CHALLENGES IN DEVELOPING INDIGENOUS THEORIES OF ORGANISATION AND MANAGEMENT: AN INDIAN PERSPECTIVE

RAJEN K. GUPTA

Most of the efforts around the world in the area of OB have been to discover universal theories of organisation and management. Now increasing attention is being paid to culture, society or nation specific theories. This paper advocates such an approach for the study of organisations in India. It delineates some major theoretical and methodological challenges in undertaking this approach. It calls for the need to have a committed academic community.

Dr. Rajen K. Gupta is Associate Professor, Indian Institute of Management, Lucknow.

Though the industrial revolution started in Europe, the managerial revolution bloomed in United States of America. It provided a suitable ground for the emergence of the 'visible hand' of managers in the nineteenth century to replace the 'invisible hand' postulated by Adam Smith and also provided opportunities for major innovations in corporate management to executives like Sloan (Chandler, 1966). Starting with Frederick Taylor, the twentieth century has witnessed the emergence of human relations school, human resources school, contingency approach, systems approach and others as major points of analysis in organisational ideas.

Perhaps, a country with a short history, with individualism growing in vast wilderness and with a democracy and free market economy, provided the most suitable soil for the new creature — the manager —to emerge and flourish. So did formal knowledge about management in the institutions across that country. Britain remained a close partner but not the leader.

Today the intellectual hegemony of this Anglo-Saxon thought on organisations and management is reflected in the textbooks used all over the English speaking world (Lammers, 1990) and India. American management thought formally entered India through the establishment of the first two national institutions of management at Calcutta and Ahmedabad in collaboration with American institutions, namely the Sloan School of Management and Harvard Business School, respectively.

To a lay thinker, it would be obvious, that the social, economic and cultural context of a country, should have an impact on the organisational and management thinking for the enterprises located in a country. However, the formal American thinking under the hegemony of American thought and the school of logical positivism have been, that an organisation can be the same universally, irrespective of the country in which it is located. Even a major effort by French sociologist, Michael Crazier, to demonstrate the impact of the wider society on organisational dynamics (Crozier, 1964) was applauded but it did not persuade many to give up the universalistic paradigm. It is only with the publication of a collection edited by Lammers and Hickson (1979), that a comparative sociology of organisations may be seen to have come of age. However, it largely remained a comparative exploration of management in developed countries, with an assumption that developing countries will follow suit (Negandhi, 1986).

It was only with the unmistakable emergence of Japan as an industrial superpower that the field of management began to take serious note of the "strange" ways of Japanese management (Ouchi, 1981), though even earlier some accounts were available of the 'exotic' forms/ways of management (for example, Abegglen, 1956; Rohlen, 1974; Dore, 1973). The Japanese style of management broke the stranglehold of the western paradigm of organisational thought and freed the space for taking up formal notice of cultural, societal and national specificities in examining the appropriateness of western ideas to individual country's genius. Unfortunately, true to fashion, many of the Indian organisations and a large number of management academics have decided to jump on to the bandwagon of Japanese management or see it as an either/or choice. Fortunately, among the academics, there are some exceptions like Sinha (1980), Pareek (1968), Mehta (1987) and Chakraborty (1988); some of their works will be taken up to illustrate the position of this paper at appropriate places. With the emergence of the comparative paradigm, studies are now available which would challenge any simplistic attempt to imitate either the American or the Japanese model of organisations. One can legitimately ask why not study South Korea or the Chinese family business in Taiwan, or Hong Kong and Singapore (Whitley, 1990; Redding, 1990), each of which have shown a path to successful industrialisation and have earned the title of the Asian Tigers.

Such questions evoke a major challenge for the Indian researchers of organisational behaviour. Jaeger and Kanungo (1990) have launched such an enquiry with their edited collection on *Management in Developing Countries.* It is for us to pick up the gauntlet. But this voyage would require a new kind of preparation, a different mental make-up and a desire to search for a new path. It would also require that we rise above the interesting but no longer fruitful debate between positivism and hermeneutics. This paper, without wishing to be exhaustive, addresses major theoretical and methodological challenges of this venture.

Theoretical Challenges

1. *Concept Formation in Relation to Context and Language*

Theories are nets cast to capture the reality. Good theories capture the crucial and poor ones, the redundant or superfluous. The co-founder of Honda, T. Fujisawa, is attributed with the statement: 'Japanese and American managements are 95 per cent same and differ in all important respects' (Doktor, 1990).

What seems to have happened in management and organisational sciences is, that the basic premises of American society were taken for granted. When an organisational analyst got down to looking at the micro reality of an Indian organisation he/she would be implicitly guided by the concepts appropriate to organisations in USA. For Indian analysts in general, it is also so ordained by the management education and reading material based on American examples, practices and theories. In this sense the dominant concepts in our minds can be inadequate in our efforts to understand, predict or control organisational phenomena in Indian settings. It is no simple challenge to overcome this indoctrination nor can it be surmounted overnight. Nevertheless, the process must begin and, more and more must join the efforts.

Fortunately, some scholars have already initiated it. Of these the work of Sinha (1980) is best known. Based on his own observation and collating from sociological and anthropological literature, he identified the concepts of *araam* (leisure, relaxation), *araam* culture and poverty syndrome governing the Indian work and political ethics. He then took the conceptual leap to propose the concept of "Nurturant-Task" leadership. Today, discussion about indigenously suitable leadership styles often begins with this concept.

