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PREFACE

This research has focused on particular aspects of organisational behaviour. It has expressed a concern for the tendency of many studies of organisational behaviour to dichotomize concepts and to separate much of the theory and empiricism. Accordingly, considerable effort has been given to appraising the theory surrounding the concepts of the 'formal' and the 'informal' with a view to determining their importance and value. The theoretical discussion has established that directly and indirectly these concepts have remained an essential part of the theory of organisations. Despite this apparent importance the concepts have been poorly defined and even more poorly utilised.

Empirical research was, therefore, embarked upon to determine the practical value of these concepts with particular emphasis on managerial behaviour. The ensuing studies provided material for the development of additional concepts which elaborate and hopefully enriched the traditional though vague understanding of formal and informal. The main intentions behind the elaboration and clarification of the concepts was to include behavioural actions and intentions. The framework adopted for this purpose was a social action framework. This approach signified the importance that was to be given to individual perception and meaning relating to situations and circumstance. It was not adopted on the basis of excluding a 'system' approach but rather to place the system approach in an 'actor' meaningful perspective. This is not so much, therefore, an attempt at convergence, but at illustrating essential relationships. The research has concluded with what is described as a 'contextual typology' which illustrates diagrammatically how the ideas of structure and process have been interrelated.
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INTRODUCTION
INTRODUCTION

An issue which continuously arises in organisational sociology is concerned with the purpose of this particular part of the larger discipline. Application of ideas and interpretation of findings could lead naturally into contribution toward organisational effectiveness. Implicitly, Weber was providing for what he felt was the inevitable process of large-scale organisations becoming increasingly bureaucratic. By identifying the ideal type there was provided not only the means for comparative studies of organisations, but also the goal to which organisations should aspire, assuming the value of rational bureaucracy was accepted. The issue therefore is really whether organisational sociology is concerned with reflecting 'social-reality' from the viewpoint of an observer role within the framework of the status quo, or whether it is intended to influence the quality of the observed scene and change the status quo. In principle, whether studies are attempting the former or the latter, the analysis which is made should be an expression of methodological rigour which allows for the continual development of the understanding of organisations.

Doubts, that may be raised, concern the application of the principle and the rigorousness with which understanding has been developed. Much organisational enquiry for example, has sought to examine relationships 'plucked from their native ground'. Assumptions about meaning have been made without concern for the basis of such assumptions. Second order meanings or common-sense have been imposed without concern for the feelings and perceptions of the actors within organisations. Organisations are even now discussed as if people were not a part of them.

This research has adopted the humanistic perspective of sociology which treats the actors and their frameworks as the central focus of attention. The idea of developing concepts to contribute toward the development of knowledge follows from this perspective. The research has sought to embrace the
'rational' organisation and the social behaviour of its incumbents and treat the relationship between these two elements as being essential and problematic. The concepts in particular are the generic title of 'formal' organisation and its corollary the informal. The research is concerned with the meaning, connotations and general relevance of these concepts.

The problems associated with this particular 'dichotomy' were brought into focus for me by the Donovan report on Trade Unions and Employers Associations and subsequently in its common usage at the Commission on Industrial Relations where I was employed as an Industrial Relations Officer. In the Donovan report there was a reference to the 'two systems' of industrial relations. Two distinct entities, which at the somewhat elusive points where they meet, were often adduced to be at odds, one with the other. The conflict was seen to be between the formal system 'embodied in official institutions' and the informal system 'created by the behaviour of people and organisations'. It could be implied from this construction that these systems are mutually exclusive. That was not the intention but it did mean that such an approach had inherent weaknesses. Is there such a precise and yet arbitrary distinction between formal and informal? What is occurring when the two systems meet and most critically is all behaviour and interpersonal contact informal?

These were the basic questions which prompted this research. They were added to by the experiences of the researcher at the CIR and in industry generally. The common reference to behaviour being informal because it was describing a social relationship was again misleading. The concepts of formal and informal seemed much abused and misunderstood. In one CIR reference team there was a prolonged debate prior to

2. Op. Cit. P.12 "The one is the formal system embodied in the official institutions. The other is the informal system created by the actual behaviour of Trade Unions and Employers Associations of managers, shop stewards and workers".
publication about what was meant by formalisation and again about how to distinguish formal, which it seemed was written and agreed procedures, from informal which encompassed all social behaviour! The members of the reference team eventually decided that the issue was too thorny to be specific about and merely published a very generalised two pages on the subject.

The importance of this dilemma in the understanding of organisational behaviour should become clearer as we proceed. The basis of the research was established upon the problem of apparently confused concepts leading to ambiguous application with regard to different types of behaviour. Subsequent sections of this research, particularly the survey of literature and analysis of organisational theory, will reveal the relationship of formal and informal in a manner which has reinforced the researcher's initial concern. That such a fundamental weakness has remained in the study of this subject for so long is perhaps incomprehensible. However, it does not require an extensive survey of previous works to ascertain that the problem, whilst apparently semantic, is actually concerned with activity in every organisation. This may be best illustrated by considering an extreme hypothetical situation.

A business organisation, (for this research is not concerned with purely 'social' or 'natural' organisations such as the family nor with total institutions or coercive organisations) of any purpose (other than perhaps a twenty-four hour service) would survive, and normally does, with all its staff absent for short periods of time - holidays, weekends and overnights. However, should such an organisation suddenly find that one Monday morning its personnel had been totally replaced with equally able and trained, skilled or educated staff, and should the organisation survive, it would be fundamentally different and operating on a completely changed basis. Part of the organisation, that part which is more than just the sum total of the participants, would disappear. Further, and this is equally important, many features of the 'old-order' would disappear or become unrecognisable and a 'new-order' would re-emerge. Thus the 'new organisation' would cause entrenched systems, 'formal' orders, instructions and rules to fall into
disuse whilst other parts of the 'formal organisation' would be worked in ways which might be entirely different from the old organisation. Without a relatively constant social element to provide continuity the organisation would thus reveal an entirely new picture. It follows from this illustration, if it were at all substantiated, that the 'formal organisation' is not a part of the organisation which is meaningful unless it is related to the respective employees who are required to make meaning out of the formal organisation. The difference, therefore, between formal organisation and the social organisation more commonly referred to as the informal, is thus more than semantically determined. If the concepts continue to be used they need greater clarification, otherwise it is necessary to follow the suggestion made by various organisation theorists, that we should now discard them.

The major purpose of the research therefore, is simply clarification and stimulation of concepts which are important to the general development of the theory of organisations. Having started with such a purpose, the research has inevitably confined itself to a more specific field of study and drawn its conclusions from this more restricted area. Therefore, before the concepts discussed can be fully clarified and utilised, the researcher is bound by the conventions of research to appeal for more widespread and differently focused studies to validate the ideas thus presented.

In fact the specific field of study chosen was managers and management structures. This specificity, partially denies that such conclusions as are made here will follow in all social groupings within organisations. The reasons for focusing solely upon managers need not detract from the general implications of the findings. There are, for example, social groupings within management which have structures akin to worker groups, albeit perhaps more loosely defined. Ideologies and technical systems may vary and objectives are likely to have some differences, but many behaviours adopted by managers have interesting parallels in the behaviours of worker and other groups. However, one of the major reasons for choosing managers as the focus of the study was that it was felt
that in the managerial sphere the confrontation of the formal and informal may be more fully illustrated. Managers are essentially concerned with the decision-making process, with the utilisation of authority in their roles and the meeting of responsibilities. The scope therefore for comparing and analysing the prescribed features of their roles with the discretionary behaviour amongst managers appeared greater than with other groups in an organisation.

The designed course of study has been conventional in most senses, except perhaps in the research methods which will shortly be explained. Whilst not denying the critical thinking about the development of most theories in contemporary sociology, this research has attempted to elaborate theoretical constructions on the basis of empirical studies. The fieldwork thus completed was not merely a mechanistic process to substantiate any proposed concepts, but a pre-requisite of the study which laid the basis for the ideas and the broad model presented in conclusion. The very nature of the fieldwork enquiry appeared to the researcher to pre-determine the social action research methods, for which this researcher must confess a prejudiced affinity.

The presentation of the thesis is a logical progression of theory and empiricism. The theoretical discussion is concerned with the theme of the formal and informal concepts in organisational theory. It elaborates the concepts and illustrates the dilemma as well as the confusion created by concepts to which many theorists have applied common-sense meaning.

Section two of part one develops the relevant concepts related to the formal and informal distinction. This section discusses the definitions of concepts used in the research and is

* Note especially A. Gouldner The Coming Crisis in Western Sociology (Routledge and Kegan Paul 1971); and P. Worsley 'The State of Theory and the Status of Theory' Sociology, Jan. '74.
therefore a necessary part of the succeeding discussions in part two. Section three of the first part has referred to the research methods used in the studies and to the hypotheses which whilst not rigorously tested, provided a necessary insight into the problems with which not only this but contemporary organisations research is concerned.

The second part of the research is devoted to the survey of the empirical findings conducted in two organisations. These findings have been discussed and elaborated in terms of the conceptual ideas which the research is studying. The final section is a conclusion, summarised with an analytical model or framework which, it is intended, may be the basis for a new interpretation of the concepts formal and informal as well as offering scope for developing some research tools in the study of behaviour within organisations.
PART I
SECTION I

THE FORMAL AND THE INFORMAL IN THE CONTEXT OF ORGANISATIONAL THEORY

This section of the research is designed to give an understanding of the 'formal' and 'informal' concepts in organisational theory. The format is in five sections, each of which includes brief accounts and comments regarding the contributions to organisation theory and the way in which the formal and informal have related to the studies discussed. The sections have been labelled and treated separately but are not fundamentally distinct. Much of organisational theory has developed with schools overlapping and with individuals not easily placed in any particular school of thought. Nevertheless there are themes running through organisational theory and the concepts of the formal and informal are evident, implicitly or explicitly in most of these themes. The themes and authors referred to are as follows:

Classical Tradition
- Weber
- Taylor
- March and Simon
- Barnard
- Merton
- Blau
- Gouldner
- Crozier

Mayo and the Human Relations School
- Mayo
- Roethlisberger and Dickson
- Warner
- Bennis

Personality and Organisation Theorists
- Argyris
- McGregor
- Likert
- Vroom

Determinism and the Technicist School
- Whyte
- Walker and Guest
- Blauner
- Woodward
- Trist and Bamforth
- Pugh et al

Social Action Frameworks
- Etzioni
- Fox
- Parsons
- Silverman
- Bittner
- Glaser and Strauss
The Classical tradition - Organisations as bureaucracies

The classical tradition has within it several main contributors and others who have included organisation theory as part of their broader analyses of society. The former category is more pertinent to this research because it was more expressive of the dual concepts under review. The latter including theorists such as Marx and Durkheim are seen for present purposes to be less relevant whilst still acknowledging that they provide useful ideas on organisations. The main classical school to be discussed here is that concerned with bureaucracies as types of organisation and with the major part in the development of our much enhanced understanding of bureaucratic organisations, emanating mainly from the ideal typology which Weber proposed as a means for analysis and comparison. The bureaucratic 'type' was not expected to be found in concrete reality, but was intended to indicate the main characteristics against which any bureaucratic organisation could be compared. These characteristics are:

- High degree of specialisation
- Differentiation of private and official rewards
- Hierarchical authority structure with limited areas of command and responsibility
- Impersonality of relationships between organisational members
- Recruitment of officials on the basis of ability and technical knowledge
- Complete separation between the office and its incumbent

It is apparent, as Mouzelis says in his study of bureaucracy, that where these characteristics exist one finds a common, all-pervasive element; the existence of a system of control based on rational rules; rules which try to regulate the whole organisational structure and process on the basis of technical knowledge and with the aim of maximum efficiency. Mouzelis continued, making the observation that "whether in the religious, educational or economic domain, Weber observes the proliferation of large scale organisations, the concentration

1. N. Mouzelis - 'Organisation and Bureaucracy' Routledge and Kegan Paul - P.39
of the means of administration at the top of the hierarchy.

The modern army, the church, the university are gradually losing their traditional aspects. They are increasingly administered by impersonal and rational rules aiming at maximum efficiency. The large scale enterprise is the most striking example in this context.  

The Weberian notion of scientific rationality applied to organisational structure and design as a means to ultimate efficiency in any of the above types of organisation could only be seen as a comparative and diagnostic tool and even then in a limited sense. The bureaucratic type proposed by Weber was the most elaborated of the ideal type concept.

Weber's theory of the ideal type has been much misunderstood and criticised for reasons which suggest a failure to appreciate that the theory was not depicting the 'real' situation and therefore was not concerned with analysing the informal behaviours, but with what Weber felt to be 'ideally' the most efficient form of organisation. Comments on Weber's construction, could be focused on the level at which the ideal type method is expected to operate and that is as a means of cross-cultural general analysis of bureaucratic organisations. In this sense the ideal type was depicting a rational, rigid and mechanistic structure in which operations were mechanically conducted in a prescriptive and strictly ruled bureaucratic system. For Weber, the operation of an organisation based on these premises was the most effective way of utilising the highly specialised skills that are employed in modern bureaucracies. Accordingly the ideal type suggests that, by strict delineation of the areas of command, the bureaucrat can more effectively determine the achievement of organisational goals. However, this strict delineation is accompanied by a minimalization of discretion. Procedures and rules determine actions and emotive, or impulsive behaviours, are reduced to the barest minimum in the ideal type. "In the great majority of cases he (the bureaucrat) is only a single cog in an ever

moving mechanism which prescribes to him an essentially fixed route of march".  

This relationship then, of the official and his office was of paramount importance in Weber's bureaucratic type and was deliberately unconcerned with the character of the human organism. The typology is of a strictly utilitarian nature with "the impersonality of such a system, since the official must perform his work sine ira et studio - without love or enthusiasm; its essentially formalistic spirit, since it is available to all, without distinction, to whom the regulations apply, such regulations having to be carried out on the basis of the provisions they contain and not of the subjective demands of individuals; finally, the tendency of officials to treat matters from a utilitarian 'point of view' ".

What then of the value of Weber's ideal type to the development of organisational theory? Certainly a most important aspect is the very notion of an 'ideal type' and it is with the characteristics of this concept that possible criticism may be levelled. Weber defined his 'ideal type' concept as follows:

"An ideal type is formed by one-sided accentuation of one or more points of view and by the synthesis of a great many diffuse, discrete, more or less present and occasionally absent concrete individual phenomena, which are arranged according to those one-sided emphasised viewpoints into a unified analytical construct".

Weber was aware that his ideal type bureaucracy was a conceptual framework, however it was based on the value of ultimate efficiency in administrative organisations of mass society. This efficiency was determined by rationality and impersonality and may be seen in this respect to remain far removed from the irrational, highly personal reality of many modern organisations. Therefore, whilst as Mouzelis remarks it has been possible to see the march of bureaucratic

organisation in modern mass society, the ideal type is limited as an effective means of contributing towards the understanding of 'social reality'. Weber was much concerned with this and had concluded says Freund, "first of all, that reality surpasses our power of understanding... next, that it is impossible to describe even the smallest segment of reality completely or to take into account all the data..." With this it is difficult to disagree, however this does not preclude the range of choices which are available to survey the social scene. The ideal type is but one choice and does not appear to this author to provide for the richest understanding of organisations. This understanding needs to emerge out of the continued development of theory grounded in empirical science.

