
UNIT 4 DIFFERENT MODELS OF OB (AUTOCRATIC, CUSTODIAL, SUPPORTIVE AND COLLEGIAL, ETC.)

Structure

- 4.0 Introduction
- 4.1 Objectives
- 4.2 Models of Organisation
 - 4.2.1 The Autocratic Model
 - 4.2.2 The Custodial Model
 - 4.2.3 The Supportive Model
 - 4.2.4 The Collegial Model
- 4.3 Comparison of the Models of Organisational Behaviour
- 4.4 Conclusions about the Models
 - 4.4.1 The Models Are, In Practice, Subject To Evolutionary Change
 - 4.4.2 The Models Are Based On Incremental Values
 - 4.4.3 The Models Are a Function of Prevailing Employee Needs
 - 4.4.4 There Is a General Trend towards Newer Models
 - 4.4.5 Contingent Use of All Models
- 4.5 Let Us Sum Up
- 4.6 Unit End Questions
- 4.7 Glossary
- 4.8 Suggested Readings
- 4.9 Answers to Self Assessment Questions

4.0 INTRODUCTION

As you already know by now, organisational behaviour is the study and application of knowledge about how people, individuals, and groups act in organisations. It does this by taking a *system approach*, that is, it interprets people-organisation relationships in terms of the whole person, whole group, whole organisation, and whole social system (as we saw in Unit 3). Its purpose is to build better relationships by achieving human objectives, organisational objectives, and social objectives. All these elements combine to build the model or framework that the organisation operates from.

In contemporary times, managers confront many challenges and opportunities. These challenges are the result of environmental changes occurring due to factors such as globalisation, information technology, quality consciousness, workforce diversity, and ethics. Organisational behaviour models help managers to face these challenges and take appropriate actions.

The model that a manager holds depicts the assumptions that he or she makes about people and influences his/her interpretation of events. Understanding of such models therefore provides a powerful albeit unconscious guide to managerial

behaviour. These models are also helpful in understanding the context of the manager-employee relationships. This includes how employees may respond to the various orientations of managers, the general behavioural climate that prevails in the manager-employees relationship, etc. Various models of organisational behaviour have been postulated by several scholars, most notably Keith Davis (1967). Many models of organisational behaviour have emerged during the last 100 years or so, and four of them are significant in contributing to our understanding of frameworks that organisations operate out of. These are Autocratic, Custodial, Supportive, and Collegial.

In this unit, we will discuss and critically examine the aforementioned models of organisational behaviour, namely, autocratic, custodial, supportive, and collegial. In the order mentioned above, the four models represent a historical evolution of management thought and practice during the last 100 years or so. These models show the evolution of the thinking and behavior on the part of both management and managers. They also express the shift in the outlook of managers in viewing their employees and the resultant organisational environment. Davis states that managerial practices have been evolving from the autocratic model to a custodial model and then to a supportive one. The autocratic model predominated about 75 years ago. In the 1920s and 1930s it yielded ground to the more successful custodial model. In this generation, the supportive model has been the most popular. In this unit, we shall also compare these four models along with their various facets.

4.1 OBJECTIVES

After reading this unit, you will be able to:

- Describe the four models of organisational behaviour, viz. autocratic, custodial, supportive, and collegial;
- Critically examine the four models of organisational behaviour; and
- Compare the various models of organisational behaviour.

4.2 MODELS OF ORGANISATION

There are different types of organisational behavior models and these are described in this unit. Organisations differ in the quality of the systems they develop and maintain and in the results they achieve. Varying results are substantially caused by different models of organisational behavior. These models constitute the belief system that dominates management's thought and affects management's actions in each organisation. Therefore, it is highly important that managers recognize the nature, significance, and effectiveness of their own models, as well as the models of others around them, four models of organisation behaviour.

These are as follows:

- 1) Autocratic
- 2) Custodial
- 3) Supportive
- 4) Collegial

Let us take each of the models and discuss.