Motivation has been another theme which has preoccupied academicians and practitioners alike, for decades. In this area also, some notable contributions have been made in India. Udai Pareek (1968) introduced the categories of 'extension motivation' and 'dependency motivation' as useful additions to the usual achievement, power and affiliation motives. Out of these two new categories of motivation, the first refers to a cultural ideal in India and the second is a major component of contemporary Indian psyche. Mehta (1987) has further developed these ideas by compounding achievement and extension into the social achievement motive. Kalra (1981) has also pointed out the conjunction between achievement and affiliation motive in Indian context in contrast to the disjunction between these two motives in American context (McClelland, 1961).

More recently, modified concepts are being shaped in relation to organisational realities in India. Kanungo (1990) suggested a drastically different model for motivational realities in India and has proposed alternative strategies for performance management (Mendonca and Kanungo, 1990). Naganand Kumar (1986) has proposed the concept of 'work-dedication' to address the contextual necessity of working under demanding and resource scarce conditions. Such features are not captured by the western concepts of job satisfaction or job involvement.

Addressing the need to be innovative in accelerating the pace of development in our context, Khandwalla has proposed the twin concepts of "strategic developmental organisations" (1990) and "pioneering-innovative (PI) management" (1983). He has also addressed the question of the sickness of organisations and argued in favour of "humane turn around management", as contrasted with "harsh surgical turn around strategies" in the Indian developmental context (Khandwalla, 1989).

These are some of the examples which illustrate the welcome development of new or modified concepts to suit Indian organisational realities. It may, however, be noted that all these are coined in the English language. To many readers, who have had their professional education in the English medium, this may appear as an unnecessary pointer. It would not be so for those who see language as a major aspect of culture. The relationship amongst culture, ordinary language, scientific theories and methodologies has seriously preoccupied those interested in basic issues of epistemology in social sciences (Outhwaite, 1983; Sartori, 1984; Cicourel, 1973).

It would be beyond the purpose of this paper to present this intricate debate. However, some examples from recent trends in management and organisational theories should establish this point.

The onslaught of Japanese industrial success on the Western world has led to a 'mini-industry' in the West to understand Japanese management. As a result, often

in the discourse in English, one finds Japanese words like 'ringi', 'Kan-ban' and 'Kaizen'. The authors take special care to explain these Japanese words (or cultural artifacts) and compare and contrast them with similar (but not identical) words/ideas/concepts in English language. These explanations usually lead to other salient cultural features like 'eimoto'.

This clearly suggests, that a number of theoretical and methodological questions are being implicitly acknowledged. In simple terms these are: (i) What is the relationship between ordinary language and organisational realities? (ii) Is it at all possible or desirable to ignore the language of the 'natives' to understand their attitudes and behaviour? (iii) What is the relationship between lay concepts and theoretically useful concepts? (iv) What are the advantages and disadvantages of developing Indian theories about Indian organisational realities in Indian language based on Indian lay concepts about people, organisations, management and society?

Without further elaborating the argument for the need of emphasising the use of indigenous languages for the purposes of research and theory building, it would suffice to say that use of an indigenous language also provides a major advantage in smoothening the process of diffusion of knowledge, if it is in the language of its users. Since human reality is socially constructed (Berger and Luckman, 1966), its reconstruction would be facilitated by indigenous translations/applications and extensions of local languages. This is not to deny the usefulness of international scientific discourse, but to correct a neo-colonial over-emphasis on English language in our local scientific discourse. Nor is one unaware of the special problems brought up by this advocacy in view of the multi-lingual nature of our society (Mohanty, 1990). But that is the challenge if our research is to become more relevant and more absorbable rather than remaining the matter of distant-applause in international conferences. In this approach, presentation of our researches in foreign languages is likely to be richer and we might even be able to achieve some flow of useful concepts from India to other countries.

It may be noted here that there is no rigorous theoretical formulation in the field of organisations and management in any Indian language. But there are a few indicators of such possibilities, though, perhaps due to the colonial denigration of things Indian, more of these illustrations refer to dysfunctional features of Indian culture and organisations. For example, Sinha (1980) has talked to *araam* culture.

In summary, theory building about the human organisation and management there of requires sensitivity to the culture and context. An important necessity to capture such cultural and contextual specificity is to treat lay concepts in vernacular as important sources for concept formation. Theory building in the vernacular is also very desirable, lest linkages with ground reality are lost. Lastly, it is indicated, through examples that such efforts have been made sporadically and there is a need for more such work on a more sustained basis.

2. *Dealing with the Complexity of Indian Society*

At a more concrete level a major challenge is to develop a coherent understanding of Indian society. As soon as the contextual nature of organisations and the

corresponding need to have contextually sensitive managerial practices is recognised, one necessarily faces the challenge of understanding the Indian society. It is an enterprise which has preoccupied many academics from different disciplines and different persuasions. Marx as well as Weber may be considered to be the pioneering Westerners, who tried to understand the processes of social change in India. Apart from them, Indology developed as a discipline, drawing people from all over the world; a well known early exponent being Max Muller. A recent critique of Indological studies suggest that in their efforts to understand India which is "other worldly". The Europeans and Americans have even reshaped their understanding of themselves (Inden, 1990).