The limitations and inherent values of Weber's approach have not however, denied the vast legacy he provided in considering the bureaucratic functioning of organisations: "Weber's theory may be regarded as the most lucid and coherent of the many endeavours made to give greater precision to the concepts used in the human sciences". However, as Mouzelis pointed out, "he (Weber) did not proceed to the empirical study of the internal structure of bureaucracy and it was left to his followers to carry on the analysis on an empirical basis".

Regrettably some of the more renowned theorists of formal organisation, as with Weber, failed to make empirical contributions. One such contributor, Chester Barnard, nevertheless challenged the nature of formal organisation thinking which was apparent at that time. Barnard's truism that "by definition there can be no organisation without persons" might have been more controversial when it was written. In contemporary terms, Barnard's identification of three elements of an organisation as i) communication,

(ii) willingness to serve and (iii) common purpose are somewhat naive. These elements were identified as part of a formal system, but one which was personalised by individual behaviour. The assumption apparently made was still very much in line with Weberian values and was based on the idea of individuals consciously relinquishing personal control, assumedly to less personal forces. Barnard's simplification denied some of the issues he implicitly raised such as the relationship between personal behaviour and the impersonal organisation. The statement for example that 'willingness means self-abnegation' cannot be accepted without empirical substantiation, which is not provided. Barnard's strengths however can be seen in the recognition of an organisation as a complex series of units. These units become associated to form a total system functioning with degrees of success which are dependent upon the concern shown for the three elements mentioned above. The idea of plurality in systems was thus created at an early stage.

At certain junctures in the development of organisation theory the relationship of formal organisation and informal organisation has received major conceptual enhancement. In themselves the concepts of formal and informal have not always been explicitly confronted, although the nature of much discussion has been concerned with what they essentially represent. At the time of Merton, the idea of informality and what it represents was approached by viewing formal organisation from a different perspective: "In his discussion, Weber is almost exclusively concerned with what bureaucratic structure attains: precision, reliability, efficiency. This same structure may be examined from another perspective provided by the ambivalence. What are the limitations of the organisation designed to attain these goals?" According to, there followed greater elaboration of the formal and informal in terms of anticipated and unanticipated consequences and in the school of functionalism using the concepts of the functional and dysfunctional. Merton developed concepts to examine the means by which the organisation of the bureaucracy was supported, providing especially the fundamental links between

personality, social groups and the organisation. As with much contemporary thought he perceived the potential richness in 'role' analysis which has probably yet to be fulfilled. Merton's classic piece on role sets, linking social status and social role, has been fundamental to the examination of many organisational social structures. Several of the 'mechanisms for the articulation of roles in role sets', for example differences in power, means of insulating role activities and role isolation have been utilised and illustrated in this research.

Subsequent followers have taken various aspects of Weberian thought in their development of the theory of bureaucracy. Two key lines of thought formed much of the basis of the formal and the informal distinction. Certain theorists, notably Blau, Scott and Schoenherr, developed the formal understanding of organisations on fundamentally Weberian lines. The basis for this form of analysis used anticipated consequences of structure as the means for control of organisations. A second line of thought examined the behavioural responses to formal organisation as represented by informal individual and group behaviour. The researchers in this area were focusing more on the unanticipated consequences of organisational order and on the problems of control that were created. March and Simon depicted this dichotomy with their General Bureaucracy Model.

The General Bureaucracy Model

12. R.K. Merton 'Social Theory and Social Structure'
   Free Press 1968
Of the formal school, there is a divergent group of organisation theorists who were forerunners of a 'managerial' tradition. This approach possessed a rational logical method of thinking in relation to managerial problems and included Taylor and Fayol and other predecessors of practitioners bridging the gap between theory and managerial practice.

Of the formal organisation theorists it appears that Blau has given rise to the greatest confusion. Initially in his work the 'Dynamics of Bureaucracy' his focus was on the "daily operations and the interpersonal relations of government officials".\(^14\)

Indeed in vague form he posited the idea upon which this research is partly based that the insights provided by studying 'informal' relations and practices "are not simply idiosyncratic deviations but form consistent patterns that are new elements of the organisation".\(^15\) Whilst the positivist methods suggested Blau was at that time still retaining a 'formalistic spirit' to his enquiries, the intentions seemed clearly to adopt a more behavioural stance. Subsequent work of Blau's has proved that he retained the orientation of a formal theory of organisations and, as will be discussed in the succeeding section, behavioural features have become a distinctly secondary feature. The somewhat severe indictment of Blau made recently by Argyris\(^16\) has cast Blau's much acclaimed earlier work into a shadow of doubt.

Gouldner was able to construct and continue to develop concepts which gave insights into the unanticipated consequences of bureaucratic organisation. Studies by Gouldner have been suggested as providing both a dynamic and dialectic aspect to organisational analysis. The classic studies exhibiting informal behaviour in the gypsum works illustrated the nature of the informal system as a means of disturbing organisational equilibrium and of the formal forces which effected return to

\(^{15}\) P. Blau, Ibid.
stability even if that meant a new equilibrium. Gouldner's patterns of bureaucratic behaviour are worth briefly examining on the basis that they are behavioural qualifications to the bureaucratic system.

Gouldner's study on bureaucracy has followed similar lines with the explicit notion of dysfunction feeding back on the system which was required to adapt to maintain a state of equilibrium. The unanticipated consequences are characterised by conflicts and tensions, particularly evident in what he discerned as three patterns of bureaucratic behaviour. These three patterns are, firstly, mock bureaucracy. This particular type of bureaucratic behaviour is of especial importance to this research for it refers to the social responses to rules and formality imposed upon the organisation and not determined by the members of the organisation. Thus a mock bureaucracy is in a sense a parallel organisation to the formal organisation. Gouldner suggests that the informal values and attitudes associated with such a mock system are bolstered by the joint violation or evasion of the rules in order to get on with 'the real job'.

Gouldner's second type is the representative bureaucracy. This bureaucratic system is essentially derived from expertise and knowledge rather than position power and hierarchical authority. Finally, there is what Gouldner referred to as a punishment-centred bureaucracy. This bureaucracy emphasises control and conformity and ensures these concepts or values by coercive measures wherever necessary. Authority and command are exerted and may, of course, raise issues of power distribution and struggles for the ability, if not the right, to control.

These types of organisational activity are essentially modes of bureaucratic functioning and it is possible to see the strands of much of Gouldner's thinking of organisational activity in many other organisational theorists. Certainly the implied criticisms which Gouldner has made of Weber, can be taken as extensive qualifications by way of exploring further concepts which indicate the complexities of modern bureaucratic organisations. In this sense, the 'school' of
organisational thinking of which Gouldner has been a part, has not replaced Weber's original concepts, rather they have been complements to the 'ideal type'.

Like Gouldner, the study by Crozier of bureaucratic phenomenon suggested that bureaucracies need not be ritualistic and inflexible, denying personal identification and imposition of influence. On the contrary, Crozier put forward the proposition, again a theme in this research, that sophisticated patterns of behaviour, rationally developed at different levels in the hierarchy can be used and developed for the purposes of personal and organisational goal achievement. Crozier however also enhanced the idea of the 'vicious circle' of bureaucratic functioning and drew attention to the inherent problems of formal order and of the often misunderstood personal responses. This approach highlighted some of the most useful contributions of the classical tradition in the sense of identifying issues of power and conflict as being fundamental to the effective understanding of organisational behaviour.

These negative aspects of bureaucracy have probably been most usefully elaborated in the functionalist school and especially through Merton. The concepts of function and dysfunction, of manifest and latent behaviour and of systems theory have served to provide many of the stepping stones between the classical tradition and contemporary organisational analysis. These links are developed in a later part of this section and in the succeeding section.

Mayo and the Human Relations School

The classical theorists produced ideas and concepts and identified phenomena which empirical research has examined in various specific, situational circumstances. Increasingly, therefore, empirical studies focused upon the relationship between individual and social organisation in the context of situational factors. The particular school most closely associated with this approach was the Human Relations school, primarily concerned with a humanistic perspective and with redressing an imbalance which morbidly purported to the notion of man subsumed under a bureaucratic tombstone. Again the
values implicit in this school have become pre-eminent to the extent that they are in danger of invalidating such insights as may be afforded by the concepts. Thus in an effort to overcome what Gouldner called the 'metaphysical pathos' in the literature of bureaucracy, the human relations school has emerged into a philosophy devoted to denying an incompatibility between the existence of large-scale organisation and the survival of personal initiative and individual freedom. However, in the process of the development of this school it must be admitted that it has represented a highly diversified and changing movement of thought with many different views having been expressed under its umbrella.

The initiator of this movement was Elton Mayo whose famous studies in the Hawthorne Plant of Western Electric were the forerunners of many empirical works and established an understanding which is now accepted as a 'commonsense' interpretation. The Mayo enquiries focused on the relationship between individuals and their environment and through a series of tests and subsequent revelations, many of the results of which were inconclusive and confusing, there developed an awareness of the 'social' content of individual reactions and behaviours indicated in workplace activity. Thus the psychological and especially the socio-psychological factors assumed an importance in explanations of organisational behaviour. The focus turned with the Human Relations school to such things as the normative expectations of groups, to the values and informal practices and generally to features of group dynamics and influences on performance. There developed a realisation that individuals interpreted information and developed attitudinal frameworks and that insights as to how these processes occurred would prove as valuable as information about externally constraining factors such as the environment or management strategies. In order to gain an understanding of these processes and the attitudes associated with them, the Hawthorne experimenters embarked upon an extensive series of interviews. This allowed an investigation into what the researchers described as the sentiments and beliefs of the workers involved, and was

intended to find explanations influencing behaviour and output, other than merely causal variables in the physical environment. In their report of the study, Roethlisberger and Dickson described the sentiments and beliefs of the workers as an ideology which was an expression of mutually interdependent relations which in themselves affected output more directly than, for example, the intensity of lighting or the workers' economic interests. This was explained as follows, beginning with the diagram:

```
A = sentiments of the group
B = behaviour in restricting output
C = reasons given for their behaviour
```

"The economic interest argument which we have been considering assumes a causal relation between C and B. It assumes that B follows from C. Actually, we see that for these operators B was an expression of A, the group's sentiments. Their behaviour was a way of affirming those sentiments which lay at the root of their group organisation. C, far from being the 'cause' of their actions, was merely the way in which they rationalised their behaviour. They attempted to give logical reasons for their conduct and to make it appear as though the latter was directed toward some outside interference, whereas in fact, B was primarily directed toward and expressed A."

This particular quote is an indication of the rather naive interpretation given in analysing such situations as the bank wiring room at Hawthorne's, even despite the fact that there was an increasing awareness of the complexity of factors.

18. F. Roethlisberger and W.J. Dickson: 'Management and the Worker' Wiley 1964 P.534
affecting behaviour. However, the complexity at this stage in their analysis focused essentially on psychologistic assumptions leading to a priori conclusions which in fact only considered a partial aspect of the work situation. The formal, structural analysis was being over-redressed by a focus on the informal behaviours generated out of group sentiment and normative activity.

In one sense a dialectic was occurring between the formal theoretical approach and the appreciation of the human behaviour - the impact of people. The problem became one of over-identifying organisational analysis with one or other of these features of the dialectic, or put another way, of failing to comprehend a synthesis. Thus the statement coming out of the Human Relations school, "But people are a rather special sort of resource. They not only work for the organisation - they are the organisation," was typical of an exaggerated importance attached to a new-found dimension.

Mayo and the early Human Relations school had found a strong counterbalance to the scientific management theorists and to the hypothesis generated at the time that man was motivated by intrinsic self-interests. The counter argument now imposed values and norms on to the organisation which had a social basis and most important of all, suggested the informal organisation. The emergence of this novel concept thus created a dichotomy at a time when synthesis might have been grasped, and whilst a sweeping indictment, it would appear that this concept of the informal grew from being an embryonic 'discovery' to become a bête noir of the theory of organisations. The separation of elements of the organisational system in the analytical approach of Mayo continues in the contemporary analyses and various examples will shortly be quoted to illustrate the implications of such devices. For the moment however, the human relations theorists suggested that the informal organisation referred mainly to values and to patterns of behaviour which are not instigated by formal rules and

policies but which arise naturally out of the activities of workpeople interacting in their work environment.

Mayo found the results of his work adequate to form the basis of his own ideology, (or perhaps to reinforce what he had already come to believe), and hence the concern for management efficiency and organisational success, in the framework of the 'human factor'. Whilst the ideology need not be of concern to this research, the initiation of the concept of "the informal" is central to the arguments contained in this work. The primary focus has been to ascertain whether this concept can be justified, particularly bearing in mind considerable criticism related to its meaningfulness. Thus the origin of Human Relations as a 'systems' school, as champions of the 'human element' and critical of the domination suggested by bureaucratic structures, must be borne in mind in the assessment of conceptual convergence and synthesis of organizational theory.

Post-Hawthorne contributions to understanding organisations fragmented into various avenues, some of which retained the Human Relations perspective of 'social man' and others of whom sought to deny the 'closed system' of intra-organisational activity. Amongst those in the latter category were the so-called Chicago school. Pre-eminent in this approach was W.L. Warner who introduced extra-organisational variables in his work, 'The Social System of the Modern Factory.' This contribution to community-industry studies was followed by numerous studies which attempted to consider the relationship between external and internal organisational factors. Further, this approach was a partial refutation of the isolation of the industrial organisation system from the broader context of societal-political, social and economic structures. For the behavioural sciences this added a dimension to be examined in the appreciation of organisations which made more complex the picture of mechanisms of human activity in specific environments.

Another major strand in the post-Hawthorne era began the development of analyses concerned with processes of interaction in certain quantifiable contexts. Again
variations existed in this approach, which are worthy of brief mention as a further backcloth to the fundamental issues of this study. Homans provided a particular insight into group behaviour. Having distinguished between 'internal' variables and 'external' variables (which again has overtones of the informal and formal) Homans proceeded to appraise the impact of interaction between individuals as a major determinant of behaviour, attitudes and performance. The interaction was thus of a specific nature, possessing a social content and being of the order of "interpersonal stimulation among members of the flow of work outside the order of the other relationships."

The interactionist school caused an important shift in the sense of redefining the orthodox human relations definition of informal and formal. If a little ambiguous in intent, the interactionist school suggest a relationship between behaviour and formal structure which moves away from the separatist intentions of the human relations school. However, in its ambiguity and the subsuming of the informal, the implication is almost of a third 'interactional' category where the interdependency remains somewhat vague. Interestingly, the formal and informal concepts are defined in terms of concrete relationships and the distinction took a different form from that in 'Management and the Worker'. Alternatively, by implication the concepts were in process of being discarded.