4.2.1 The Autocratic Model

“Might is right” is the motto of the theory. It depends upon power. Those who are in command must have power to demand. Employees are to follow their boss. Management thinks that employees are passive and resistant to organisational needs. It is just like theory developed by McGregor. Under autocratic conditions the employee orientation is obedience to a boss, not respect for a manager. The psychological result for employee’s orientation is dependence on their boss, whose power to hire, fire, etc., is almost absolute. The boss pays minimum wages because minimum performance is given by employees. They are willing to give minimum performance though sometimes reluctantly because they must satisfy subsistence needs for themselves and their families.

The autocratic model has existed for thousands of years. During the Industrial Revolution, it was the prominent model of organisational function. The managers of this type of organisation operate mostly out of Mc Gregor’s Theory X. As you might recall, this philosophy of management assumes that people are inherently lazy, dislike work, and will avoid work if they can. As a result, management needs to closely supervise workers and develop comprehensive systems of control. Beliefs of this theory lead to mistrust, highly restrictive supervision, and a punitive atmosphere.

The model depends on power with a managerial orientation of authority- those who are in power act autocratically. The message to employees is- ‘*You do this, or else*’, meaning that employees who do not follow orders are penalised, often severely. In an autocratic environment the managerial orientation is formal, official *authority*. This authority is delegated by right of command over the people to it applies. The employees in turn are oriented towards obedience to a boss, not respect for a manager. The psychological result for employees is dependence on their boss, whose power to hire, fire, and “perspire” them is almost absolute.

The employee need that is met is *subsistence* (for themselves and their families). The boss pays minimum wages because minimum performance is given by employees. Some employees give higher performance because of an internal achievement drive, because they personally like the boss, because the boss is a natural leader, or because of some other situational factor; but most of them give only minimal performance.

When an autocratic model of organisational behaviour exists, the measure of an employee’s morale is usually his compliance with rules and orders. Compliance is “unprotesting assent without enthusiasm” (Hicks, 1971, p. 186). The compliant employee takes his orders and does not talk back.

The autocratic model uses one way downward communication emanating from the top down to the workers. Management believes that it knows best. Employees are obligated to follow orders. Management does the thinking; employees have to obey the directives. Under such conditions, the “worker’s role is *obedience to management*” (Zastrow, 2009, p. 260).

Although modern writers have an inherent tendency to condemn this model, it is actually very effective in some settings, for instance it works well especially in times of an organisational crisis. Military organisations throughout the world are based on this model. This view of work built great railroad systems, operated

giant steel mills, and produced the spectacular industrial civilisation in the United States. It, however, also has a number of disadvantages. Workers are often in the best position to identify shortcomings in the structure and technology of the organisational system, but downward communication prevents feedback to management. The model fails to generate commitment among workers to accomplish organisational goals. Lastly, the model fails to motivate workers to further develop their skills- skills that might even help the employer. It often has disturbing side effects- employees feel insecure, frustrated, and may even have feelings of aggression towards the management. Since employees could not vent these feelings directly, sometimes they vented them on their families, friends and neighbours, leading to the suffering of the entire community.

Large commercial organisations have moved away from hierarchical organisations to models where there are relatively autonomous groups of front line staff, supported by the technical staff and management. Control is exercised by the users/consumers and their requirements, translated through information and operational systems that highlight the degree to which consumer demand is being successfully met. The demands of a 'Just in Time' system of production, for example, provide the structure and discipline to front line staff formerly supplied by hierarchical managers. The manager's task in this case is to assess variances in performance and ensure the system is integrated effectively. This thinning of hierarchies and distributing of responsibility to front line teams has been termed heterarchical where there are many nodes of power and responsibility. Another version is provided by The Visa Company (jointly owned by its member banks) which developed what its founder Dee Hock called a 'chaordic' organisation, combining organisation and chaos. For social innovation, such models are particularly applicable to large charities and to public services.