Just as the development of a society, the industrial revolution or the process of modernisation is a historical phenomena, the emergence and growth of organisations in a particular society is also a historical phenomenon. Scholars interested in understanding organisations in Western countries seriously devote themselves to the historical studies of evolution of socio-economic organisations, the progression of industrial revolution, the rise of capitalism, the arrival of managerial revolution (Burnham, 1960; Chandler, 1977), as well as the evolution of management, techniques (Chandler, 1966). Such studies sensitise the scholars to the contextual nature of organisations and management and accelerates the process of authentic understanding of these. Perro (1986) has recently re-emphasised the need for more exhaustive studies of the historical evolution of bureaucracy in Western societies.

In India, studies in business history are few and far between, with the exception of the work of Dwijendera Tripathi in the form of his writings (Tripathi, 1981; Tripathi and Mehta, 1990) and the edited volumes, produced as a result of the seminars and conferences initiated by him (Tripathi, 1984; 1987).

Actually, comprehending the general historical studies of India for their implications on organisations and management is no easy task. Historical perspectives on Indian society are in the process of a continuous re-evaluation. This is because the initiation of formal studies of Indian history took place during the colonial period, which many respectable post-independence Indian authors (Bhattacharya and Thapar, 1986) and modern foreign historians (Inden, 1990) consider greatly influenced or biased in the selection of data as well as the resultant theories. Even such well established Western ideas remain debatable in the Indian context, as to whether India at all passed through a 'feudal' phase.

The credit of being one of the oldest civilisations multiplies the complexity of the task many fold. The significance of pre-vedic social heritage for evolving more democratic social or organisational functioning, the nefarious effects of the caste system or the Hindu mind on the work ethic, or the deleterious effects of Moghul and British periods on the development of Indian thought or Indian industry, largely continue to be lay theories without enough meaningful and progressive debate based on rigorous studies, though subaltern studies (Guha, 1982-89) represent the healthy development in this direction. The interested researchers in organisation and management in the Indian context would have to contend with this complexity, catalyse historians to undertake studies useful for understanding organisations and management, as well as undertake some well focused historical studies themselves.

Though the past is difficult to understand because it is no longer amenable to study in its totality, even the present Indian society poses no mean challenges to the scholars. South-Asia is seen as a region distinct from other regions of Asia. In South-Asia, India has the proportion of a sub-continent. Diversity of its people in terms of languages, and cultural heritage is well known. States and union territories could be providing distinct economic, cultural and political context for the establishment and functioning of the organisations. Due to the predominance of the universalistic frameworks, such regional differences have not been studied systematically, though one often hears that particular states offer more hospitable climate for the development of industries or cooperatives. To the students of political modernisation also India still remains an enigma (Pye, 1985). It emerged as the largest democracy after the second World War. It adopted a constitution based on values of autonomous individuals and a rational-legal framework for societal governance. But in the past decade or so, the ethnic uprisings, secessationist movements, growing communal violence, criminalisation of politics and increasing corruption in public life raise the doubt whether the process of emulating the West is progressing or the honeymoon with the Western ideal is over.

On the economic front India has had one of the most complicated systems of controls vitally affecting the chances of the emergence, growth and viability of industrial enterprises. Changes in the governmental policies need to be understood continually to understand their implications for the functioning of organisations in India.

Once a contextual approach to the study of organisations and management is taken up all the multi-dimensional cultural, economic and political forces must be incorporated into the explanatory and prescriptive models. Even in the West such comprehensive frameworks are in the initial stages of development, but the directions are emerging (Lammers and Hickson, 1979; Whitley, 1991).

3. *Developing Comparative Perspectives*

It is theoretically possible to understand a context and the organisations therein, without reference to other contexts, societies or nations. However, it seems desirable for more than one reason, to move towards comparative frameworks. Firstly, for the human mind it is easier to grasp the uniqueness through comparison with similar phenomena. Secondly, social sciences are in the business of improving the state of affairs, apart from understanding the reality. Human progress is facilitated through import and export of ideas. In the hands of practitioners it remains a process of trial and error. That is why one finds frequent transfer of fads in the field of management. This process can be made more efficient and effective if managerial innovations are seen as context related, and then, a comparative analysis of the contexts is also done, before transfer of ideas are applied from one social context to another. For facilitating this process the appreciation of contextual differences would be required. Hence the need for developing comparative perspectives.

However, theoretically, countries could be seen to vary on numerous dimensions. The challenge lies in formulating, identifying and validating those dimensions which affect the dynamics of organisations. Some conceptual innovations for Indian organisations were cited in the previous section on concept formation. But

development of comprehensive comparative frameworks is a more complex task. As indicated above, these would have to be multi-disciplinary, a requirement which itself poses a special intellectual challenge. Fortunately, there are some good examples to follow. Crozier (1964) had shown how the psycho-social preferences, governing relations system affected the dynamics of innovation and change in the French bureaucracy. Hofstede (1980), in his well-known study on work values, discovered four variables to compare countries across all the continents. He also proposed complex casual models, resulting in a country profile. Though, his results have been widely used, little work has been done to test and refine the casual models. Lammers and Hickson (1979: 132) proposed a broad framework to study cultural influences on organisations, as a conclusion to their edited volume on comparative studies of organisations. Maurice et al. (1986) have shown how internal structuring of French and German organisations is closely linked with other societal institutions.