Thus a middle path was developed by this approach and was broadened by the further analysis of group structure and leadership, notably studied by L.R. Sayles. The analysis by Sayles categorized groups and their structure according to their behaviour in different contexts, thus illustrating a relationship between situation, especially technology in the situation, and behaviour of the group.

The Human Relations school has received extensive criticisms which in themselves have failed to appreciate the value of the contribution made by the school to the more inclusive studies of some contemporary sociology. The excuse of Roethlisberger that "one cannot look and talk about everything at the same time" is a fair defence in one respect. However, research can express its boundary of analysis and not make a priori assumptions without suggesting the other variables not under scrutiny. Further the highly rigorous, systematic and quantifiable approach of parts of the Human Relations school detracted from some important problems especially concerning the nature of some of the processes, for example the interaction processes which they had constructively identified.

However, in providing an emphatic bias toward the influence of individuals and groups in work situations, the Human Relations school and its various sub-schools compelled subsequent organisation theorists to accommodate this element even if in many cases this was inadequately achieved. Certainly the Human Relations influence created a basic problem of much system theory and this is, how are different systems integrated and what impact have they one upon the other? Thus having created the dichotomy of formal and informal, there remain the unsatisfactory definitions and the ongoing debate concerning the relationship between the systems and whether to redefine or remove the concepts they embodied. New ideas were therefore prompted, but many questions arose out of the complexities which the human relations variables seemed to pose. The whole aspect of social-psychology, of personality influence, was now brought to bear on understanding of organisations. Also, as previously mentioned, perhaps inevitably there was the division between the purists or organisational academics and the champions of organisational effectiveness. The former became increasingly concerned with the maze of complex factors impinging upon organisations and the latter with an ethos of productive efficiency combined with a humanitarian morality. Perhaps the rather spurious idea of academic respectability influenced

the validity of various contributions, and it is notable how the compendiums of the theory of organisations tend to disregard those writers who have dramatically simplified what the human relations school significantly projected as a complex problem.

Personality and Organisation Theorists

Argyris is amongst the theorists who have retained a respectability despite simplifying the perspective on the basis of personality and organisation. The trend Argyris developed is complementary to the idea of removing a dichotomy such as the formal and informal, and in that respect is an important contribution to the present argument. As with others in this 'school' however, Argyris certainly gave undue emphasis to the socio-psychological concepts. Argyris's model is based on the relationship between individuals and the formal organisation; reducing in fact, organisational behaviour to three factors:

1. Individual factors - requires an understanding of personality factors and principles.
2. Small informal group factors - requires understanding principles of social psychology, one aspect of which is group dynamics.
3. Formal organisation factors - requires understanding of traditional principles of organisational people (staff - line, chain of command, specialisation of tasks; production layout and control and so forth.)

Whilst simplifying organisations to basic elements, the framework has particular value in the analysis of some individual behaviours, especially when attempting to distinguish between incumbents of similar roles. However, Argyris does not otherwise appear to overcome many of the theoretical problems of the general bureaucratic model. He is basically concerned with two 'grand systems,' (these being the 'individual personality' and the 'formal organisation'). By adopting a system approach he is confronted with the problems

of system theory. This is strongly implied in a recent criticism of Argyris by Nord who suggests that by focusing upon the micro-level of organisations Argyris fails to comprehend larger system inputs as factors in organisational activity. The criticism continues, in concern for Argyris's appeal for an all inclusive approach to the subject: "Even in his plea for interdisciplinary work, Argyris's discussion has a micro-flavour... Sociological variables which might be added include: attention to sources of legitimacy of authority in the social system, political power, ownership of property, the competitive economic structure, individualistic versus collectivistic value orientations and so forth."26

However, despite this apparent preoccupation with the micro-level and the implied built-in conservatism of such a theory, Argyris is one of several of the so-called P and O theorists, (personality and organisation) who concentrate on management's problems of achieving organisational effectiveness. On the one hand he advocates methods of interaction whereby "... trust, openness and individuality are able to predominate"27 thus firmly committing his values and at the same time appealing for research which is "designed to confront the foundations of present society."28 Accordingly, there arises out of Argyris the confusion as to whether what he is saying is concerned with what does, or what should exist.

Central to Argyris' theory is the notion of needs and along with other personality and organisation theorists the postulation is basically that much of man's behaviour is consequent upon his driving to satisfy certain needs. Maslow was amongst the earliest to project this line of thinking when he developed the idea of a need hierarchy through which individuals would progressively pass as they satisfied each level of needs. This particular school was significant in a number of senses. One is related to the idea that behaviour

28. Ibid
is not caused solely by social interaction as was the theory of much of the human relations era but that there were significant psychological factors that required understanding. However, as with the human relations school, in order to emphasise their ideas the personality theorists gave their additional insights a pre-eminent role as an influence upon action and, unlike the human relations school, they failed to provide any significant empirical support to their generalised theory. Thus Argyris mentioned at one stage, that "... 'underneath' the layers of social learning there may be strong but regressed needs and capabilities for self-actualisation;" and continued: "Unfortunately, there are no systematic studies that have focused on this proposition."  

Other personality and organisation theorists who have contributed to this field in a pseudo-scientific manner are McGregor, Likert, Herzberg, Lawrence and Lorsch, Blake and Mouton, and Bennis. Each of these contributors, and indeed one or two others have assumed some importance in the field. This may be due to the 'popular' views they have tended to project rather than the additions they have made to organisational theory. However, whilst it is possible to be polemical about these businessmen and authors, it is appreciable that their area of focus is highly marketable and its very marketability has in recent years led to substantial criticism from those applying the more stringent rules of the behavioural science disciplines. Silverman however suggested a telling perspective provided by such contributions when he commented: "If the claim of organisational psychologists to offer 'a general theory' of organisations, which synthesises the knowledge of the social sciences, might be regarded as premature, a sociological approach can still derive a useful insight from their work. This arises... from the important reminder that they indirectly provide of the limitations of positivist sociology." Indeed, McGregor has shown sympathy with phenomenological approaches such as Silverman's; "human behaviour is seldom a direct response to objective reality, but is rather a response to the individual perception of that reality."  

29. C. Argyris: 'Integrating the Individual and the Organisation' P.79-80  
McGregor's approach focused on an examination of the basic assumptions which dominated much managerial thinking about organisational behaviour. These assumptions considered man as resistant to change and by nature antagonistic and recalcitrant. Such a view, McGregor maintained, led to managerial behavioural responses which sought to achieve high performance despite the inherent attitudes in the 'nature of Man'. Such responses denied the higher level needs and accordingly the conditions created were in contradiction to the objectives which were sought. The similarity with Argyris' observation of the contradiction of personality requirements and the formal requirements of the organisation are quite evident. McGregor continued his analysis by using what he called the Theory X and Theory Y approach which are two alternative means of appraising human motivation. Theory X is proposing characteristics suggesting man has a negative orientation to work whilst Theory Y suggests a more positive, and by implication, desirable orientation to work.  

Likert is also concerned with similar problems and identifies four systems of management which typify the nature of possible responses to the assumptions about man's working nature. These four systems are: 1) the exploitive authoritative type; 2) the benevolent authoritative type; 3) the consultative type and 4) the participative type. Again the premise is that man has a basically positive orientation to work and has needs which require satisfying which in themselves will contribute to the positive attitude. However, the means of satisfying is determined by the 'law of the situation', elements such as individual needs, adequacy of communication, superior sensitivity and therefore the actions taken must vary if objectives are to be met. The underlying assumptions are however much disputed: particularly the notion that satisfaction is correlated with performance. The confidence with which these theorists make such assertions in the hasty disregard
of other inputs into the situation, whether these are economic or social, is remarkable when one considers the schools that have preceded the personality theorists and which have contributed to a complex understanding of organisational activity.

By implication of the personality theorists it is through the utilisation and the impact of the formal structures in relation to task objectives, that the 'unanticipated' or negative consequences arise. In effect the concern therefore is less with the nature and form of the structure, although they seek some changes in this element, but rather more with the process by which the structure is made operational in the organisational context. The relationship between organisational structure and behaviour, now has an intervening variable. Of course for these theorists 'the personality' is that variable, and yet despite this, the nature of the characteristics described in the personality concept, notably the 'needs' of individuals remains unconvincing as untestable hypotheses.

The other names previously mentioned as working in this area have either made similar contributions, such as Herzberg and Lawrence and Lorsch; or have tried to replace the needs hypothesis with more generalised notions. In the latter case Bennis and Schein have suggested that organisations should be treated as organisms with the same characteristics of health and disease as a living creature. Again as such theorists have been writing in recent years it is somewhat amazing that they are not more aware of the debate concerning problems of the holistic school and the functionalists.

If these various theorists have tried to embrace all that has gone before and develop 'general theories' which patently oversimplify because they are over ambitious, then it would be fair to say that the perspective adopted by Vroom is less ambitious. Vroom focused upon individual behaviour and professed that "although research on the behaviour of groups and formal organisations was of interest to me, I doubted that meaningful generalisations would emerge which would 'cut across'
phenomena at different analysis, Vroom was also less concerned with prescriptive thoughts and more with analytical tools, especially the concept of valence. Valence is used with reference to 'affective orientations towards particular outcomes' and attempts to relate those situations where the outcome is satisfying to the individual concerned. Vroom suggests that "the problem which besets the industrial psychologist is to identify the affective consequence of particular forms of social interaction within the work situation," and in attempting to provide concepts to answer this problem does not appear to be applying the same universality as the 'human needs' theorists. Nevertheless, Vroom is still concerned with solving problems internal to the organisation and the individual within it and is in danger of reducing the impact of macro-forces by enlarging the significance of micro-factors. Further Vroom's preoccupation with the value of outcomes denies any inherent value in the means of achieving outcomes to the individual.

The significance of the 'micro' theorists should not be underplayed in terms of conceptual development of the formal and informal, although it needs to be considered in a realistic perspective and assessed on its contextual merits; that is in relation to the general understanding provided by conceptual development of the complex array of variables. As Fox has commented referring to the personality and organisation theorists: "Most writers of this persuasion, however, have not hesitated to urge the re-designing, re-organising, and re-structuring of work to meet the supposed requirements of the 'natural man'." The limitations of this school are well expressed by such remarks!

The human relations school and the subsequent off-spring, have over-emphasised the individual and the group, concluding with the analysis that there is inherent contradiction between the social elements in the work situation and the formal structure of the organisation. The criticism conveyed by Fox is

particularly pertinent to the theme of this research in that he is implying that whilst these schools have delved into human motivation, needs, drives and so forth, they have focused on elements which cannot be fully appreciated without comprehension of the context. The context, especially as represented by the formal organisation has been summarily discussed in many cases as the root cause of organisational 'illness' or 'disease', or of dissatisfaction by the individual. Alternatively, a priori the context is not as important as the people who define that context.

It would seem, therefore, that irrespective of the nature of the formal structure, its development and organisation, its adaptability or rigidity and the application of the individual to a situation which has formal arrangements, the concern should be with the individual and his 'world' or his personal 'social reality' as conceived in a unique and highly personal 'conceptual environment'. In this conceptual environment, that is a personal framework in which elements have been labelled with personally meaningful conceptual terms, the individual may act out his role within individually prescribed choices of action and 'freedom' of perception. Accordingly importance is attached to the choices of action and the perceptual framework adopted by the individuals. There is an exclusion of the nature of any relation between the variables in the situation and the people who have created that situation. It is almost as if, in organisational terms, the nature of formal organisations was created before individuals had a part to play in the design of organisations.

Whilst the personality and organisation theorists may have a significant role in conceptual development it is necessary that they should express the conditions under which their ideas apply and do not make assumptions about the organisational level and societal level without having first shown for, or conveying an appreciation of, those levels.
Determinism and the 'Technicist School'

Alternative approaches to understanding organisational activity have come particularly from various contributors concerned with the impact of situation upon behaviour. Many of these contributors have been labelled deterministic and over-structuralist in their approaches. However as this 'school' has developed, it too has become increasingly aware of the importance of socio-psychological factors such as perception and meaning. In its appraisal of contextual - environmental factors the following is most significant to the structure and process argument of this research.

Technological impact on organisational activity was evident from the very early contribution made by Taylor, but he was able to give only a limited insight as to its effect. The idea of factors in the situation or the environment impinging upon behaviour developed partly out of stages of the Human Relations school, and here Whyte was instrumental in leading into the deterministic framework. However, Whyte was one of the earlier theorists who postulated that in the absence of contrary evidence, where variation existed in the behaviour of workers in different situations it was due to the impact of technology upon 'activities', to 'interaction' and to the 'sentiments' or values of the work force. Thus, the much popularised accounts of the disquieting effects of the assembly line became apparent as causes of dissatisfaction through 'negative sentiments'.

An important process had thus been embarked upon in considering a major variable in organisational design and behaviour. Despite what has been an over-deterministic and strongly positivistic stance during some stages in the understanding of situational variables in the form of technology especially, it is notable that it is very much an extension of the interactionist approach Whyte adopted that the students of organisational behaviour have tended to follow.

In a valuable contribution to the conceptual clarification regarding group behaviour, Sayles projected a strong determinism.

in his work. "Our whole emphasis has shifted from concentrating on the informal group to the relation of workgroup behaviour to the technological and organisational setting."\textsuperscript{38} and as a conclusion to his study his findings indicated that the technology of the plant - the way jobs are distributed and flow into one another and the nature of the division of labour - moulds the types of workgroups that evolve ... the human element, so called is a resultant of the technological decisions ... "\textsuperscript{39} The fallacy of such a conclusive outcome is again due to the exclusion of factors not measured or analysed. The implication in Sayles' argument was that there were characteristics inherent in the group which were caused by factors in the technological environment and that other variables, for example what the individuals brought into the group, or the history of an organisational culture, or the type of leadership, were only of secondary consideration. Sayles' group analysis and the technological determinism which affected them, was again essentially a 'closed system' approach. Accordingly, it is difficult to gauge the full effect of the factors Sayles analysed and still more difficult to determine in circumstances of change and the nature of processes going on when one type of group becomes characterised by the criteria of another group type. Nevertheless, Sayles' group types of apathetic, erratic, strategic and conservative are heuristically valuable, if less useful in any processual analysis. Further, Sayles was also shifting the emphasis from the social nature of the informal group to suggest other objectives in terms of their interaction with their environment: "this is not the traditional concept of the informal group seeking conformity with established norms of conduct; these are much more free enterprise units interacting in a struggle for maximisation of utility."\textsuperscript{40}

This orientation has been developed in various ways but notably by further studies in the assembly line type of technology, through Walker and Guest\textsuperscript{41} and studies of the

\textsuperscript{38} L. Sayles: Behaviour of Industrial Work Groups, P.168
\textsuperscript{39} L. Sayles: Op. Cit. P.4
\textsuperscript{40} L. Sayles: Op. Cit. P.158
machine shop through Roy. Also in this particular field and shortly to be mentioned are studies of cross-industry comparison such as Blauner and Woodward who with different basic approaches nevertheless examined different technologies and the impact on organisations. These studies led a considerable amount of work that has been done, especially in lesser known studies concerned with the impact of technology and with correcting the indictment Walker and Guest made in the early 50's that "the relatively small number of studies which have been made of assembly-line and other types of repetitive work have been mostly laboratory experiments, not explorations of experience in actual industrial plants." (My underlining)

Broadly, Walker and Guest identified many of the 'classical symptoms' usually associated with certain production jobs, repetition, lack of autonomy and variety, a minimum use of skill and minimal integration and work group relations on the job. However, they extended their analysis by interpretation to which they were not fully entitled but which is again an unfortunate earmark of much research work. Their interpretations were led by the determinism which the technology appeared to dictate and by the apparent job dissatisfaction which meant a priori that needs were not being met in the work situation.

