1972; Sheth, 1968; Saiyadain, 1974). In more recent years, interest in concepts of power and stress (Pestonjee, 1992) has emerged. One other area of interest in the late 70s and the 80s has been the impact of Indian culture on management practices. Two predominant approaches are noticeable: first, going back to religious and ancient writings, derive what is considered the "Indian" way of doing things, and determine how best culturally rooted patterns can be transferred to modern organizations (Chakraborty, 1987). The second approach has its orientation in sociological and anthropological literature (Dayal, 1976; Chattopadhyay, 1975; Sinha, 1977). How do early experiences of growing up influence adult patterns, and in what ways are these patterns dysfunctional in the context of the demands made on people in modern organizations? There are very few empirical studies in this area.

Problems of Change, Rehabilitation, and Adaptation

Most writings in this area are based on action research and consulting (Sinha, 1976; Dayal, 1977; De, 1991), apart from a few comparative studies on rehabilitation. Literature on adaptation such as hi-tech industry is normative (Dayal, 1988).

The organizational change literature is primarily derived from action and case research. These accounts have been either provided by the researchers (De, 1971; Dayal, 1971) or interested students of organizational change (Balachandran, 1987; Das, 1972). Organizational change involves subjects of change in examining their own problems, and in the redesign of the work system along with changes in the role and role relationships (Pareek and Keshato, 1981). The work on rehabilitation is impressive but confined to a limited number of studies in India.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Some issues of considerable significance that require continuing attention are:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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