Redding (1990) used an interesting inter-disciplinary concept of "economic culture", first proposed by Berger (1966) to analyse and explain the functioning of Chinese family businesses, in various countries of East and South-East Asia. Whitley, after comparing the structuring of American and Far-Eastern organisations on some selected dimensions (1990; 1992), has now proposed a useful new idea of "business systems", based on a vast array of comparative studies across the continents. According to him:

> Business systems....are particular arrangements of hierarchy market relations which become institutionalised and relatively successful in particular contexts. They combine differences in the kinds of economic activities and skills which are authoritatively co-ordinated in firms, as opposed to being co-ordinated through market contracting with variations, in the degree of discretion exercised by managers from property rights holders and differences in how activities are authoritatively co-ordinated between economic factors. Thus, the nature of firms as quasi-autonomous economic factors, their internal structures and their interdependences together constitute business systems as distinctive configurations of hierarchy-market relations and differ significantly between institutional contexts (Whitley, 1991: 7).

Whitley's framework is a tentative one but deserves serious consideration. It is obviously multi-disciplinary and would be a demanding one on the researcher. That, however, might be the call of the time.

All the points made above in the section on theoretical challenges have one thing in common. These demands that we take our own reality, our context, and our own nascent as well as radical thoughts seriously. From convenient imitations of Western organisations and management research, we must move to the double task of basic and application oriented research, concerned with the unique and pressing problems of organising and organisations, in our context, for world class efficiency and effectiveness. Quite obviously, it would pose corresponding methodological challenges which are indicated in the next section.

Methodological Challenges

1. *Need for Grounded Research*

Given the necessity of contextual specificity and fresh concept formation, methodology must begin with the grounded reality, reality of the day-to-day world. Alfred Schultz (1963), the phenomenological sociologist, had suggested that the social scientist ought to perform the dual task of understanding the reality in terms of its meaning for the people living it and then abstracting the multiple meanings into a coherent and internally consistent theory.

There have been a number of methodological innovations consistent with this epistemological requirement. Perhaps, the most well known is the approach suggested by Sayles and Strauss in their book on *The Discovery of the Grounded Theory* (1967). Strauss (1987) has followed it with a fairly comprehensive methodological manual. Other similar developments have been ethnomethodology (Garfinkel, 1967), semiotics, frame analysis, hermenaeutics (Silverman, 1985).

These methodologies, based on phenomenological sociology, have the strength of capturing the micro day-to-day reality in its richness which was not possible with logical-positivist empiricism, but they fall short of capturing macro dynamics. For the latter, the methodological innovations of Crazier and Friedberg (1980) and Giddens (1984) are of value.

2. *Need for Holistic Case Studies*

The case study method appears to have a debatable position in social scientific knowledge building. Very often it is seen to be unworthy of scientific recognition. It is said that a case study is too prone to researcher's biases, that a single case or a small number of cases cannot capture the variety of the phenomena, and that insights obtained from a case study are too situation specific. At the best, it is allowable at the exploratory stage of research or theory building.

However, the case study method has a renewal appeal (Yin, 1984; Stoecker, 1991), along with grounded and qualitative methodologies indicated in the previous paragraphs. Survey based researches have failed to reach robust generalisations. Meta-analysis techniques are being tried to decipher a voluminous **number** of fragmented survey studies (Hunter and Schmidt, 1990).

It is not implied here that, methods other than case study have no place in discovering indigenous ideas on organisations and management. In USA and England, organisations are continuously being studied by an array of methods. Starting with classical case studies known as Hawthorne studies (Roethlisberger and Dickson, 1939), major contributions were made by the case studies done by Gouldner (1954), Dalton (1959), Selznick (1949), Crazier (1964), Trist et al. (1963), Rice (1959), Jaques (1952) and so on. They continue to rely on case studies to explore new challenges: Pettigrew has attempted to understand the politics of decision making and the dynamics of change (Pettigrew, 1973). Rohlen (1974) and Dore (1973) have tried to understand the subtleties of Japanese management. Most studies of organisational culture are often by necessity case studies. Multiple

methods are used to study the same case(s) to arrive at a sounder and deeper understanding (Jick, 1983).

This, unfortunately, has not been the case in India. Case studies are rare and most work is based on surveys largely comprising of structured interview or questionnaire based data. However, there are important examples like Sheth's classic social-anthropological study of the *Social Framework of an Indian Factory* (1984); Dayal and Sharma's study of a strike (1971); and more recently, Sinha's case studies on the *Work Culture in Indian Context* (1990) and Virmani and Guptan's (1990) case studies on *Indian Management.* The latter two works emphatically establish the point that to discover our own organisational realities, case study method is a necessity.