The assumptions of needs and the necessity for job satisfaction pre-empted the interpretations of Walker and Guest and led to the criticisms which have been directed at the personality and organisation theorists. That is essentially that they cannot see the complexities which exist between the individual's attitudes and state of mind and his commitment and involvement to work. When these attitudes and mind states are expressed as being problematic then the issues of relationships between individuals and organisations and understanding of organisational activity become both more interesting and more complex and would seem assuming, logical.

rational social scientific methods to be more appropriate. Fox, in his section on 'Orientation to Work' appears to basically agree with this approach: "given this picture of culturally-moulded orientations and varying levels of aspiration, with a process of self-selection operating in widely differing degrees according to time, place and circumstance, we now need to examine the nature of the interaction which occurs when they are brought to bear upon the social organisation of the industrial enterprise."  

The importance of the technical determinists, however, even if they over-redressed the human relations balance, is in their identification in more concrete terms of the relationship between situation or structure and process or interaction. Whilst it is in the essence of this research to regard the above relationship as problematic and not akin to universal generalities, nevertheless the development of concepts and understanding of variables continues to move through an invaluable process of thesis and antithesis. Subsequent to Walker and Guest's studies, came the much respected contribution of Blauner, who again invoked a determinism emanating from his Marxist orientation. The distinction from Marx however, was that whereas Marx referred to the structural system of capitalism with ownership and control as determinants of dissatisfaction and alienation, to Blauner and others the sources of dissatisfaction could be found as much in the nature of industrialised mass society itself. Blauner stated that "the breadth of the alienation concept is due to the fact that it reflects the social conditions and consequences of the transition to an industrial society."  

Blauner also added an informative footnote to this statement: "Note the similarity between this statement of alienation theory and the standard sociological analyses of modern industrial society (from Toennies to Parsons) which stress the predominance of instrumental over expressive orientations, of means over ends, of technology and organisations over family and community."  

45. R. Blauner: Alienation and Freedom. Chicago 1964 P.33  
46. Ibid
Whilst again there are insights developed into the normative commitment of an individual as affected by technological and structural circumstances, Blauner gives little attention to the problem of distribution of power and control in his studies. Blauner also faces the dilemma of interpretation of facts and imposition of meaning which to the actors may be unwarranted. However, such questions are now contemporary problems and thus the structural and technological determinists virtually bring up to date much of current organisational theory.

Substantial work in this field has come from the focus on the interaction between systems based on the socio-technical model. This method, common to both sides of the Atlantic, adopts a 'task analysis approach.' This means identifying technical and administrative operational systems first and then explaining variations and the nature of behaviour as a function of these systems. Woodward and her colleagues examined a range of variables including elements such as the role of supervision and the impact of the pay structure. They also examined the social background and expectations of the workers whom they studied. Woodward confessed, however, to only really being concerned with what was referred to as 'constrained behaviour.'

This is 'behaviour which has to be engaged in because of a person's obligations of employment and because of the administrative and technological constraints to which he is subject in his job.' The research activity led to a typology of industrial organisations, distinguishing between unit and small batch production, large batch and mass production, and process production. The conclusions which were reached suggested that the behaviour (constrained) of workers in specified technological environments was limited in choice by technological factors: "most of the variations of attitudes and behaviour within the different works can be attributed to technological factors."

47. Note: In America similar exponents have included Bell, the above-mentioned Lawrence and Lorsch, Perrow - now focusing on Organisational Development-and Udy.
A particularly useful and relevant part of Woodward's research concerned the overall categorisation and analysis of control systems. Whilst not attempting to be exhaustive, especially concerning control informally achieved for example by power distribution, it nevertheless focuses upon organisational categories of control systems. These control systems, emanating out of certain technological constraints were seen as the mediating influence upon behaviour and were identified as follows:

1. Firms with unitary and personal controls.
2. Firms with fragmented and mainly personal controls.
3. Firms with fragmented and mainly administrative or mechanical controls.
4. Firms with unitary and mainly impersonal administrative or mechanical controls.

This method of categorisation was conveyed across two dimensions, although Woodward admitted to much complexity in the dimensions.

UNITARY

PERSONAL ——— MECHANICAL

FRAGMENTED

The conceptual addition of these 'control systems' added to the complexity of organisational activity and can be appraised both on the basis of how the researchers were unable to fully utilise the potential of the concepts, and on the inherent weakness in the concepts themselves. Thus, the under-rated concern for what Woodward described as 'other' or 'non-task' behaviour was limiting on some of the conclusions. Indeed the fundamental issues of 'human determinism' or intentionality

have been largely neglected. This criticism was developed especially by Child in his concept of the "role of strategic choice," which conceptualized the idea of a decision-making process being made by the executive of the organisation determining what they perceived to be the best technological fit for their type of production.

Other researchers in this field are, notably, Trist and Bamforth, of the so-called Tavistock School. Initially studying coal-mining in Durham, they found interesting variations in group behaviour consequent upon the organisation of work. Again, the focus here is on a theme now much discussed and referred to, namely the 'emergent informal organisation structure.' Certainly Trist and Bamforth, like Miller and Rice have developed their models very much on the basis of organisations being 'living organisms' with systems and subsystems impinging upon each other. As mentioned above the limitations imposed by this approach are to be found very much in the criticism of system theory. As with the Tavistock School, who developed further insights into the encapsulated work-environment, so Burns and Stalker made significant contributions to the system concepts with which this research is concerned (and which, with reference to Burns and Stalker are further developed in the next section). The Burns and Stalker perspective is essentially an open system approach and by implication the systems they are referring to operate as a function of situational circumstances and system effectiveness is a function of the situational fit. The multi-system activity of organisations is characterised by multi-direction causality; that is that the open systems have factors affecting them which are derived from many diverse sources. The systems-theorist, von Bertalanffy, conceptualized the basic idea behind this approach with the term equifinality: "In terms of the consideration of the relationship between


technology, size and structure, equifinality means that an organisation can be moved to a particular system state, from a previous system state, no matter whether technology, size or structure is changed first.\textsuperscript{53}

The value of this type of system perspective is that it can accommodate forces or influences upon behaviour and upon structural change from a range of alternative directions. This would, therefore, seem to overcome some of the confusion created by those researchers who have concluded that it is not technology which determines structure and behaviour, but rather other significant factors such as dimensions of size. Indeed a criticism made of the socio-technical concept has been its over-emphasis on technological impact. Brown has thus fairly simply noted that, "social organisation can no longer be regarded as straightforwardly determined by any one or two factors."\textsuperscript{54} (See note.)

More recent studies have contributed to the 'causal factor' debate, although little more clarity has been achieved beyond Hickson's remarks: "structural variables will be associated with operations technology only where they are centred on the workflow. The smaller the organisation the more its structure will be pervaded by such technological effects; the larger the organisation, the more these effects will be confined to variables such as job-counts of employees on activities linked with the workflow itself, and will not be detectable in variables of the more remote administrative and hierarchical structure."\textsuperscript{55}

The socio-technical approach has no clear orthodoxy, rather as may be seen from the above, different emphases have developed and different variable relationships have resulted. Criticism

\textsuperscript{53} J. Child and R. Mansfield; 'Technology, Size and Organisational structure' - Sociology - Sept. 1972,
\textsuperscript{54} R.K. Brown et al; 'The Sociology of Industry' Penguin 1954 P.113
\textsuperscript{55} D. Hickson et al; 'Operations Technology and Organisational Structure' ASQ 1969. P.394-5

\textbf{NOTE:} - Whilst there is substantial evidence to illustrate a relationship between technology and organisational structure (Woodward 1958, 1965 - Udy 1959 - Zverman 1970) there have been countervailing studies, (Mohr 1971)
has fallen into various categories concerned particularly with the problems of a system approach, with the attempts at categorization and quantification of differing variables, and finally with the minimal role usually given to the meanings, perceptions and intentions of actors in organisations. Again in varying degrees, some organisational theorists have tried to overcome these criticisms and probably the developments of Burns and Stalker are the most notable exceptions. Burns and Stalker recognised the importance of objective demands of the environment and the significance of goal attainment. Thus their dynamic political and status systems are orientated to individual attainment of objectives, whilst organisational form is an interpretive response to definitions of the situation made by the intentions of top management to give scope to their capacity to lead.

Thus whilst a series of further advancements have been achieved by the socio-technical theorists there lacks a definitive analytical approach to organisational form and behaviour. Also, as noted earlier, there is a danger with some theorists projecting accentuated values onto their conclusions and as Silverman has said the socio-technical approach "requires a more conscious distinction between those factors which determine organisational form and those which can be used to judge its efficiency." The more quantifiable, scientifically rigorous techniques, of the technicists, still pervade current organisational theory to the point where the divisions between organisational structure and organisational behaviour are seen to be naturally analytically distinct. The trends and counter trends which have outlined in this section have identified the swaying emphasis between observable concrete phenomena which can be categorised and mathematically correlated, and the more vague descriptive and qualitative methods which have nevertheless provided insights and valid concepts.

Social Action Frameworks

The major means by which understanding of system interaction has been most effectively achieved is by way of a somewhat nebulous school of social action theorists. Contributions made by this school have focused primarily on three major areas. The first of these concerns the organisation of and the nature of the role system and those who occupy such roles. Secondly, the nature, development and understanding of the means and methods of behavioural operational attainment and the ends or goals which are being pursued. Finally the nature and form of interaction amongst the participants in organisations. Inevitably these three areas of concern are closely interrelated and different studies have merely drawn attention more strongly to one or another.

As with previous trends and schools, the writers in this contemporary field are numerous and cannot be fully covered in this work. However, the social action approach has been the basic methodology behind this research, and it is therefore logical, having examined the background development, to appraise the most pertinent contributions.

A useful starting point to this discussion is provided by Etzioni who was concerned amongst other things with examining the problem of social order and control and the means for ongoing survival in organisational activity. Etzioni's method of analysis was by means of a typology of organisations focused around the core concept of compliance. Recognising that the organisation had to achieve certain objectives and these were dependent on certain behaviours, the typology consisted of the various means of influencing behaviour. These means of influence, Etzioni suggested, may be through varying types of power, described as - coercive, remunerative or utilitarian, and normative. These three types of power rest on three means which are respectively, physical (coercive), material (remunerative,) and symbolic (normative). Thus, for example, coercive power depends on the application threatened or otherwise of physical controls to achieve compliance. Different organisations may possess varying degrees, uses and balances of the three types. The variations depend upon
many factors, but especially upon the objectives, or goals, existing within the organisation. Associated with Etzioni's power types is a dimension of involvement. This dimension ranges between low and high feelings toward the organisation, with three major types: alienative, calculative and moral. These power and involvement types provide a matrix with nine types of compliance relationship in organisations. The most common forms of compliance, Etzioni's suggested, are coercive/alienative; remunerative/calculative and normative/moral.

Etzioni's schema was designed especially for comparative analysis, although some conclusions using the method may have been as generalised as the typology itself: "A central finding of the comparative analysis of organisations is that organisations which differ in the kinds of control they use, and in the alienation or commitment they elicit, also differ in the organisational structure in many significant respects." A difficulty with such an approach is the presumption of an inherent form of logic that what is happening in organisations is designed to relate the means systems with certain a priori goals representing the ends systems. Such intentionality might in itself be regarded as problematic and worthy of examination.

The usefulness of Etzioni's typology may well be in its ability to differentiate the basic forms of organisation and thus lead into a second stage of analysis. For example, if the second stage analysis needed to focus on either the degree of integration and harmony or alternatively needed to focus on conflict and division, the typology may well give the appropriate guide to such a second stage of enquiry.


*NOTE: Indeed, if there is something of a theme in the literature and research concerning social action approaches in organisations then it is that there has often been an emphasis either toward a value-integration approach or a conflict-stricken orientation. Again there are implicit connotations and parallels in these emphases such as we have seen throughout this appraisal of literature of the formal representing rationality, and the informal representing non-rational affectivity. Various authors have sought to work through the problems inherent in these different strands of social action approaches, thus moving toward what Mouzelis describes as a "broader approach". 58

In his study, "A Sociology of Work in Industry," Fox provides a thorough-going and at times, controversial analysis of many of the social action approaches. Fox develops a framework based upon a complex normative system seeking conformity from individuals in the organisation. This normative system, says Fox, achieves the regularity and standardization of behaviour which allows for the continuation of organisations and the achievement of goals. "The social organisation therefore consists of patterned uniformities of behaviour which persist for varying lengths of time." The normative framework employed in Fox's theory encompasses the constraints which operate upon behaviour at all levels of the organisation. These norms include "explicitly enunciated rules formally promulgated by those in superordinate positions... explicitly enunciated rules formulated, and articulated by subordinate groups... informal understandings generated within superordinate and subordinate groups... (and)... finally, organisational norms include formal rules and informal understandings that are concerted and jointly sponsored by superordinate and subordinate groups." The significance of such an all-embracing understanding of norms might be profound, however, Fox suggests that the extent of the effect of these norms on behaviour "is of course a matter for empirical inquiry."

The aspect of interest to this research is that Fox has removed the distinction of formal structure and informal structure as two systems. This problem will be considered in depth later in this text, however it is worth noting at this point the comment by Fox that "there is only one organisation - people cannot behave in two different ways at once." The argument continues that because people are behaving in accordance with the normative structure, that such a structure can only exist within a 'single social organisation.' This is indeed a different approach because it removes the ambiguity of a poorly defined dichotomy which is what the formal and informal concepts.

61. Ibid.
have traditionally represented. However, it does not really clarify the nature of behaviour other than to suggest that it is a 'patterned uniformity'. This would appear to be an oversimplification of organisational behaviour implying a mechanical response to a normative structure. A further difficulty with Fox's approach would be that referred to earlier by Silverman et al. that such norms appear to be a part of a preconstituted world. It is insufficient to argue that this complexity of norms exists without explaining both the means of their coming into existence and also the method of their transference to incumbents of roles within the organisation.

Fox's theoretical framework makes a further important point when he suggests that the formal or rational structure of top management in organisations is merely the notional basis upon which to build. The subordinates' behaviour in an organisation may, as Fox says, be structured by norms other than top management's. "In such situations it is their (subordinates) adaptations which constitute the relevant aspects of the social organisation, not some mistaken impression, wish or aspiration which may exist in the minds of top management or within the pages of an organisational manual." 63 This argument is consistent with a pluralistic system with a number of interest groups each expressing its own norms. 64 Again, however, these norms are neither preconstituted nor static but part of an adaptive, and indeed problematic process. It is this process where by groups and individuals are identifying, relating to and changing the perceived norms, particularly with regard to the achievement of goals, that has been a strategic part of this research.