Many social ventures try and avoid strict hierarchical structures by remaining small and by sub-dividing (like cells) or collaborating with other similar ventures. Some have adopted a franchised model, to allow each unit to remain relatively small, while benefitting from economies of scale for the group of ventures as a whole. This is the basis for the expansion of Riverford organics, which franchises distributors of its organic produce, while involving 12 sister farms in a co-operative of regional producers. This structure was intentionally adopted by the founder of Riverford, Guy Watson, to keep his venture small, and production local. The resulting network now delivers 47,000 organic food boxes a week.

Different development stages of the innovation will require different forms and styles of leadership and management. In the initial stages, leadership is that of a pioneer. As the organisation develops, leadership needs to take on the skills of adapting, listening and learning. Management is not only about the giving of orders, but it is about seeding multiple centres of activity and initiative and building forums to allow this mosaic of energy to interact, channelling debate and tension into further innovation.

There is commonly a tension between the demands of continuing operations and the venture's ability to maintain innovation. The financial and managerial demands of innovation may put pressure on existing business. There are different management styles that may be appropriate for innovation and operations. Spin offs are one way of managing this tension. Careful succession planning is another, permitting the initial innovators to move on to the new tasks.

4.2.2 The Custodial Model

Workers being managed under the autocratic model often feel insecurity and frustration. They may even show aggression towards their boss and their families and neighbours. That is why progressive managers felt that there must be some way to develop better employee relationships so that insecurity and frustration could be dispelled. The custodial model provides for employees' dependence on organisation rather than dependence on their boss. The model emphasizes economic reward, security, organisational dependence, and maintenance factors. The custodial approach leads to employee dependence on the organisation. Rather than being dependent on their boss for their weekly bread, employees now depend on organisations for their security and welfare.

Employees working in a custodial environment become psychologically preoccupied with their economic rewards and benefits. As a result of their treatment, they are well maintained and contented. However, contentment does not necessarily produce strong motivation. It may produce only passive cooperation. The result tends to be that employees do not perform much more effectively than under the old autocratic model.

As already mentioned, the managers using an autocratic model operate mostly out of McGregor's Theory X. The next three models, starting from the custodial model, begin to build on McGregor's Theory Y. The Theory Y approach to management is more progressive and paints a more optimistic picture of employees than Theory X. Managers holding the custodial model believe that if the insecurities, frustrations, and aggressions of employees could be dispelled, they might feel like working. Development of the custodial model was aided by psychologists, industrial relations specialists, and economists.

The custodial model of organisational behaviour takes into consideration the security needs of employees. A custodial environment gives a psychological reassurance of economic rewards and benefits. The basis of this model is economic resources with a managerial orientation toward money to pay wages and benefits. Clearly, if an organisation does not have the wealth to provide pensions and pay other benefits, it cannot follow a custodial approach.

A successful custodial approach depends on economic resources. Since employees' physical needs are already reasonably met, the employer looks to *security needs* as a motivating force. To satisfy employees' security needs, many companies began to provide welfare programs, such as pension plans, child-care centers at the workplace, health and life insurance.

However, researchers found that the custodial approach leads to employee *dependence* on the organisation. Rather than being dependent on their boss for their weekly bread, employees now depend on organisations for their security and welfare. Employees working in a custodial environment become psychologically preoccupied with their economic rewards and benefits. Employees working under such a model tend to focus on economic rewards and benefits. As a result of their treatment, they are certainly happier and more content than under the autocratic model, but they do not have a high commitment in helping the organisation meet its goals.

Contentment does not necessarily produce strong motivation; it may produce only *passive cooperation*. This results in the employees producing substantially below their capabilities. They are still not motivated enough to advance to higher capacities. It is important to point out here that unlike cows, happy and contented employees are not necessarily the most productive ones!

It is imperative to point out here that one great benefit of the custodial model was that it brought security and satisfaction to workers, something that was a welcome change from the times of managers holding the autocratic model. At the same time, due to their contentment and passive cooperation, they cannot even afford to quit.