A case study method, usually, requires greater involvement in the field, rigorous scientific temper, tolerance for uncertainties of the quantity and quality of data, tedious sifting and classification, and special skills in presentation. However, all these would be worth the effort for those interested in capturing Indian organisational realities. A methodological approach that simultaneously addresses the urge to do grounded research based on holistic case studies, with an acute sensitivity to the cultural aspects, is 'ethnography' (Silverman, 1985). Gregory (1983) and Rosen (1991) have addressed some of the special issues in 'understanding and doing organisational ethnography', including the problems of reporting ethnographic case studies. They have also noted the paucity of such studies due to the demands the method makes and the dominant ideologies in the academia.

Fortunately, Indian academia is not totally averse to such studies. Gupta (1990) was an activist-participant-observer in an action research study, and Reddy (1986) studied the evolution of the identity of a nascent organisation through participant observation. Reddy's study, also illustrates the potential of such an approach, in uncovering society specific organisational dynamics, as it explores the struggle between the competing 'familial' and 'professional' paradigms of organisational culture.

3.   *Need for the Method of History*

Under the dominance of positivist empiricist paradigm, social scientists considered it redundant to go into the past of existing social phenomena. All that was presently relevant must be understood from the data of the present. The past is also no longer available for rigorous empirical investigations. But once it is recognised and ac-cepted that organisations are historical entities, embedded in societies which have long histories, it becomes necessary to utilise the methods of history to understand the etiology of the present dynamics. This view is gaining ground in organisational studies (Gillette, 1988; Barrett and Srivastava, 1991). In India, Tripathi's (1981, 1984,1987,1990) writings (mentioned earlier) have amply demonstrated the value of such work.

4.   *Potential of Culturally Sensitive Depth Psychology*

Given the contention that individual behaviour, beliefs and values are simultane-ously influenced by culture as well as the deep (often labelled subconscious or unconscious) layers of the psyche, methods developed by psycho-analysis and other forms of depth psychology, ought to be of potential use in discovering the

culture specific understanding of organisational behaviour. The problem of psycho-analysis has so far been that, it tended to pitch itself directly at the universals of human psyche. Nevertheless, now culturally sensitive psychoanalytic work is be-ginning to appear (Kakar, 1982; Roland, 1988) and this should help the researchers address the concerns raised in this paper. Blended with applications of psychoanaly-sis to organisations (de Board, 1978; Zaleznik and Kets de Vries, 1972; Kets de Vries, 1984; Hirschhorn, 1988), it could provide a new potent theoretical and methodological approach. Other projective and semi-projective methodologies also have similar potential (Pareek, 1984; Kalra, 1981).

5.   Need for Studying Natural Experiments

The need for studying natural experiments has been well made by Khandwalla (1977) in the general context of organisational research. Natural experiments in organisational context are the conscious efforts of one or more organisational members to change the organisation. Study of organisational change is more complex than taking static snapshots through one time studies. The study of change has to be process sensitive, and the human processes in organisations capture the subtle cultural influences better than the study of formal structures and systems (Pareek, 1988). Change process also brings to focus some of the taken-for-granted beliefs derived from the past. So, the choices to be made bring out the dilemmas, associated with changing the culturally presumed features and throw up such issues in sharp relief. Previously mentioned studies by Khandwalla (1989) of the turn-around strategies bring out the relevance of "humaneness" in the process in the Indian context. Reddy (1986) shows such sensitivity to the 'familial' Indian self and its encounter with 'professional' world view in the context of a modern hospital. Many Indian organisations have been making various conscious efforts to improve them-selves (Chattopadhyay and Pareek, 1982; Rao and Pereira, 1985; Rao et al., 1989), but these are reported mainly by executives and consultants and often lack research rigour.

6.   Need for Action-Research

A particularly endearing approach for enquiring into human systems such as organisations, is action-research, in which action interests of organisational mem-bers and research interests of the academically oriented can achieve a specially rich collaboration. Susman and Evered (1978) summarised the advantages of action-research over the positive-empirical studies. Reason<(1988) has edited a collection on cooperative inquiry which includes an organisational study. Gupta (1990) has illustrated the potential of such an approach by integrating action-research into the processes of implementing a major human resource development programme in a large Indian organisation. Action-research projects make special demands on researchers but they also provide some of the deepest and richest access and insights into organisational realities. The works of Chris Argyris (in Argyris et al., 1985), who now prefers to call his approach action-science, are a clear reminder that such enquiry is possible, as does the earlier work of Jaques (1952). Organisational consultants are in the best position to make such research happen as indicated by these examples. But action-research also imposes new constraints

on the research process, which must be recognised and appreciated by the degree granting bodies. In India organisational consultancy is booming, but not the related action research. Some academic institutions have taken lead in this direction (Mohanty, 1979; Gupta, 1990), and other academic institutions would do good to the discipline by following this lead.

7. *Challenges of Comparative/International Research*

The necessity of developing comparative perspectives has been highlighted in a previous section. But this would also require undertaking comparative research. In the multi-cultural Indian context, comparative research would need to be done at two levels: one, the cross-cultural and cross-state research within India, and two, the cross-cultural or cross-national research involving countries other than India. Cross-cultural research in psychology (for example, Triandis, 1980) and comparative sociology are well developed. Now, more specifically, challenges and opportunities of cross-national organisational research are being recognised and written about (Lammers and Hickson, 1979).

International Studies of Management and Organisation

Let us now turn to the technical details of the problems associated with concepts, meanings, construction and administration of research instruments, interpretation and communication of research findings. It is useful to emphasise the negative effects of the intellectual and material dependence of Indian researchers on their foreign counterparts.