Fox's analysis and theoretical contribution will be referred to again later. The identification of a pattern of behaviour within any particular organisation through the framework suggested by Fox is not inconsistent however with the social action framework of Talcott Parsons. Mouzelis suggested that Parsons has made a significant contribution to this

63. Ibid.
64. See Research Paper 3 - by Alan Fox - Royal Commission on Trade Unions and Employer's Associations 'Industrial Relations' H.M.S.O. 1966 P.4
discussion, despite Parsons' lack of familiarity with the literature on organisations - "... although he manifestly is not well acquainted with all organisation literature his systematic conceptualisation of the entire organisation as a social system constitutes the most elaborate attempt to provide a really sociological framework for organisation analysis."

In Parsons' systems theory the organisation like "all concrete systems of action" possesses "at the same time... a system of culture... a set of personalities (or sectors of them) and a social system or subsystem." Within the organisation there are, according to Parsons, four major functional problems. Two of these have already been mentioned in Fox's framework and 'adaptations' and 'goal achievements'. These problems refer to the normative regulation of activities within the organisation and the mobilisation of resources, particularly of organisational power in order to achieve goals. The other functional problems are those of 'latency' and 'integration'. Latency refers to the condition of the parts of the sub-systems and their relationships with the larger system. Integration is the problem of relationship between the sub-systems. A further important dimension to Parsons' theory is the pattern variables which are the pattern of choices available both to individual personalities and to social systems as a whole. For Parsons the pattern variable "proved to form indeed, a peculiarly strategic focus of the whole theory of action."

The accent upon integrated systemic organisation has been particularly criticised because of its reliance upon a harmonious value system. This is the means for organisational goal achievement and for what Fox described as a "patterned uniformity of behaviour." However, unlike Fox, it denies the significance of pluralities in organisations and thus of interest groups which can determine not only the

66. T. Parsons and E. Shils - Toward a General Theory of Action, Harper 1965 P.49 (Note: for a fuller appreciation of Parsons' theoretical contribution, a sufficient summary is found in the introduction to the above-mentioned work).
distribution of power within the organisation, but also the nature of the goals to which action is directed. The varying nature of these value systems are problematic as observable determinants of behaviour and such theory has been superficially criticised for its inadequacy in explaining change and conflict. The comment that "the Parsonian view of organisations is not false but very partial" would seem appropriate, but Parsons' theory needs to be complemented, perhaps by theories with different value systems. The ability to account for different levels of analysis in Parsons' theory: those of the individual, the group and the organisation, is of value and has been well utilized by Fox. The achievement of providing a broad theory to encompass organisational behaviour has been significant and gives a basis on which to move forward.

Such approaches as Parsons', have illustrated the need for more detailed studies and especially for employing the advantages of broader sociological theory. These theories, however, still tend to emphasize cooperation and harmony and to create a somewhat mechanical structure in which social action is the response to norms and values.

The most notable problem created with the systems theories is however, its apparent exclusiveness. The dilemma which has faced organisational analysis has been the ability to


69. Note: It is interesting that the limitations which Silverman lays at the door of the functionalists organic model are almost the same as the 'functional problems' Parsons identifies with regard to organisational systems in general.
effectively understand structure and process relationships. Meantime, there appears an abiding need, not necessarily for convergence, but for a more integrated approach to synthesise the hitherto dichotomous theories of social systems and social actions. As Dawe has suggested, such integration is not possible as long as "one (system-sociology) views action as the derivative of system, whilst the other (sociology of action) views system as derivative of action." This debate has been echoed for some time by Silverman who has argued consistently for a social action analysis of organisations. Particularly concerned with the tendency of the systems approach to treat 'end and means' as given, Silverman suggested the need to draw attention toward asking 'why' questions and towards causes rather than, as with the functionalists, asking questions about the consequences. Silverman allies himself with Renate Mayntz in this respect, the latter of whom attacks such system thinking that reifies behavioural concepts to the status of inanimate objects: "This way of thinking substitutes a vague - one is tempted to say: metaphysical - explanatory assumption for the concrete questions why an organisation is as it is, and why it functions as it does."

Silverman raises the issue of whether the systems and action approaches are in conflict or complementary to each other, quoting various sources of contemporary sociological thinking.

71. See also P. Worsley - 'Sociology' Jan. 1974
Note: The argument projected here by Dawe was taken up by Worsley (in his Presidential Address to the British Sociological Association April 1973) when he said he was sceptical of "a Levi Strauss or a Chomsky (who) never shrink from the painful task of trying to build the entirety of human culture into their theoretical systems." Worsley also denigrated the 'denuded sociology of action,' the vocabulary of which he said, "contains only the situation, the actor and a bundle of 'ideal' orientations."
72. D. Silverman: 'Formal Organisations or Industrial Sociology' Sociology May 1968
73. R. Mayntz: 'The Study of Organisations.' Current Sociology 1964 P.114
some of which have since suggested that convergence may create grave strains in the development of the discipline. It is certainly possible, as has already been suggested that the value systems of different theories do not deny the usefulness of such theories, but merely influences their use in certain contexts. For Silverman's own part he has projected the argument that "the action frame of reference can be a useful source of propositions in organisational analysis." This same frame of reference has been broadly adopted in this research and has tended to focus quite substantially on various dimensions of roles in organisations, and especially upon the role incumbents.

In conclusion of this section it is now apparent that the part played by the formal and informal concepts has been significant in what has been seen as the dialectic of organisational theory. It is the intention of this research to avoid overthrowing these concepts, and this avoidance is dictated it seems, by the fact that much organisational theory has included the formal and informal idea but that what has been lacking is an effective appraisal of the concepts. Whilst therefore it is possible to substitute new labels, the basic idea remains of different types and forms of behaviour and greater purpose might be served by reviving the concepts with substantial clarification of their meaning.

The social action frame of reference is best suited to this conceptual revival on the basis of its concern for interaction of structure and process. As a frame of reference in this field of study it is becoming well established, particularly by those seeking an understanding of social reality as a reflection of man's consciousness in relation to his social being. An example of this type of enquiry is by Strauss et al.

74. Notably A. Gouldner: 'The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology' - Routledge Kegan Paul 1971
in 'The hospital and its negotiated order.' This study is particularly relevant to this discussion because of its frame of reference and its interest in 'social being' in a restricted context - the psychiatric hospital. Strauss repeats a dictum of the present research "students of formal organisation tend to underplay the processes of internal change as well as overestimate the more stable features of organisations - including its rules and its hierarchical statuses." In their studies Strauss et al differentiated between a negotiated order, which entails "...the processes of give and take, of diplomacy, of bargaining - which characterises organisational life" and an organisational order. The conclusion drawn from this study was that it was apparent in a conventionally termed 'formal' organisation that "the area of action covered by clearly enunciated rules is really very small."

The simple conclusion from this is that organisations are relatively meaningless without these types of social action model because the fundamental order within organisations is socially determined and becomes typified in processes of formation, especially in the form of roles. "Roles appear as soon as a common stock of knowledge containing reciprocal typifications of conduct is in process of formation, a process that, as we have seen, is endemic to social interaction and prior to institutionalization proper." It is essentially this process whether defined as a negotiated order, an informal system or a typification of conduct that is the focus of this research.

77. Op. Cit. P.147
PART I

SECTION II

CONCEPTUAL PROBLEMS AND THE DEFINITIONS OF CONCEPTS

An often used hallmark of the behavioural sciences has been the research methods of dichotomous or polar-type concepts. A concept expressing a notion or labelling an action invariably has an opposite in the vocabulary. Possibly this approach of polar-type concepts has been given respectability by the classical use of ideal types, the best known of which are in this very field of organisation theory. It is equally well established, however, that these polar 'types' are valid at the extremes and useful heuristically but serve little purpose in determining where subject matter stands when it is identified more centrally between two concepts. For example, can something be neither particularistic nor universalistic, or must it be one or the other?

A device proposed in this research to overcome polar type concepts and the problem of clarifying the 'middle ground' is that of 'complementary concepts'. The purpose of this method is to suggest that hitherto dichotomized concepts are interrelated and may even have a processual relationship. In this sense 'complementary concepts' are not the opposite poles to a particular subject nor are they elements in the static continuum. They express a fluid idea whereby the subject may indicate elements of both concepts or may be in the process of moving from one to the other. Thus there may be a point, for example, where action previously identified as power is becoming part of an authority relationship. The influences affecting such a process are likely to vary considerably according to the factors in the situation so that an arbitrary dividing line is not desirable. Again, for example, if authority were something requiring legitimation (this will shortly be discussed) and in an authority relationship there was only partial consensus as to the legitimation, then the control imposed presumably contains elements of both authority and power. The means of domination in such circumstances is subject to a social process which the concepts need to accommodate.
The complementary concept device, therefore, seeks to accommodate changing situations and the possibility of situations or subject matter containing elements of both concepts. The most important aspect of the concepts then becomes that of the process which subject matter is undergoing. The notion of process would seem crucial if attempts are to be made to accommodate varying perceptions and interpretations of the meaning of subject matter. It is, then, the nature of these processes which could yield substantial information about organisational behaviour.

The full understanding therefore, of a situation may demand an analysis of what does and, by comparison, what does not exist. An analysis of authority in one set of circumstances may be relatively meaningless without knowing whether it is comparable with similar situations. There are, for example, occupational and industrial norms about authority prescription which are carried from organisation to organisation without having any base in the organisation itself. Thus a full appreciation of phenomena may only be possible by examining its existence in the organisation and comparative non-existence in other organisations or even in other parts of the same organisation, and vice versa. As with the ideal type, there is something against which to compare, the difference being that with the complementary concept idea, there is a dual comparison which is possible.

The device of complementary concepts means that the concepts concerned must be defined in relation to each other and also express the notion of process in their definitions. The concepts are thus not merely labelling devices, but are also identifying phenomena susceptible to change and variation. Criticism of the traditional usage of concepts may indeed be that they have been static, labelling devices. The ensuing commentary discussing this and other problems of definition will not provide a conclusive answer. However, it is hoped to establish the notion of process as an integral part of 'complementary concepts.' Further discussion of the empirical research material should clarify what is meant by this approach.
The first 'complementary concepts' requiring discussion are the
corcepts providing the raison d'être for this research. The
meanings commonly ascribed to the formal and the informal
have little variation. The rational, mechanistic theme of
Weber almost inevitably permeates through the definitions of
'formal'. Blau and Schoenherr, for example, define formal
as those aspects of organisations which are determined by
"explicit design" and "deliberately established by men to
accomplish certain ends."¹ In an earlier definition Blau and
Scott also said that formal organisations possess "a formal
status structure with clearly marked lines of communication and
authority."² These definitions affirm the idea of a rational
and conscious structuring of situations to meet specific
goals which have in some form been made explicit. Firth, in
his study of organisations and their value systems, has defined
formal as represented in an organisation structure that
"implies a systematic ordering of positions and duties which
defines a chain of command."³ Continuing the identification
of clear and overt, written prescriptions as part of the
definition, March and Simon refer to 'explicit stable roles
which make for a high degree of predictability and
co-ordination in organisational behaviour.'⁴ A further
definition of formal is provided by Pugh as the "extent to
which roles, procedures, instructions and communications are
written."⁵ In broad terms there is a fair degree of unanimity

¹Note: Silverman has defined Weber's ideal typical features
of bureaucracies as "a clearly defined hierarchy
where office holders have very specific functions and
apply universalistic rules in a spirit of formalistic
impersonality" in D. Silverman; The Theory of
Organisations. H.E.B. 1971 P.11
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in these definitions. Indeed one organisational theorist has been not a little surprised at the unanimity - "the similarities between these definitions point up the general consensus about the meaning of formalisation. Even when quite different measures of this variable are used in research the same meaning is utilised; an all too rare occurrence in organisational analysis." 6

There are, however, a variety of problems relating to these definitions. Who makes rules explicit, who determines what are "the organisation's goals" and having made explicit rules and decided upon organisational goals, should this be possible, how do these rules and goals relate to individuals and groups at different levels of the organisation? Also, when phrases such as "explicit stable roles" or the "extent to which roles (etc.) . . . . are written", are used, the problem remains as to how explicit and how do you determine the extent which satisfies 'formal' requirements? These are important questions which have not been considered in the context of the simple formal and informal dichotomy. As has already been suggested, one of the reasons it has been considered that these "concepts are not adequate to deal with the complexities of organisational behaviour and structure" 7 could be that they have not been defined in parallel. Most of the aforementioned writers have left implicit the notion that the informal is that which does not meet the defined formal requirements! Silverman has been one of the few to make this explicit when he says of the informal that it is "where social life is carried on without a framework of explicit goals or rules which define a formal status structure . . . ." 8 The important division which is thus drawn between these concepts is that the formal definitions are referring to structure and the informal definitions are referring to (social) process. By implication of these definitions, and by their explicit use, these authors have collectively conveyed the impression that the structure of

organisations and the social processes which are occurring within those organisations can be understood as separate conceptual entities.

Faced with this dilemma there are two possible alternatives. One is to reject the formal and informal dichotomy, the second is to define the concepts such that they more meaningfully reflect observations about organisational behaviour and structure. Mouzelis' reaction to this is that: "A more elaborate framework is needed which could not only account for all these various aspects of the organisation now covered under the simple formal-informal formula, but which could also link systematically the one with the other and with the organisation as a whole."9

The former approach of rejection has been adopted by Burns who has grounded his attempt at clarification of organisational theory in significant field research. This is, therefore, a relevant stage at which to examine Burns' schema in more detail. Burns considers there is more than a single system of interaction within organisations, and that the traditional, bureaucratic models which treat unanticipated consequences as residual and random, are over-simplified. However, Burns continues, the dualism created by the formal and informal dichotomy have reached exhaustion, particularly the latter as an analytical device.10 In an early work by Burns and Stalker, this criticism was succinctly portrayed. "The Manichean world of the Hawthorn studies (the chapter of Management and the Worker dealing with these matters is headed 'Formal versus Informal Organisation') has been left behind but it has been succeeded by a crudely, Freudian dualism, with formal organisation in the role of consciousness and the concealed or repressed informal organisation up to all kinds of mischief."11

* Note: Again this approach has been suggested, and referred to earlier, by Blau and Schoenherr (see preface to their work - 1971) and the phenomenologists or socio psychologists (especially personal construct theorists) the latter of whom are only interested in intrapersonal aspects of the situation: (see P. Worsley's comments in his Presidential Address - Sociology January 1974.