4.2.3 The Supportive Model

The basic idea behind this theory is that leadership motivates the people to work and not the power of money as in custodial model. Through leadership management provides a climate to help employees grow and accomplish in the interest of the organisation, the things of which rather than to simply support employee benefit payments as in the custodial approach.

Under the supportive model, the workers feel a sense of participation and task involvement in the organisation. The manager's role is one of helping employee solve their problems and accomplish their work. This model has been found to be effective in affluent countries where workers are more concerned about their higher level needs affiliation and esteem. This model has limited application under Indian conditions because a vast majority of operative workers are more concerned about their higher level needs affiliation and esteem.

The supportive model of organisational behaviour seeks to create supportive work environment and motivate employees to perform well on their job. The basis of this model is leadership with a managerial orientation of support. The supportive model depends on leadership instead of power or money.

In fact, this model has its roots in Likert's principle of supportive relationships: *"The leadership and other processes of the organisation must be such as to ensure a maximum probability that in all interactions and all relationships with the organisation each member will, in the light of his background, values, and expectations, view the experience as supportive and one which builds and maintains his sense of personal worth and importance"* (Likert, 1961, p. 102-103).

Through leadership, management provides a climate to help employees grow and accomplish in the interests of the organisation the things of which they are capable. Just as Theory Y philosophy, it is believed that work is as natural to employees as play. Workers are not by nature passive and resistant to organisational needs, but that they are made so by an inadequately supportive climate at work. Given the right conditions, employees will seek achievement and responsibility and will work hard, without being pushed. They will take responsibility, develop a drive to contribute, and even try to improve themselves if management will give them half a chance. Management orientation, therefore, is to support the employee's job performance rather than to simply support employee benefit payments as in the custodial approach.

The employees in turn are oriented towards job performance and participation. The employee need that is met is *status and recognition*. Since management supports employees in their work, the psychological result is a feeling of participation and task involvement in the organisation. Employee may say “we” instead of “they” when referring to their organisation. Employees are more strongly motivated than by earlier models because of their status and recognition needs are better met. The performance result is *awakened drives for work*.

The supportive model works well with both employees and managers, and has been widely accepted at least in principle, though it is not easy to translate it into practice. One advantage of this model as you can see is that, supportive behaviour is not the kind of behaviour that requires money. It is a part of management’s lifestyle at work, that reflects in the way that it deals with other people. This model tends to be very effective particularly in developed nations because it awakens employee drives toward a wide array of needs. It is less applicable in developing nations like ours, because employees might still be trying to meet their sustenance needs. As their needs for material rewards and security become satisfied, employees here might also demand a more supportive approach, as has already started to happen.

4.2.4 The Collegial Model

A useful extension of the supportive model is the **Collegial model**. The term *Collegial* relates to a body of persons having a common purpose. The collegial model, which embodies a term concept, first achieved widespread applications in research laboratories and similar work environments. The collegial model traditionally was used theory is based on the principle of mutual contribution by employer and employees. Each employee should develop a feeling that he is a part of the whole and contributing something to the whole and recognizes the others contribution. Management is supported to be joint contribution and not the boss.

The managerial orientation is toward teamwork. Management is the coach that builds a better team. The employee response to this situation is responsibility. The collegial approach for the employee is self-discipline. In this kind of environment employees normally feel some degree of fulfillment, worthwhile contribution, and self actualisation, even though the amount may be modest in some situations. This self-actualisation will lead to moderate enthusiasm in performance.

The term ‘collegial’ literally means a body of people having a common purpose. An extension of the supportive model, the collegial model relates to a body of people working together cooperatively feeling a commitment to achieve a common purpose. Some organisations, for e.g., most human service organisations have a goal of creating a collegial atmosphere to facilitate achieving their purposes.

The basis of this model is partnership with a managerial orientation of teamwork. Management is akin to the coach that builds a better team. Managers are seen as joint contributors rather than as bosses. Since the management nurtures a feeling of partnership with its employees, the employees feel themselves as an asset to the organisation. They feel needed and useful. The employee’s response to this situation is responsibility. They feel that managers are contributing also, so it is easy to accept and respect their roles in their organisation. For example employees

produce quality work not because management tells them to do so or because the supervisor will reprimand them or worse even fire them if they do not, but because they feel inside themselves an obligation to provide others with high quality. They also feel an obligation to uphold quality standards that will bring credit to their jobs and company.