> When one thinks about it, cross-national research faces many of the same problems as foreign aid. Given the onesidedness of available funds for research in social science, there is a strong tendency to use one's colleagues in other countries for one's own purposes rather than to collaborate with them. After all we have the resources, the money, the computers, and all the rest that go with efficient research today, so why should we not extract the data we want and then just say "good-bye"? (Osgood et al., 1975: 9).

These candid remarks indicate how, involvement in cross-national research may be counter-productive for the research enterprise advocated in this paper. Hence, while Indian researchers must pursue such research, they must guard against the suppression of their innovative urges to address organisational issues from the Indian perspective.

8. *Need for a Playful Creative Research Attitude*

Mills (1953) showed by sharing his own research experience and using other examples, of how research is more a craftsmanship than just a logical-rational and sophisticated programme, governed by established theory and techniques of research. This aspect of doing research goes beyond the standard and often acrimonious debate between 'quantitative' and 'qualitative' research approaches. Daft (1983: 39-40) says:

....significant new knowledge (about organisations) is the outcome of something deeper. Research involves basic attitudes and ways of thinking. Research is a craft. Like other crafts, activities are not analysable (Perrow, 1967). Cause-effect relationship are not clear. Unexpected problems appear. Procedures are not available to describe each aspect of research activity. The learning of craft skills may take years of trial and error. Through practice one learns how to ask research questions, how to conduct research projects, and what to strive for when writing a research paper.

He then goes on to sketch "seven elements that form a tentative framework of research craftsmanship". These are:

(i) Build in plenty of room for error and surprise
(ii) Research is storytelling
(iii) Design research as a poem, not as a novel
(iv) Research decisions are not linear
(v) Relate ideas to commonsense
(vi) Learn about organisations first hand
(vii) Many colleagues in our discipline really care about quality research and new knowledge.

In short it is a manifesto for creative, non-traditional research. Such a research stance is extremely desirable for developing indigenous ideas, for otherwise, the hegemonic Western theories would continue to keep us in a neo-colonial and almost willing intellectual subjugation.

Conclusion

Though every researcher is alone in his quest, on the whole, pursuit of knowledge is a vast collective enterprise. It is definitely universal in its intent, but social scientific knowledge must bear the spectre of being itself dependent on language, culture and the historical moment of its articulation. To be useful it must take the peculiarities of different locales into account. Hence it would be worthwhile for Indian OB researchers to invest their efforts into this society specific programme, without having to lose the universal scientific intent. We also need to overthrow our self-imposed inhibitions for developing a strong indigenous community of scholars interested in organisations.

REFERENCES

Abegglen, J.
1956
: *The Japanese Factory Aspects of its Social Organisation,* New York: Free Press.

Argyris, C, R. Putman and D.M. Smith
1985
: *Action Science,* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Balachandran, S.
1987
: *Managing Change: An Indian Experience,* Bombay: Business Books.

Barrett, F.J. and S. Srivastava
1991
: "History as a Mode of Inquiry in Organisational Life: A Role for Human Cosmogony", *Human Relations,* 44(3), 231-254.

Berger, P. and T. Luckman
1966
: *The Social Construction of Reality,* Garden City, New York: Doubleday.

Bhattacharya, S. and R. Thapar, (Eds.)
1986
Situating Indian History, Delhi: Oxford University **Press.**

Burnham, J.
1960
The Managerial Revolution, Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.

Byres, T.J. and H. Mukhia, (Eds.)
1985
Feudalism and Non-European Societies, London: Frankcass.

Chakraborty, S.K.
1988
Foundations of Managerial Work: Contributions from Indian Thought, Bombay: Himalaya Publications.

Chandler, A.D.
1966
Strategy and Structure, New York: Doubleday Co.

Chattopadhyay, S. and U. Pareek
1982
Managing Organisational Change, New Delhi: Oxford and IBH.

Cicourel, A.V.
1973
Cognitive Sociology, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Crazier, M.
1964
The Bureaucratic Phenomena, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Crozier, M. and E. Friedberg
1980
Actors and Systems: The Politics of Collective Action, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Daft, R.L.
1983
"Learning the Craft of Organisational Research", *Academy of Management Review,* 8(4), 539-546.

Dalton, M.
1959
Men Who Manage, New York: Wiley.

Dayal, I. and B.R. Sharma
1971
Strike of Supervisory Staff in the State Bank of India, Bombay: Progressive Corp.

de Board
1978
Psychoanalysis of Organisations, London: Tavistock.

Doktor, R.H.
1990
"Asian and American CEOS: A Comparative Study", *Organisational Dynamics,* Winter, 46-56.

Dore, R.
1973
British Factory-Japanese Factory, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Garfinkel, H.
1967
Studies in Ethnomethodology, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Giddens, A.
1984
The Constitution of Society, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gillette, J.H.
1988
"History in the Here and Now: The Development of a Historical Perspective", in Berg, D.N. and Smith, K.K. (Eds.) *The Self in Social Enquiry,* Beverly Hills: Sage.

Gouldner, A.
1954
: *Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy,* Glencoe, III: Free Press.