Burns' studies led to the development of his description of two 'ideal types' of management organisation at opposite ends of a continuum. These types were the organic system of organisation, equipped to be flexible and adjustable according to changing circumstances. Within communication channels, high commitment to organisational aims and an absence of precise operational functioning are characteristics of this system. At the other end of the spectrum lies the mechanistic system, characterised by specialisms, precise definitions of tasks and functions and with clear hierarchical communication and control. Burns' schema was concerned with the response of these systems of operation to changing circumstances and found the mechanistic system more liable to have strains and contradictions as a consequence of trying to cope with change and innovation. These strains are especially due to the attempt to retain a formal bureaucratic operation, whilst accommodating emerging and influential pathological systems. Burns describes three typical behavioural reactions. The first of these is the tendency, as problems arise, to seek the advice of specialists, experts and long-experienced individuals. As a consequence of many senior managers being excluded from this advisory and decision-making activity, there is a tendency for decision making to be focused excessively at the head of the concern. There develop "more or less clandestine systems of pair relationships between the head of the concern and some dozens of persons at different positions."

The second response is to enlarge the bureaucratic machinery, leading to a system described by Burns as the 'mechanistic jungle.' Thirdly, there is the displacement method, of creating a third party, a super-personal or committee system which acts as a receptacle for all the problems of the organisation.

Burns' schema also devised three social systems which are working simultaneously in organisations. These social systems are interrelated and are identified as analytical tools and are therefore problematic in substance and in the

effect they are having. The formal authority system, characterised by the technology, the 'working organisation' and the prescriptive organisation, is the first of these systems. Within the formal authority system, activities will be conducted on a specified and methodically ordered basis, such as the process of decision-making. The formal authority structure being characterised by a hierarchical order, there is secondly a career structure. There being differential career prospects for different organisational employees, there are efforts made by individuals to enhance personal opportunities for achieving promotion. Competition for advancement may thus imply seeking compatriots in similar situations within the organisation and the subsequent evolution of a pattern of activity designed to benefit the individuals concerned.

Thirdly, Burns identified a political system which was organised around the competition for and distribution of power. This system of relationships gave rise to various political 'activities' in which processes of pairing, empire building, acquisition of resources and support would be very much part of the methods used for achieving greater influence and control.

Burns emphasised that these systems are not subordinate to a larger system in his schema but are rather "best treated as separate and distinct". Indeed they are not the only social systems identifiable in organisations; there may be a variety of systems each providing particular means and circumstances to achieve particular objectives. As with Fox, Burns has denied the existence of a unitary system within an organisation which can be simply equated to the formal structure. The formal structure in itself merely provides a skeletal form as it were, and gives little indication about the activity surrounding such a form. Thus, any change in the formal structure will reverberate in some method upon the career structure and the political system although the impact of change, for example from a mechanistic to a more organic system, will depend on the nature of the social systems themselves. It is not

difficult to perceive however, that the opportunities for individuals to influence, and the acceptability of personal development of occupied roles, would be significantly enhanced in the more organic type of organisation. Thus any shift, for example in technological innovation, could have far-reaching social implications. Burns was, therefore, concerned to view organisations as inherently dependent upon the continuous processes of the three systems of formal organisation, career structure and political structure.

Burns' approach is a deliberate attempt at clarification without over-simplification, however he stresses the need to ascribe "objects for classification" to "analytical concepts and frames of reference" which is in itself a mechanical and descriptive method. Whilst the heuristic devices of Burns are useful descriptively, they do not enable analysis of the interrelationship between action and situational factors. Accordingly, the impression is created of a series of uninterrelated systems and analytically distinct categories. Again, therefore, it is difficult to perceive the relationship between the structure of an organisation and the social process occurring within that organisation.

A second alternative (to the dilemma mentioned earlier), that of Hage and Aiken, shows a concern which is again almost exclusively with the formal structure. The significance of Hage and Aiken's approach, however, is that they have encompassed a 'behavioural element in the formal definition'. Hage and Aiken refer to 'formalisation as representing the use of rules in an organisation'. The important aspect of this definition is that formality is identified not in its written, explicit form but in its actual 'usage'. Hage and Aiken were concerned with the degree of formalisation in job descriptions and rule definition and related this to 'job codification' but also relating these elements to the way in which they were employed in 'rule observation'.

14. T. Burns: "List of Analytic Categories" includes (i) Relationships between the Organisation and its Environment; (ii) Definitions of Task and Division of Labour; (iii) Communication System; (iv) Authority Structure.

"Job codification is a measure of how many rules define what the occupants of positions are to do, while rules observation is a measure of whether or not the rules are employed." 16

Hage and Aiken, however, were attempting to determine whether an organisation was more or less highly formalised and used a methodological device to obtain recipient scores of perceived formality and took a median score of the composite figure. This might be seen as a methodological device for operationalizing an Etzioni type schema. As with Etzioni's organisational types, however, such categorization, as in Hage and Aiken's case of the degree of formality, is relatively meaningless in abstraction from other elements of organisational activity. Further, for what it may be worth, as Hall says, "the official system sets the parameters... As a general rule, organisations that are more formalised on paper are more formalised in practice." 17 Effectively, therefore, categorization and quantification of the degree of formality is a device for comparing broad structural differences or similarities between organisations. It uses a limited definition of 'formality' and leaves unanswered the questions about its operationality and the relationship between the degree of formality and the nature and type of behaviour except in the broadest terms as suggested in the quotation above by Hall.

The consequences of such partial analysis would thus seem to serve as a reminder of organisational analysis several methodological paces removed, at a stage when, for example, the psychologists referred to the behavioural consequences, of unvalidated individual needs and drives. Thus from the extreme analysis, where certain behaviours were a function of inherent individual characteristics there again rears the somewhat deterministic implication of the formal organisation.

17. R. Hall; Op. Cit. P.176
theorists. Whilst Hage and Aiken have introduced the aspect of perceived formalities, which indeed has been used in this research, there would seem to be no examination of the basis of perception.

This is an important point on which to reflect and attempt to draw together some of the preceding discussion and to explain subsequent issues in the argument. Whilst perceptual processes are significant in that we know that individuals have different interpretations of the same phenomena and that perceived meaning may expose 'facts' in different dimensions, there is also significance in the reasoning behind varied perceptions. Thus whilst an analysis of so-called official documents and manuals is important as are studies of the number of levels of hierarchies or the type of workflow, such analyses ignore the people who make such 'facts' part of the social environment. Conversely, a study of human relations phenomena would ignore the 'facts' which obviously influence the social environment. It is not sufficient, methodologically, to ignore one set of phenomena and to develop assumptions on such a basis. Nor is it believed methodologically adequate to attempt a superficial melding of these two aspects of the situation. Perception of what officially exists as 'formal' may, therefore, be a function of a complex set of interrelations between these different phenomena. We will see in the major section on empirical studies in this research how major formal features of an organisation such as budgeting, did not exist for some people because they were not involved in budgeting. Knowledge of formal procedures and methods, or rules and of prescription, is in itself a form of power as well as of security. An individual, in a high hierarchical position in an authority structure may be relatively powerless without the knowledge of certain rules and procedures, or even with the knowledge possessed by other people who then proceed to wield such knowledge to personal or group advantage. Industrial action of the form of work-to-rules and job demarcation disputes emanate from such formalised rules and the use of these rules merely expresses their importance in manipulating a situation rather than utilisation toward any 'organisation goal'. Thus the very existence or non-existence of formality begs various questions about why such a situation should exist as well as
what function it serves. Individual perception may be explained by asking such questions as, not only what is perceived, but why it is perceived in a certain way. Additionally, it may be necessary to attempt some deduction of what has happened to formality and its relationship with behaviours on a historical or longitudinal basis on the assumption that individual perceptions might have historical influences. Also necessary might be an inductive analysis, examining for example, the reasons why some individuals remain ignorant of certain phenomena, not through accident but by deliberate exclusion. The example of budgeting is illustrative of this point. The control of expenditure and the determination of targets can be a major constraint on the range of options available to people in the way they may act. To exclude certain individuals from the process of budgeting might be an obvious way to retain powerful control and prevent dilution of personal influence. This type of explanation of an individual's perception of formal procedures might, therefore, only be arrived at through inductive analysis of behaviours rather than questioning various individuals' real intentions.

This line of reasoning is suggesting that the relationship between the objective facts of a situation and the social behaviours of that situation are processually interlinked and may be most effectively understood and analysed by the processual linking of the concepts conventionally used as separate labels. This inter-relatedness has no time-boundary and is dependent upon the actors' definitions, meanings and actions in what may complexly be described as a self evolving interactive situation. This methodological use of concepts is merely a different way of applying the enduring Weberian analysis: "...every artifact, such as for example a machine, can be understood only in terms of the meaning which its production and use have had or will have for human action; a meaning which its production and use have had or will have for human action; a meaning which may derive from a relation to exceedingly various purposes. Without reference to this meaning such an object remains wholly unintelligible. That
which is intelligible or understandable about it is thus its relation to human action in the role either of means or of end; a relation of which the actor or actors can be said to have been aware and to which their action has been oriented. Only in terms of such categories is it possible to 'understand' objects of this kind. On the other hand processes or conditions, whether they are animate or inanimate, human or non-human are in the present sense devoid of meaning insofar as they cannot be related to an intended purpose. That is to say they are devoid of meaning if they cannot be related to action in the role of means or ends but constitute only the stimulus, the favouring or hindering circumstances. The qualification made in this research which relates to this passage meets the comment of Parsons who made a footnote to the passage and expressed concern at Weber's "rationalistic bias." The method referred to above, of analytic induction as a means of overcoming some of the difficulties of whether actor intentionality relates means to ends, might assuage the critics of Weber's bias.

The major argument, however, revolves round the viewing of social structure in organisations as emanating from either Immanent or Transcendental sources. The Immanent refers to the relationships which individuals have identified as personally meaningful. Such meaning is seen to be directly related to other actors and to have a 'real' expression in the behaviour of the individual and those with whom he has contact. Thus processes develop from these behaviours coming from within actors and change is consequential upon the actors. The Transcendental refers to influences above and beyond the individual over which he has control of a problematic nature. The Transcendental thus has expressions in individual behaviour, but these expressions are essentially externally and impersonally determined. Related to this organisation it is possible to see expressions of immanence derived from an individual's personal response where behaviour is not prescribed. Alternatively,

where the organisation has imposed itself formally and response would be the same irrespective of different incumbent actors it is evident that the Transcendental is operating. In theory this is probably a useful contributory distinction, especially on the basis that both concepts are concerned with the same behaviours but are explained from differently derived sources. Practically however, it may prove difficult to effectively differentiate the concepts. Organisations, for example, usually have some form of specified hierarchy which is transferred chronologically irrespective of the actors, (that is using impersonal means for transferring the hierarchical order).

However, again as will shortly be illustrated, the hierarchy might be commonly understood and acknowledged but may provide little more than an operational parameter, a guideline or an authoritative expectation upon behaviour. The way individuals relate to this Transcendental phenomena may thus derive much from Immanent forces and the problem remains to determine the 'actual' source. It is evident however, that such concepts as these may well be additionally used to provide a greater understanding of the formal and informal distinction with which we are here preoccupied.

To further assist in the process of clearer understanding of the formal and informal concepts, this research has introduced an additional category which encompasses part of that which is usually described as the formal in its entirety. This is the 'objective' organisation, the part which is available for all or most organisational members to see and absorb according to their capacity to do so and the availability of the explanatory material. It refers to organisational documents and records, to written, explicit rules and procedures, to prescribed role function and organisation charts. The label ascribed to these characteristics which will subsequently be used is the 'extant organisation', or the standing organisation. Possessing apparently a transcendental form in that it is above individuals, the effect as already suggested, of the extent organisation, (or even its form), may be considered problematic in understanding organisational social structure.

The conceptual redefinition proposed in this text also includes behaviours, regularly identified and commonly indulged in by
actors within the organisation. Whereas again an Etzioni type categorisation might talk about a normative organisation in which behaviours occur regularly as a consequence not of rule prescription but of norms, the inclusion of a normative element in a definition of formal organisation would overcome the problem that even in a highly coercive organisation, norms may be a powerful source of influence. The significance of this part of the definition is made especially clear by the problems relating to a new organisational member or even the new incumbent of an organisational role who may have transferred from another part of the organisation.

In the initial phase of role occupancy the behaviour of individuals is partly prescribed and partly achieved by the new incumbent or entrant to a role, introducing his own expectations and initial interpretations. As this is the beginning of the process, it is part of the activity which requires analysis and requires also concepts which can cope with the initial entry stages and with behaviour in the ongoing organisation. An individual is immediately confronted, when joining an organisation, with the 'Manichean World' referred to above, albeit a world which will vary in importance and in the manner of confrontation to the individual. The choice of behaviours is restricted by the norms and values, firstly which exist in the organisation as held and projected by other individuals and secondly as perceived and interpreted by the new entrant, the latter of whom will anyway evaluate his choices on the basis of personally held values and expectations. However, unlike the Human Relations school, who took as given, that individuals have sets of needs, we cannot take a normative system within an organisation for granted. A normative system is problematic. If we take as a base definition of a norm Cohen's two major criteria, which are firstly common perceptions and secondly common behaviours with expectations there arise some important issues. For example,

what do we mean by 'common', and do the perceptions and
behaviours have to be exactly the same or similar; if an
individual denies the existence of a norm, how important is
it that such a norm does not exist in his world but does
exist in other people's? This also raises questions about the
value of norm adherence or rejection, and the costs to the
individual, other parties or the organisation, of an individual
not conforming. Further issues which are raised concern the
intentionality or the fortuitous nature of certain behaviours.
Thus an individual may conform in behavioural terms without
even being aware that a norm exists. To know of the existence
of a norm does not necessarily provide information about its
social context, its general or detailed acceptability by the
individuals concerned, and the presence of a norm does not
always explain its innovation in the first instance. There
is a processual history to a normative structure and in
organisational theory, there is very little commentary or
knowledge relating to such histories,

It is now possible to distinguish three major characteristics
in the redefinition of the formal. These characteristics are
firstly the 'extant' or standing organisation, secondly the
normative structure, and finally the behaviour in social action
terms including intentions, meanings and perceptions. These
characteristics have, except in the case of the extant
organisation, continuing significance in the hitherto informal
organisation. Implicitly, therefore, the latter concept may
be identified by the absence of prescribed 'organisational'
sources of behaviour as well as by the intended objectives
of individual actors or groups of actors which are seen to
fundamentally differ from those of the normative organisation.

This definition is intended to move away from the more static,
descriptive type of concept, towards a more evolutionary and
developmental understanding of what exists in organisations.
The major concern was to establish the social organisation more
concretely in the context of this understanding on the basis
that without using the social organisation as an inherent part of the analysis, then the problems which organisational theory has sought to apply itself to would otherwise remain. Further, this inclusion of the social organisation is very much in the organic sense of a processual concept which requires understanding of such problems not only of the context but also why and how it came to exist and what purpose it serves.

To complete the definition it is necessary to identify the complementary concepts in the informal organisation. There are two particular characteristics. The first is a major area of concern in organisational analysis, namely the power structure. This is, therefore, the complement to the authority structure as determined by the extant organisation and as affected by normative influences. The definition and conceptual problems of power will be discussed shortly. The second characteristic is typified by behaviours which have not become normalized. That is, behaviours which are not commonly expected nor commonly reflected in the everyday actions of organisational members. Such behaviours lack consensus and, for purposes of labelling, this research has described these forms of activity as 'dissensus behaviour'. These behaviours are only to be found outside the bounds of the extant organisation and may indeed be problematic to the extent that their goal direction may be consistent with the goal direction which the extant organisation is trying to achieve. Further, 'dissensus behaviour' may not be prescribed, it may represent original, creative or discretionary action. The distinction brought to bear in this analysis, therefore, is the social acceptability of such action. This may be indicated by the passive or active acceptance of such behaviour by various actors in the organisation. It is, therefore, essentially a 'social action' criteria which determines the categorisation of such behaviour.