The psychological result of the collegial approach for the employee is *self-discipline*. Feeling responsible, employees discipline themselves for performance on the team much in a similar same way that the members of a football team discipline themselves to training standards and the rules of the game.

The employee need that is met is *self-actualisation*. In this kind of environment employees normally feel some degree of fulfillment, worthwhile contribution, and self-actualisation, even though the amount may be modest in some situation. The performance result is *moderate enthusiasm*. If the sense of partnership is established, employees produce quality work and seek to cooperate with coworkers, not because management directs them to do so, but because of their internal obligation to produce high quality work.

Self Assessment Questions

Analyze the following case study and tick mark the correct answer:

- 1) Organisation XYZ Solutions was dealing with problems of employee turnover, absenteeism, and stress related problems. A survey showed that employees, a lot of them young mothers (many single) had huge problems arranging for quality child care that lead to the above mentioned problems. The company decided to subsidize an on-site day care center, which very soon became filled to capacity. It required huge economic investment from the Company- about Rs. 12, 40, 000 per year- and created organisational dependence. This can be seen from a comment made a young mother, “It would really take a mind-blowing job offer from another company now for me to leave XYZ”.

Which model of organisational behaviour is operating in Organisation XYZ Solutions?

- (a) Autocratic (b) Custodial (c) Supportive (d) Collegial

- 2) Organisation ABC Electronics recently abolished the use of reversed parking spaces for executives, as was the earlier practice. Now every employee has an equal chance of finding a parking space close to the workplace. It has eliminated the use of terms like ‘bosses’ and ‘subordinates’, feeling that such terms simply create perceptions of psychological distance between management and managers. It also sponsors team building activities, such as river rafting trips in Rishikesh and requires managers to spend a week or two annually working in factory locations.

Which model of organisational behaviour is operating in Organisation ABC Electronics?

- (a) Autocratic (b) Custodial (c) Supportive (d) Collegial.

4.3 COMPARISON OF THE MODELS OF ORGANISATIONAL BEHAVIOUR

The following table (Davis, 1967) presents a comparison among the four models of organisational behaviour with regard to its basis, the predominant managerial orientation, the predominant employee orientation, psychological result for the employee, the needs of the employees that are met, and the ultimate performance result.

Table 1: Comparison among four models of organisational behaviour (from Davis, 1967, p. 480)

	Autocratic	Custodial	Supportive	Collegial
Basis of model	Power	Economic Resources	Leadership	Partnership
Managerial orientation	Authority	Money	Support	Teamwork
Employee orientation	Obedience	Security and benefits	Job performance	Responsible behaviour
Employee psychological result	Dependence on boss	Dependence on organisation	Participation	Self-discipline
Employee needs met	Subsistence	Security	Status and recognition	Self-actualisation
Performance result	Minimum	Passive cooperation	Awakened drives	Moderate enthusiasm

Activity

Consider an organisation where you now work or have worked in the past. Which model of organisational behaviour does (did) your immediate supervisor follow? Is (was) it the same as the top management's model? Reflect on your experience.

4.4 CONCLUSIONS ABOUT THE MODELS

4.4.1 The Models Are, In Practice, Subject To Evolutionary Change

As you would have probably understood by now, each of the four models described in this unit have evolved over a period of time. The first model, autocratic, had its roots in the industrial revolution. The managers of this type of organisation operated mostly out of McGregor's Theory X. The next three models began to build on McGregor's Theory Y. No one particular model is the permanently 'best' one that will endure over the long run. Eventually the supportive model may also fall to limited use. Even the collegial model should not be thought as the last or best model, but the beginning of a new model or paradigm. The primary challenge for management is to critically examine itself and identify the model it is *actually* using and then assess its current effectiveness. The manager thus has two key tasks- to acquire a new set of values as models

evolve over a period of time, and apply the behavioural skills that are consistent with those values.