Gregory, K.L.
1983
: "Native-View Paradigms: Multiple Cultures and Culture Conflicts in Organisations", *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 28, 359-376.

Guha, R. (ed.)
1982-89
: *Subaltern Studies: Writings on South Asian History and Society,* Vol. I-VI, Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Gupta, R.
1990
: *Implementing Human Resources Development,* Jaipur, Rawat Publications.

Hirschhorn, L.
1988
: *Workplace Within: The Psycho-Dynamics of Organisational Life,* Cambridge: MIT Press.

Hofstede, G. 1980	*Cultures Consequences: International Differences in Work Related Values,* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
Hunter, J.E. and F.L. Schmidt 1990	*Methods of Meta-Analysis,* Newbury Park: Sage.
Inden, R. 1990	*Imagining India,* London: Basil Blackwell.
Jaeger, A.M. and R.N. Kanungo (ed.) 1990	*Management in Developing Countries,* London: Routledge.
Jaques, E. 1952	*The Changing Culture of a Factory,* New York: Dryden Press.
Jick, T.D. 1983	"Mixing Qualitative and Quantitative Methods: Triangulation in Action", Van Maanen, J. (ed.) *Qualitative Methodology,* Beverly Hills: Sage.
Kakar, S. (ed.) 1982	*Identity and Adulthood,* Delhi: Oxford University Press.
Kalra, S.K. 1981	"Family Life of High Achievers: A Study in a Business Organisation", *Indian Journal of Social Work,* Oct. 1981.
Kanungo, R.N. 1990	"Work Alienation in Developing Countries: Western Models and Eastern Realities", in Jaeger, A.N. and Kanungo, R.N. (Eds.), *Management in Developing Countries,* IX(1), 27-43.
Kets de Vries 1984	*The Neurotic Organisation,* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Khandwalla, P.N. 1977	*The Design of Organisation,* New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
1983	"PI Management", *Vikalpa,* 8, 220-238.
1988	"Organisational Effectiveness", Pandey, J. (ed.), *Psychology in India: The State of Art,* Vol. 3, 97-215. New Delhi: Sage.
1988	*Social Development: A New Role for the Organisational Sciences,* New Delhi: Sage.
1989	"Dynamics of Corporate Regeneration", in *Towards Organisational Effectiveness through HRD,* Jamshedpur: National HRD Network: 408-445.
1990	"Creative Regeneration of Strategic 1990 Organisations", Monograph Series No. 2, *Centre for Applied Behavioural Science Studies and Action Research,* University of Delhi, South Campus: New Delhi-110 021.
Lammers, C.J. 1990	"Sociology of Organisations around the Globe: Similarities and Differences between American, British, French, German and Dutch Brands", *Organisation Studies,* 11(2), 179-205.
Lammers, C.J. and D.J. Hickson 1979	*Organisations Alike and Unlike,* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, p. 132.
Maurice, M., F. Sillier and J. Silvestere 1986	*The Social Foundations of Industrial Power,* Cambridge: MIT Press.
McClelland, D.C. 1961	: *The Achieving Society,* Princeton, N.J.: Van Nostrand.

Mehta, P.
1987
Scoring Imagination for Motivation: A Scoring Manual for Personal Achievement, Social Achievement and Influence Motivation, New Delhi: Participation and Development Centre.

Mendonca, M. and
R.N. Kanungo
1990
"Performance Management in Developing Countries" in Jaeger, A.N. and Kanungo, R.N. (Eds.), *Management in Developing Countries,* London: Routledge.

Mills, C.
1953
Sociological Imagination, London: Harvester.

Mohanty, A.K.
1990
"Social Psychological Aspects of Languages in Contact in Multi-Lingual Societies", Misra, G. (ed.), *Applied Social Psychology in India,* New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Mohanty, B.
1979
Management Control Systems: Implementation and Administration, Delhi: Macmillan.

Monappa, A. and M. Saiyadin
1979
Personnel Management, New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill.

Nagananda Kumar, P.B.
1986
Identification and Measurements of Work Dedication, unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Ahmedabad: Indian Institute of Management.

Negandhi, A.R.
1986
"Convergence in Organisational Practices: An Empirical Study of Industrial Enterprises in Developing Countries", in Lamers, C.J. and Hickson, D.J. (Eds.), *Organisations Alike and Unlike,* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Osgood, C.E., W.H. May and
M.S. Miron
1975
Cross-Cultural Universals of Affective Meaning, Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Ouchi,W.
1981
Theory 2: American Business can meet the Japanese Challenge, Reading Mass: Addison-Wesley.

Outhwaite, W.
1983
Concept Formation in Social Science, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Pareek, U.
1968
"A Motivational Paradigm for Development", *Journal of Social Issues,* 24,115-122.

1984
Role Pics: Instrument and Manual, Ahmedabad: Navin Publications.

1988
Organisational Behaviour Processes, Jaipur: Rawat Publications.

Pareek, U. and T.V. Rao
1981
Designing and Managing Human Resource Systems, New Delhi: Oxford and IBH.

Perrow, C.
1986
Complex Organisations: A Critical Essay, 3rd Edn., New York: Random House.

Pettigrew, A.M.
1973
The Awakening Giant: Continuity and Change in Imperial Chemical Industries, London: Basil Blackwell.