Power and authority are undoubtedly fundamental concepts in this elaboration of the formal and informal and indeed for the understanding of organisational behaviour in general. It is necessary, therefore, to clarify the meanings of power and
authority and to comment upon the problems related to the use of these concepts.

Simon has indicated the problem related to the concept of authority when he said, "there is no consensus today in the management literature as to how the term 'authority' should be used." This lack of consensus is equally true within the behavioural sciences and may have two causes. The first is the problem of specifying the set of behaviours to which the term 'authority' should be applied. The second is the problem of specifying the circumstances under which such behaviour will be exhibited. It is with regard to these problems that the notion of complementary concepts and the processual relationships between concepts is useful.

Weber's classical definition is limited by its focus on formal transcendence - "authority, the power of control which derives from an acknowledged status, inheres in the office and not in the particular person who performs the official role." This definition is echoed by March and Simon when referring to a new incumbent who "in joining the organisation accepts an authority relation, i.e. he agrees within some limits (defined both explicitly and implicitly by the terms of his employment contract) he will accept as the premises of his behaviour, orders and instructions supplied to him by the organisation." These definitions are referring essentially to formal authority, that is authority based on hierarchical office and applied with legitimate right. Legitimacy, however, may be achieved other than through hierarchical office. Peabody, for example, distinguished two types of authority. The first has a basis in status and position, the second a basis in competence and personal skill. Peabody sees these forms as commonly interdependent: "formal authority flowing from legitimacy and organisational status

almost invariably must be supported by authority based on professional competence and human relations skill. Formal authority as traditionally understood is the same for different actors, but as this comment by Peabody suggests, it is a resource which is applied in varying ways according to other factors.

Thus, whilst formal authority may define a source or basis for use, its actual use or the 'real' form which authority takes is a function of factors external to what Weber would define as the 'office'. Formal authority may, therefore, give rise to a source of ambiguity, to a commodity or resource which will be utilised, developed, interpreted in such a way as to suggest that no 'office' possesses a fixed sum of authority and that even the limitations or explicit boundaries of formal authority may be extended or changed according to what happens and what is affected by, in particular, the incumbent of an 'office'. In this sense, therefore, hierarchical or position authority is only one source or form of control and it is evident that such control or influence may be amended, complemented, or as Peabody says, "supported", by various other forms. The concept of power however, refers to an influence or control which is not prescribed, but rather to an ability which is acquired to act in an influential manner. Power may thus be seen as the basis of control, and authority is another form of control which possesses an element of impersonal, official determination. Accordingly, the different forms and variations of authority are different expressions of the basis of power, which is itself the means of control. Therefore, expressions of power may be conceived in, for example, organisational hierarchies as formal authority or position power, or another example would be a coercive expression, as in the control of a group over individual members of the group. The essential point here is that the concept of power as a base and of authority as a form of that base suggests that control over actions is a variable function and the degree of control which any individual 'office' can exert...


* Note: T.T. Paterson refers to four forms of authority, these are moral; sapiential; structural and charismatic. See 'Glasgow Ltd.' Cambridge 1960.
is, therefore, not a fixed sum of control. This allows considerable flexibility in the use of the concepts because obviously the degree of control just referred to, can be affected by a wide range of factors, some of which it is intended to explore in the case studies of the current research.

Following from this argument, it is possible to use a broad definition of power, such as is provided, for example, by exchange theory with regard to dependency relationships. Exchange theory has suggested that the source of power is based in social exchange and that the nature of power is affected by the processes of social exchange. These processes are concerned with concepts such as the state of balance between those exchanging, the reciprocal nature of exchange (Gouldner), and the availability of resources being exchanged (Homans). There are subtle distinctions to be drawn such as “where Homans talks of the dependence of power on social exchange, Blau emphasises the derivation of power from social exchange processes”. These subtleties do not override the importance of social processes, but rather relate to the concepts referred to earlier. That is, they distinguish between relationships in which individuals perceive the power as an immanent phenomena (Homans) and where it is seen as more transcendental in force and merely conducted by the actors in social events (Blau, who derives his leaning from his explicit Durkheimian inclination). It is sufficient for this work, not to resolve these issues but to use the reliance upon social exchange as the definition of power. This might take the form of the socially recognised dependence of one actor or group of actors upon another actor or group of actors! This does not usurp the problems which are in dispute in exchange theory such as whether power is a zero-sum concept or whether there is unequal exchange and so forth. Indeed this research sees role relationships which express this social exchange to be an important and highly productive focus for the understanding of organisational behaviour and the power structure surrounding such behaviour. In these role relationships it is intended to treat as problematic the derivations

of the forms of both power and authority as well as questions such as those of legitimation and of the actors’ behaviour in either consenting, recognising or in experiencing coercion in the forms of control and dependency.

The framework so far, therefore, intends to use the concept of power as a resource whose bases are in social action and authority as a legitimated form existing within the formal social structure. This predisposes the categorisation of power for operational purposes in terms of two criteria. The first is the extant basis, indicating institutionalized authority in hierarchies which are explicit. This would obviously be a part of the formal social structure. The second criteria concerns the perception, by actors in the relevant role set, of the nature and extent of power which is or can be exerted. Dependent upon the degree of consensus of perceptions, both horizontally and vertically within the organisation, the power may be either legitimated or identified as non-institutionalized and coercive. If the latter is the case and perceptions of the role set deny a collective recognition of authority then such a basis of control may be categorized under the heading of the power structure.

There are two features requiring emphasis with which to conclude this discussion of power and authority. The first relates to the aspect that authority and power may be analytically defined, but are only of significance to the actors concerned in terms of their perceptions and the apparent existence of these constructs. Thus if subordinates do not perceive that an authority relationship exists, then any control, even if it is ‘legitimated,’ which is exerted by the superordinate is by definition of this social action framework achieved by coercion and should be categorized as power. Authority in this sense may be granted as much from below as from superiors in the organisation. Authority and power are susceptible to change both in the bases and especially in the form in which they are exhibited. They are not fixed sum constructs but rather varying sum, so that social forces in any particular situation may detract or add to the value of the distributed power and authority. The
concern, therefore, and this is the second aspect, should be with the process by which such variations and alterations in the distribution of power and authority are achieved.

By defining power and authority in the framework of social action it is intended to accommodate the means by which behaviour in an organisation can processually affect the form of the social structure. Therefore, whilst it is the sociologist and not the actors who may wish to recognize and categorize the altering form of social structure, it is necessary nevertheless to provide analytical methods to clarify this process. The analytical methods used here are the complementary concepts of the formal and informal and in conjunction the power and authority concepts are being used as integral parts of this processual change. It is intended to illustrate that the process of normalization, of action becoming socially or organisationally acceptable behaviour, may be significantly affected by changing patterns and forms of power and authority relationships. These changing forms of the power and authority relationships indicate the dialectic between organisational structure and the social activity which makes such structure meaningful. It is recognisable however, that such a process requires the means by which activity is able to permeate such conceptually verified relationships and that the mediating influences in this process are the roles and role sets which the actors occupy as incumbents of offices.

The concept of 'role' is important to this research but is seen essentially as a mediating influence, a vehicle which provides the dynamic for the processes mentioned above. As a concept however, 'role' has been great with promise, but somewhat unsuccessful in fulfilment. This may have changed in recent years although Levinson's comment that, "the concept of role remains one of the most overworked and underdeveloped in the social sciences" can scarcely be denied. Indeed the classic text by Gross, Mason and McEachern expresses similar concern and suggests that 'role' has been viewed in an

---

holistic manner which has denied its content elements. This confusion has been of considerable hindrance to this research which has attempted throughout to clarify conceptual understanding. Certainly the core of the confusion is in the meaning of the term role and in its methodological use. Again using Levinson’s approach this difficulty is soon apparent, “A role is, so to say, an aspect of organisational physiology; it involves function, adaptation, process. It is meaningful to say that a person ‘occupies’ a social position; but it is inappropriate to say, as many do, that one occupies a role.” 27 Levinson proceeded to define ‘role’ as a set of expectations and behaviours with three specific elements: (1) structurally given normative demands and responsibilities associated with a position; (2) a role conception; which is an individual’s perception of the position he occupies; (3) role performance; which is the behaviour enacted by the individual in a position. Levinson has, therefore, in his definition of role and thus of the core concept in role theory, used the areas of concern already identified in this research. Levinson’s respectability in ‘role theory’ * and his similarity with the views expressed here, should reasonably permit that much of this research could be accommodated in role theory, whilst at the same time it should be emphasised that, for the central purpose of contributing to the development of organisational theory, ‘role theory’ has not been specifically used in this work. Indeed the reason for adopting the action frame of reference as a more embracing method for analysing organisational social structure is that role theory tends toward somewhat global distinctions between “intra-personal and structural-environmental contexts.” Further, with regard to the problems of the formal and informal, role theory remains as a conceptual adjunct to various problems, such as the derivation and distribution of power. The advantages of role theory are essentially in its descriptive ability and not so obviously in its contribution to the understanding of processual activity.

27. D. Levinson: Ibid.

This research has been conscious that roles are the focus about which social processes within the organisation are converging. There is a consistency here with theory which has, as Hickson says, "... converged upon the specificity (or precision) of role prescription and its obverse, the range of legitimate discretion." This consistency has continued into the methods of this research and even in some similarity with the development of concepts. Levinson's concept of 'personal role-definition', for example, contains substantial elements of the conceptual ideas emanating out of this current research.

In conclusion of this section, it should be apparent that the concepts of organisational theory have hitherto been much discussed and that the theory has developed substantially. The fruitfulness of further exploration and more in-depth understanding has been well stimulated; particularly of recent by the criticisms of the "world of common sense, the concept of rational organisation..." that are "...devoid of information on how its terms relate to facts." Such criticisms appear well founded in a concern for a balanced perspective in organisational study and are well reflected in the action framework expressed by Bittner, which has also been adopted as the current framework "the meaning of the concept, (organisation) and of all the terms and determinations that are subsumed under it, must be discovered by studying their use in real scenes of action by persons whose competence to use them is soundly sanctioned."

PART I

SECTION III
PART I
SECTION III
Research Methods and Hypotheses

The research methods used in this research were simple, largely unquantifiable and readily understandable. The methods, which will be discussed, were trying to avoid the positivistic approach of relating statistical findings and making social facts out of such findings. Further the research sought to develop a theoretical perspective consistent with the intended research methods. As Cohen has said "the relationship between theory and research in sociology is far from satisfactory." The social action framework of this research has demanded that the focus of the research method be based not on factual or statistical findings, but on perceptual findings and on the identification of meaning to participants.

The present research is as much concerned about the structural features of organisations as it is about the social action related to those structures. Structure, however, is only significant in terms of individual actors and groups through the meaning and interpretation which such actors perceive in the structure. However, the argument of this research is not that there are cause and effect relationships but rather social processes in which actors are interacting with each other and with organisational structures. The research methods used here have examined a part of the processual activity, between managers and their roles within their organisational context. The methods were therefore mainly concerned with the identification of meaning and behaviour from the subjective viewpoint of the actors in the situation. Walsh has expressed sympathy with this approach "Action is never just the product of formal rules; rules are enacted in social situations through a continuous interpretation of their meanings in the context of commonsense decision-making. What is important, therefore,

1. P. Cohen: Modern Social Theory H.E.B. 1968 P.242. Also on the same page Cohen says: "There is a depressing tendency for social theorists to discuss the nature of social theory and not the nature of social reality."
is not formal rules but the procedure by which members demonstrate that activities are in accordance with a rule and thereby intelligible. Social meanings, then, and the social order which is produced by them, are the ongoing practical accomplishment of members achieved in situations of interaction."²

This approach, therefore, is intended to establish a fundamental link between, firstly, the theoretical concerns of this research and, secondly, the empirical research including the methodological techniques. However, such theoretical criteria as are necessary to meet the demands of the link being established in this work requires some clarification and explanation. Also, in conjunction with this, it is necessary to explain the rejection of what might be referred to as the typical natural-science-hypothesis testing procedures.

The theory which this research is contributing toward is concerned with the understanding of organisations. Theories in themselves are presuming certain universal characteristics and may be denied in the particular example. However, if they are supported in general and have the possibility for rejection by the particular, then the principle for the empirical existence of a theory can be said to exist. This is consistent with the Popperian criterion for a theory which is empirical insofar as it may be refuted by observations.

This leaves the status of a theory at a point at which it is susceptible to criticisms of degree of transferability, of how general is its empirical existence and to what extent is the theory of any value if it is at too high a level of generality. Thus the theories which have been developed have tended to possess many intricate ideas and concepts which in themselves offer the scope and indeed create the demand for qualification of the theory. Ultimately, this would suggest that theories should be capable of expressing one of two

viewpoints. Firstly, that they are sufficiently precise in content to enable conclusions about a wide variety of situations and have been deduced and validated by the evidence from such situations. Secondly, theories may be so complex that rather than deduce or validate their applicability, the theories may be used to examine the more particular and, on each occasion, slightly adapt and modify the content of the theory. This latter type of theory would, therefore, be concerned to accommodate such conditions or pre-requisites as may be seen necessary to enable a theory to remain credible.

The evolution of organisational theory has illustrated that many contributions have firstly added to the qualifications, making theory still more complex, or have worked at a higher level of generality, or, finally, ignored certain variables as unimportant and emphasised a uni-dimensional approach. It is evident that none of these methods are satisfactory. Simplification is increasingly denied as more research discovers more evidence and enhanced observations about minute parts of the theory, or more precisely, the school of theories in this instance concerned with organisations. Herein lie many of the problems of the contemporary perspective. Firstly, is the new evidence significantly contributing to the theory, or merely creating confusion? Secondly, should efforts be made to integrate or achieve convergence of different theoretical approaches? Finally, is it possible to still maintain some overall paradigm which can accommodate innovatory research and lead to the development of theory? Each of these questions has received prolonged debate. The first has been discussed with particular accent on the type of research which has been accomplished and whether the right questions are being asked on the important issues. Typical of one school of thought are the remarks of Phillipson, "...it is precisely here that the injunction of phenomenology to 'get back to the things themselves' becomes of crucial importance by drawing attention to the problematic features of that which conventional sociology takes for granted."