4.4.2 The Models Are Based On Incremental Values

Organisations behaviour models produce *incremental* as opposed to *allocative* effects. Economic values with respect to allocation of scarce resources are generally allocative- for e.g., if Organisation A has a fixed budget of Rs. 1 million that must be shared amongst its four branches, if the first branch is allocated half a million, no other branch can be allocated that much. This can be thought of as similar to a zero-sum game, a situation in which a participant's gain or loss is exactly balanced by the losses or gains of the other participant(s). If the total gains of the participants are added up, and the total losses are subtracted, they will sum to zero.

In sharp contrast, human values such as growth, fulfillment or actualisation are incremental. Incremental values are self-generated, being created within individuals and groups as a result of their attitudes and lifestyles. In order to build say, job satisfaction in department A, you do not have to take it from department B. There is enough job satisfaction for everyone (in fact one department's job satisfaction may even help you to build up job satisfaction for another department. Isn't satisfaction contagious?)

4.4.3 The Models Are A Function Of Prevailing Employee Needs

The four models presented in this unit are closely related to human needs. New models have been developed to serve the different needs that became important at the time. The autocratic model, for instance, reasonably serves subsistence needs, but does not meet needs for security. The satisfaction of employees' security needs is addressed by the custodial model. Similarly the supportive model is an effort to meet employees' other needs, such as affiliation and esteem, which the custodial model is unable to serve. Lastly, the collegial model makes an attempt to satisfy employees' self-actualisation needs.

It must however be kept in mind that emphasis on any one model of organisational behaviour does not mean an automatic rejection of other models. It also does not mean that other needs are not important. What it does mean is that employees have progressed to a condition in which newer needs dominate. For instance, adoption of a supportive approach does not mean abandonment of custodial practices that serve security needs. It simply implies that employees' subsistence and security needs are reasonably met by a suitable structure and security system, and that their esteem and/or affiliation needs are more important and need addressing.

4.4.4 There is a General Trend towards Newer Models

As organisations today become more complex with rapid advances in computers and management information systems, top managers cannot afford to be authoritarian and use the autocratic model. In addition, as literacy, education and professional orientation of employees grows; they are no longer readily motivated toward creative tasks by the autocratic model. Keeping this in mind, it seems that the trend toward the supportive and collegial models will continue.

An emerging model of organisation behavior is the *system model*. It is the result of a strong search for higher meaning at work by many of today's employees, who want more than just a paycheck and job security from their jobs. Since they spend many hours of their day at work, they want a work context that is ethical, infused with integrity and trust, and provides an opportunity to experience a growing sense of community among coworkers. To accomplish this, managers must increasingly demonstrate a sense of caring and compassion, being sensitive to the needs of a diverse workforce with rapidly changing needs and complex personal and family needs.

In response, many employees embrace the goal of organisational effectiveness, and reorganize the mutuality of company-employee obligations in a system viewpoint. They experience a sense of psychological ownership for the organisation and its product and services. They go beyond the self-discipline of the collegial approach until they reach a state of self-motivation, in which they take responsibility for their own goals and actions. As a result, the employee needs that are met are wide-ranging but often include the highest-order needs (e.g., social, status, esteem, autonomy, and self actualisation).

Because it provides employees an opportunity to meet these needs through their work as well as understand the organisation's perspectives, this new model can engender employees' passion and commitment to organisational goals. They are inspired and they genuinely believe in the usefulness and viability of their system for the common good.

4.4.5 Contingent Use of All Models

Although there are four clear separate models, almost no organisation operates exclusively in one. There will usually be a predominate one, with one or more areas over-lapping in the other models. Although one model may be used at any one point in time, some appropriate uses will remain for other models. Some jobs may require routine, low-skilled, highly programmed work that will provide mostly material rewards and security (autocratic and custodial conditions). Other jobs will be unprogrammed, intellectual and unstructured, requiring team work and self-motivation. They generally respond to the supportive and collegial approaches.