Pye, L.W.
1985
Asian Power and Politics, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Rao, T.V. and D. Pereira (Eds.)
1985
Recent Experience in Human Resources Development, New **Delhi: Oxford** and **IBM.**

Rao, T.V., K.K. Verma,
A.K. Khandelwal and
S.J.E. Abraham
1987
Alternative Approaches and Strategies of Human Resource Development, Jaipur: Rawat Publications.

Redding, S.G.
1990
: *The Spirit of Chinese Capitalism,* Berlin: Walter de Guyter.

Reddy, C M.
1986
: *A Study of the Processes of Evolution of the Internal Environment of a Nascent Organisation,* Unpublished Dissertation, Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad.

Rice, A.K.
1959
: *Productivity and Social Organisation: The Ahmedabad Experiment,* London: Tavistock.

Reason, P. (ed.)
1988
: *Human Enquiry in Action,* London: Sage.

Roethlisberger, F.J. and W.J. Dickson
1988
: *Management and the Worker,* Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Rohlin, T.
1974
: *For Harmony and Strength: Japanese White Collar Organisation in Anthropological Perspective,* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Roland, A.
1988
: *In Search of Self in India and Japan,* New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Rosen, M.
1991
: "Coming to Terms with the Field: Understanding and Doing Organisational Ethnography", *Journal of Management Studies,* 28(1), 1-24.

Sartori, G.
1984
: *Social Science Concepts,* Beverly Hills: Sage.

Sayles, and A. Strauss
1967
: *Discovery of the Grounded Theory,* New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Schultz, A.
1963
: "Commonsense and Scientific Interpretation of Human Action", Natanson, M. (ed.) *Philosophy of Social Science: A Reader,* New York: Random House.

Selznick, P.
1949
: *T.V.A. and the Grass Roots,* Berkeley, Calif: University of Califronia Press.

Sheth, N.R.
1981
: *Social Framework of an Indian Factory,* 2nd Ed., Delhi: HBC.

Silverman, D.
1985
: *Qualitative Methodology and Sociology,* Hants, England: Gower.

Sinha, J.B.P.
1980
: *The Nurturant Task Leader,* New Delhi: Concept Publishing.

1990
: *Work Culture in Indian Context,* New Delhi: Sage.

Stoecker, R.
1991
: "Evaluating and Rethinking the Case Study", *The Sociological Review,* 39(1), 88-112.

Strauss, A.L.
1987
: *Qualitative Analysis for Social Scientists,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Susman, G.I. and D. Evered
1978
: "An Assessment of the Scientific Merits of Action-Research", *Administrative Science Quarterly.*

Triandis, H.C.
1980
: *Handbook of Cross-Cultural Psychology* (6 Vols.), Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Tripathi, D.
1981
: "The Dynamics of Tradition: Kasturbhai Lalbhai and his Entrepreneurship,* New Delhi: Manohar.

Tripathi, D. (ed.)
1984
: *Business Communities of India: A Historical Perspective,* New Delhi: Manohar.

| 1987 | *State and Business in India: A Historical Perspective,* New Delhi: Manohar. |

Tripathi, D. and M. Mehta
1990 — *Business Houses of Western India: A Study in Entrepreneurial Response, 1850-1956,* New Delhi: Manohar.

Trist, E., G.W. Higgin,
H. Murray and A.B. Pollock
1963 — *Organisational Choice,* London: Tavistock.

Virmani, B.R. and Guptan
1990 — *Indian Management,* New Delhi: Vision Books.

Whitley, R.
1990 — "Eastern Asian Enterprise Structures and 1973 Comparative Analysis of Forms of Business Organisation", *Organisation Studies,* 11(1), 47-74.

1991 — "Societies, Firms and Markets: The Social Structuring of Market Economies", Mimeograph, Manchester Business School.

1992 — *Business Systems in East Asia,* London: Sage Publications.

Whyte, W.F. and E.L Hamilton
1965 — *Action Research for Management,* Homewood, ICL: Irwin Dorsey.

Yin, R.K.
1984 — *Case Study Research: Design and Methods,* Beverly Hills: Sage.

Zaleznik, A. and
M.F.R. Kets de Vries
1972 — *Power and the Corporate Mind,* Boston: Houghton Miffin Co.

RESPONSE 1

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT

UDAI PAREEK

The author emphasises (a) the process of identity formation of the 'Indian' and (b) the collective unconscious that the Indian has inherited. The historicity implied in this understanding is the focus of this brief response.

Prof. Udai Pareek is Scientific Adviser, Indian Institute of Health Management Research, Jaipur.

Professor Rajen Gupta's paper draws attention to some important issues in evolving theories about the dynamics of Indian organisations which cannot be understood without understanding the psychodynamics of the Indian society. He has discussed both the theoretical and methodological challenges, and has ended up by stressing the need for academic rigour and commitment on the part of the concerned researchers/thinkers. The issues discussed *are* critical for the process of evolution of the indigenous theories and methodologies — the use of Indian languages for academic work, a historical-cultural approach to understanding a complex culture evolved over centuries and spread over a sub-continent, use of holistic case studies, and a comparative framework.

Two core insights are necessary to understand the complex Indian reality: (1) understanding the process of identity formation of an Indian (in spite of sub-cultural