You might be wondering at this juncture: "Which model is the 'best' one?" This question is actually incorrect. A better question 'which model should be applied in order to obtain the highest productivity' is also not that obvious. It depends on the task to be completed and on employee needs and expectations. For e.g., the autocratic model works well in military operations, where quick decisions are needed to respond to rapidly changing crises, but it does not work well in say NGOs where employees expect collegial approach.

4.5 LET US SUM UP

Organisations differ in the quality of organisational behaviour that they develop. These differences are substantially caused by various models of organisational behaviour that influence the management's thought in each organisation. Models of organisational behaviour help the managers to adopt organisational practices that best suit their requirements.

In this unit, we presented and critically examined four models of organisational behaviour, namely, autocratic, custodial, supportive, and collegial. In the order mentioned above, these models show the evolution of the thinking and behaviour on the part of both management and managers. They also express the shift in the outlook of managers in viewing their employees and the resultant organisational environment.

The autocratic model is based on power. Under this model, the person who holds power has the authority to demand work from his/her employees. It is based on the assumption that work can only be extracted by means of pushing, directing, and persuading the employees. In the custodial model, the emphasis is on providing job security (and fringe benefits that strengthen employees confidence in security) to the employees. The supportive model emphasizes leadership rather than power or money. It enhances the relationships between the employer and employees. In the collegial model, employees are self-disciplined, self-satisfied, and have specific goals which motivate them to improve their performance.

Models of organisational behaviour not only differ from organisation to organisation, but may also differ from department to department within an organisation. The point is that one model of organisational behaviour is not an adequate label to describe all that happens in an organisation.

The evolving nature of models of organisational behavior makes it very clear that change is the normal condition of these models. As our understanding of human behaviour changes or as new social and organisational conditions evolve, our organisational behavior models are also likely to change.

4.6 UNIT END QUESTIONS

- 1) Examine the trends in the models of organisational behaviour as they have developed over time. Examine why the trends have moved in the direction that it has.
- 2) Is the autocratic model the least useful in contemporary times? Examine the situations where it might be especially appropriate to use.
- 3) Is the collegial model the ‘best’ to use with all employees? Discuss.
- 4) Outline the similarities and differences among the four models of organisational behaviour.

4.7 GLOSSARY

- Downward Communication** : A flow of information from the top of the organisational management hierarchy, from the superiors to the subordinates.
- Self-actualisation** : The desire for self-fulfillment, the desire to become more and more what one is, to become everything that one is capable of becoming, and ultimately the full realisation of one’s potential.

Zero-sum

- : A competitive situation which involves a constant sum where the benefits and losses to all players sum to the same value of money (or utility). For e.g., cutting a cake is zero- or constant-sum, because taking a larger piece reduces the amount of cake available for others.

Different Models of OB
(Autocratic, Custodial,
Supportive and Collegial,
Etc.

4.8 SUGGESTED READINGS

Davis, K. D. & Newstrom, J. W. (1989). *Human behaviour at work: Organisational Behaviour*, 8th Ed. New Delhi: McGraw-Hill.

Zastrow, C. (2009). *The practice of social work: A comprehensive work text*, 9th Ed. California: Brooks/Cole.

4.9 ANSWERS TO SELF ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1) b: Custodial

2) d: Collegial

REFERENCES

Chakraborty, S.K. (1991). *Management by values: Towards cultural congruence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cooper, C., & Locke, E. A. (Eds.) (2000). *Industrial & organisational psychology: Linking theory with practice*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Cooper, C.L. (1991). *Industrial and Organisational Psychology*, Vols 1 & 2. Aldershot, Hampshire: Edward Elgar Publishing; New York: New York University Press.

Davis, K. & Newstorm, J.W. (1989). *Human behaviour at work*, 8th Ed. New York: McGraw Hill.

French, W.L., Kast, F. E., & Rosenzweig, J.E. (1985). *Understanding human behaviour in organisations*. New York: Harper & Row.

Frone, M.R., Russell, M., & Cooper, M.L. (1992). Antecedents and consequents of work-family conflict: Testing a model of the work-family interface. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77, 65-78.

Greenberg, J. & Baron, R.A. (1995). *Behaviour in Organisations: Understanding and managing the human side of work*, 5th Ed. New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India.

Herskovits, M.J. (1955). *Cultural anthropology*. New York, NY: Knopf.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's Consequences*, 2nd Ed. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Janis, I. (1972). *Victims of groupthink*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Jex, S.M. (2002). *Organisational psychology: A scientist-practitioner approach*. New York: John Wiley
- Kakar, S. (1978). *The inner world: A psychoanalytic study of childhood and society in India*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Katz, D. & Kahn, R.L. (1966). *The social psychology of organisations*. New York: John Wiley.
- Katz, D. & Kahn, R.L. (1978). *The social psychology of organisations*, 2nd Ed. New York: Wiley.
- Khandelwal, K.A. (2009). *In search of Indianness: Cultures of Multinationals*. New Delhi: Kanishka.
- Khandwalla, P.N. (1988). Organisational effectiveness. In J. Pandey (Ed.). *Psychology in India: The state of the art*, Vol. 3, pp. 97-216. New Delhi: Sage.
- Lippitt, R. & White, R.K. (1943). The social climate in children's groups. In R.G. Baker, J.S. Koumin, & H.F. Wright (Eds.). *Child behaviour and development*. New York: Mc-Graw-Hill.
- McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Meade, R.D. (1967). An experimental study of leadership in India. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 72, 35-43.
- Moorhead, G. & Griffin, R.W. (1995) *Organisational behaviour: Managing people and organisations*, 4th Ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Morgan, 2006. *Images of organisations*, Upgraded Ed. New Delhi: Sage.
- Morgan, G. (1986). *Images of organisations*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Mowday, R., Porter, L., & Steers, R. (1982). *Employee-Organisation linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism and turnover*. London: Academic Press.
- Murray, H. A. & Kluckhohn, C. (1953). *Personality in Nature, Society, and Culture*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Nelson, D.L. & Quick, J. (2003). *Organisational Behaviour: Foundations, realities & challenges*, 4th Ed. Ohio: South-Western, Thomson.
- Pugh, D.S. (Ed.). (1971). *Organisation theory: Selected readings*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Ramnani, V. (2010). Please don't go. p. 1, *Shine*, Hindustan Times Weekly Supplement, New Delhi.
- Robbins, S.P. (1991) *Organisational Behaviour: Concepts, controversies and applications*, 5th Ed. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall International Edition.

Robbins, S.P., Judge, T.A., & Sanghi, S. (2009). *Organisational Behaviour*, 13th Ed. New Delhi:

Rode, J. C. (2004). Job satisfaction and life satisfaction revisited: A longitudinal test of an integrated model. *Human Relations*, 57, 1205-1229.

Rollinson, D. & Broadfield, D. (2002). *Organisational behaviour and analysis: An integrated approach*, 2nd Ed. New York: Prentice-Hall.

Sinha, D., & Sinha, M. (1990). Dissonance in work culture in India. In A. Moddie (Ed.), *The concept of work in Indian society*. Shimla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study.

Sinha, J.B.P. (1985). The psychic relevance of work in Indian culture. *Dynamic Psychiatry*, 18, 134-141.

Sinha, J.B.P. (2008). *Culture and organisational behaviour*. New Delhi: Sage.

Smither, R.D. (1988). *The psychology of human and work performance*. New York: Haper & Row.

Taylor, F. (1911). *Principles of scientific management*. New York: Harper.

Trompenaars, F. & Hampden-Turner, C. (1999). *Riding the waves of culture*, 2nd Ed. London: Nicholas Brealey.

Williams, A., Dodson, P., & Walters, M. (1993). *Changing culture, new organisational approaches*, 2nd Ed. London: Institute of Personnel Management.