The second question raised above has been argued both in the immediate part of sociology focusing upon organisations and in more general terms amongst sociological theorists. This debate has already been referred to in a previous section and the conclusion would appear to be to adopt such theory as the type of research demands. As for the final question, it is already evident that uni-dimensional theories have not withstood academic criticism and that meta-theories have probably not had the impact on studies or organisations that they might. That is to say that various theories have been put forward regarding organisational behaviour and the nature of processual and structural activity. Relatively few of these ideas, however, have actually been translated into research methodology and therefore have provided minimal additional insights into the 'social reality' of organisations. Thus whilst meta-theories may survive, organisational theory or middle range theory has not proved particularly fruitful, especially bearing in mind that much research has been conducted but not easily translated into a substantial theoretical conclusion. Examples of this are illustrated by the work of renowned observers of organisational behaviour such as Goffman and Dalton.

The concern expressed earlier in this section, therefore, about the relationship between theory and research has been given due consideration. The concepts developed in the theory of this research were essentially based in the idea of processual activity. In the knowledge that analysis of organisational behaviour is in danger of elevating the commonsense world of the observer to the status of 'social reality' this research has avoided the methods of positivistic sociology, and concentrated on identification of meanings and perception. This approach conforms to the view that researchers and effective social action research is "condemned to meaning"4 and that without an awareness of this precept, the researcher will observe and comment upon a 'taken for granted' world. However, no research can do more than meet a

variety of compromises on the essential criteria, and these compromises are dictated by other than methodological adequacies and competence. The essential criteria have been established as an awareness of those problems which assume meaning for the actors or as an awareness acknowledging that meaning may be problematic in itself. Whilst believing in the exhortations of phenomenology, this research has not altogether agreed with the research methods of this particular trend. Therefore, the current analysis has adopted the awareness and sensitivity referred to above, without conforming to the more contentious methods of inquiry proposed by the school of 'second order meaning.'

The corollary of this approach may be seen in various respects in the proceeding empirical analysis. Whilst concerned with the development of social action theory in organisation, and therefore moulded by this influence, nevertheless this research can at best, add to the existing fund of knowledge and thus contribute toward such theoretical trends as may exist. This argument has thus led to the point at which this research has recognised the link between theory and research activity and has attempted to accommodate this link.

We are not, therefore, concerned in this research with identifying categorizable behaviour for the purpose of a descriptive label and forsaking the nature of social processes and the meaning of such processes to the actors. "All too frequently studies seek to force respondents into categories which bear no relation to the subjective meanings of those concerned." For the ongoing value of knowledge it is nevertheless important to provide frameworks and indeed categories in the way defined in this research, so that subjective meanings can be placed in an ongoing theoretical perspective.

Research of this nature has, therefore, two concerns. The first are the resources available for such a study. The

second, the subjectivity and the value orientations of the researcher which may 'slant' the 'level of meaning. With regard to the resources problem this research could not employ the methods of Dalton for example. Dalton, in his significant study of managers which will be referred to later, spent some ten years as a participant observer studying American firms. Longitudinal studies of such a nature may be most insightful, as was Dalton's but suffer severely without theoretical frameworks or an ongoing theoretical critique. A further study by Kahn et al., on organisational stress had the resources to undertake a nationwide survey as well as a more parochial study of role sets using multi-stage interviewing methods.

The methods selected here were used both for their relative value in terms of obtaining evidence and also for their practicality. The enquiries were organised in three ways. Firstly, in the two organisations directly examined, information was sought, usually from personnel departments, regarding the 'extant organisation'. This entailed collecting organisation charts, manuals, introductory pamphlets, house magazines, job descriptions and any other explicitly, written information which the companies concerned could supply. The major phase of the operation was then an interview programme around a semi-structured questionnaire. In the first organisation which was studied, during the summer of '72, all ten managers were interviewed including the joint managing directors. This was only a small company and was intended as the pilot study. In fact this pilot proved a most valuable study in its own right and an extremely fortuitous comparison with the second larger study. The second organisation yielded interviews from 39 managers and directors, some of whom were interviewed on more than one occasion. The third method was a more informal spontaneous approach, trying to develop contacts and relationships, talking informally to people in the workplace and in social meeting places. This latter method had operational constraints but did reveal some interesting information. Its limitation was affected largely by practical difficulties rather than the nature of the method. Dalton used a similar approach.

by developing 'social' and 'informal' contacts with respondents whom he described as 'intimates'. Whilst an obvious bias might result from such a method, the interviewing style which was adopted in this research had similar results to Dalton's intimates in that the bulk of the most revealing information came from a minority of respondents.

Burns and Stalker also used these methods and indeed their approach formed the basis for the research methods adopted in this study. The case study method of Burns and Stalker was part of what they termed 'field sociology' the means of enquiry being "...simply directed towards gaining acquaintance, through conversation and observation, with the routines of behaviour current in the particular social system being studied... All this emerged fairly slowly in the course of interviews, meetings, lunch-time conversations, and the like."

These methods yielded considerable information, some of which was in a relatively miscellaneous form. The interviews were semi-structured although common questions were asked of all interviewees which enabled responses on certain subject areas. This was particularly useful in determining the normative structure of the organisations. However, the interviews were designed to allow exploration of interesting and problematic areas by the use of open-ended questioning. Also, where potential problem areas arose, for example different interpretations of authority structures, these were cross-referred to different interviewees. Again it is evident here that the researcher was fully responsible for identifying and raising these problems, so that the level of meaning was restricted by the interviewer's subjective observations.

The questionnaire covered background details about the respondent, perceived positions in the organisation hierarchy, descriptions about the role function and fairly extensive enquiry into authority limits and authority relationships. The so-called inter-faces between different hierarchical levels and between different functional departments were also focused.

---

upon. The interviews averaged about one and a half hours each and about a quarter of the interviewers were taped. Tape recording was treated with circumspection because some respondents appeared to be constrained by the recording machine. However, this would be used to advantage by recording the more factual descriptions and then switching the machine off when more sensitive areas were approached, thus achieving a more open response!

These methods were not rigorous, systematized, structured research techniques. They were, however, used with sensitivity and with the objective of optimising interview situations without disturbing relationships or organisational operations. Indeed, it was stressed in every interview that the research was not concerned with organisational effectiveness and internal problems so that interviewees could convey information without fear or repercussions. Further, and this is a marked difference from Dalton, both co-operating organisations were approached through the company directors. Dalton feared that this could lead to manipulation and he operated without the executive level knowing of his research. However, this research was concerned to gain the executive perceptions as much as any other level of management, and to secure the confidence and the understanding that the research was only seeking observations.

These methods then were tested in the pilot study conducted in a small furniture manufacturing company. Employing about 150 staff, the company was a subsidiary of a group owned and operated by two joint managing directors. The company was only concerned with manufacturing and distribution, the other supporting services such as sales and marketing being done at group level. The company was not selected for any particular criteria. The research was examining processes and should, therefore, have had general applicability to any organisation. However, size was an important factor for the pilot study if the methods were to be tested for viability. A small company allowed for an organisational study to be conducted throughout the complete management hierarchy.

9. See Appendix H
The findings of the pilot study were sufficiently useful to endorse the use of the methods mentioned, although the semi-structured questionnaire was rewritten. Also it was evident that the compilation of all the explicit material (such as organisation charts, job descriptions and so forth) was likely to be restricted by embargoes of various kinds, and that anyway the nature of what information was available, was found to be very partial and outdated and therefore in itself of limited value. Further, factual information which might be expected of most organisations is not available (e.g. labour turnover figures, absenteeism, compiled age structures). Therefore, whilst information was sought with regard to explicit material in the major case study, such information gathering was not pursued so vigorously as had been the case in the pilot study.

The major case study was conducted in a large civil airline company. An overtly dynamic, prosperous and highly competitive independent airline, this 'company' like all other independent airlines, was conscious of an ongoing struggle for survival. The company employed about six thousand people and was organised in the conventional complexity of inter-related divisions each with a range of functional departments. The company was having to cope with perpetual change, largely foisted upon the organisation by external factors. The case study was obliged to be fragmented because of the size and complexity of the organisation. Accordingly, it was agreed with the board representatives to research into the sales department and a department called for the purposes of this research 'support services'. These departments were selected for various reasons. Some departments had been over-exposed to studies, some were further removed from the operational centre of the organisation, others were politically sensitive. The board feared that the 'support services' department might be a little too new for such research and were concerned that a new department might convey rather exaggerated impressions and therefore distort any conclusions about the processes under examination. Both departments had several sensitive, operational 'interfaces' with other departments and these
interface situations had strong potential for illustrating problems of authority relationships. In the airline company, the managers and directors who were interviewed represented virtually all the managers, in the two departments concerned and the respective senior line managers (i.e. of the division) and board directors. These interviews were conducted during the autumn and early winter of 1972/73.

These research methods were seen to be consistent firstly with the theoretical framework of the research and secondly with the objective of contributing toward clarification of concepts used in organisational theory. Certainly, the methods used produced an abundance of evidence and research material which then required consciously selective filtering in the analysis without distorting the essential nature of the findings. It is the intention of this research to use such findings as have arisen to develop constructive (in the sense of contributing to, rather than substituting for organisational theory) theoretical frameworks in much the same way that Burns and Stalker developed their ideal type constructs. As is evident however, the basis of this research is not in examining merely organisation structure but also organisational processes which interact with the former. The possible concepts emerging from this approach, therefore, will not be the ideal-types, but rather analytically defined processes.

Hypotheses

During the analysis of the pilot study and consequent upon the assessment of the literary material, the research developed several hypotheses. These hypotheses were intended to relate to the theoretical framework and covered strategic areas. Their significance is in terms of expressing more emphatically the framework and in providing insights into the concepts and their use. The research was not concerned to validate these hypotheses but to disprove them or to assess their relative merit. Nor was this approach intended as a rejection of the preceding discussion on different levels of meaning. If
individual perceptions are held by a collectivity then research is not imposing a meaning but rather stating its collective existence. Of the original hypotheses, there are a few which are crucial to the theoretical framework and worthy of introduction. An important problematic area concerned the nature of individual and corporate goals and to what extent particular behaviour was directed toward achieving either of these respective goal sets. To suggest that behaviour is directed toward particular goals assumes both intentionality and rationality on behalf of the actor or actors. To establish firstly the nature of such goals and secondly to determine the relationship between goals and behaviour is indeed an awesome task in itself. Nevertheless, it would appear that much of previously so-called informal behaviour has been categorized as such because it is directed toward individual goal achievement, possibly at the expense of organisational goals. The first hypothesis therefore is - that the extent of informal behaviour within organisations is related to the degree to which individual and organisational goals complement one another.

The more complementary individual and organisational goals may be, the less the informal behaviour adopted by the individual. Thus, for example, if the individual sees his own progress related to that of the organisation's progress it is suggested he is less likely to behave independently of other organisational members. The converse it is hypothesised, may be the case when there is disparity between an individuals adopting informal behaviours to achieve organisational goals is something of which this research is aware. However, the concepts, as outlined in earlier sections, have anticipated that when such behaviour may be adopted it will invariably seek some consensus support, and accordingly would be re-classified as formal behaviour on the basis of normative expectations. The issue which is really in dispute is, therefore, whether informal behaviour as identified in this research is revolving essentially about an individual's objectives and not the organisation. If this is the case it denies the existence of an informal 'system' and suggests informality is localised and highly fragmented.

10. See Appendix. A
Additional hypotheses, or problem areas, relate to the nature and existence of authority. The first of these identifies the process of behaviour changing from being dissensus, unexpected and irregular to becoming regular anticipated and acceptable by consensus. The effect of this process, it is suggested, is in the alteration of the authority associated with particular roles. It is apparent that in any organisation individuals can only behave independently of others for a very limited period without organisational members at some level becoming conscious of that individual's action. The nature of the conscious identification may then be expressed in various forms. It may remain as an implicit acceptance or rejection of the individual's behaviour. That is, it is not verbalized or acted out and shown to be an overtly responsive behaviour. Alternatively, there may be explicit reference to an individual's 'informal' behaviour which might constitute an attempt at determining whether a consensus of perceptions exists, and then to determine any individual or collective response to the informal behaviour. The central point would then be that many such informal behaviours are related to the authority structure and to the decision-making process inherent in the authority structure. If the informal behaviour of individuals is recognised and accepted by a significant role set, which may include peers, superordinates and subordinates, then it is apparent that this will have repercussions on parts of the authority structure. The informal behaviour, therefore, starts an immutable process, albeit unintentional in many instances, which may extend the boundaries of one role's authority definition, possibly at the expense of another role. This issue might therefore be expressed as follows - that the authority of specific roles may be altered by means of a process whereby dissensus behaviour becomes acceptable consensus behaviour as a consequence of social activity.

A second hypothesis is concerned with an issue raised by March and Simon which suggests that individuals accept authority relations and the orders and instructions as supplied by the organisation in what we would call the 'extant' form. This has since been refuted by other authors but still remains problematic in that the process and the eventual balance and relationship between 'extant' demands and expectations and individual responses remains unclear. This research, therefore,
proposed:

that authority is only meaningful in an organisation in terms of how it is perceived and used in relationship to specific roles. To this extent, authority is as much a function of the influence of the incumbent as it is of the prescribed role.

Further hypotheses related to roles and role sets. The primary concern here was with the degree to which a role remained constant despite various incumbents. The transference of a role from situation to situation in any time period does, of course, raise many issues about other changing factors which become part of the process. The role incumbent is merely a single influencing factor among many. It would certainly appear to be logical that in a more mechanistic structure the role would remain more constant and less likely to change under incumbent and other influences. However, this assumption is inadequate. It may be equally possible that roles change within a mechanistic structure whilst still retaining the essential character of the structure itself.

The precision of role definition, like that of role authority is relatively meaningless if an incumbent decides to interpret that definition to suit his own purposes or on the basis of his mental-set toward the role.

In contradiction to the suggestion therefore, that roles and role behaviour are a function of prescribed behaviour, the hypothesis suggested here is:--

that the understanding of a role and its relationships with other roles is the function of a number of unspecified or unstructured processes, implicitly conveying meaning and understanding to the incumbent of that role.

In consequential relationship to this, the following hypothesis attempts to be more specific about the process of understanding:--

That the major understanding of role definitions and role relationships is a function of a cognitive process by incumbents of roles, learning through behavioural experience, the acceptability of different forms of role behaviour.
These then are the more important hypotheses and will be assessed in relationship to the empirical findings in the succeeding sections of this research. The significance of the hypotheses, it should be stressed, is in their contribution to the elaboration of the concepts which are of major concern to this research. As hypotheses in themselves they may not appear far reaching, but intentionally they are not trying to presuppose behaviour which in essence can only be interpreted meaningfully by the actor. However, on the basis that we are concerned with theoretical development it seems important to provide more than interesting insights. Further it is not intended to validate these hypotheses, but examine their meaningfulness and initiate their development into processual or social action theories of human behaviour.
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Research Findings

Results of empirical enquiries in the field

In assembling the research findings it has been necessary to examine particular areas relating to behaviour within the management structure of organisations. As the methods have suggested, the accumulated information is not quantitative although some reference may be made to figures to give an insight into those who were interviewed. The essential significance, indeed, of these findings, is the insight that they enabled within the confines of two organisations. To compare and complement this insight, it is intended to refer both to other empirical findings, few as they are in this specific field, and also to add the personal experiences and observations of the researcher in various situations.

The studies of the two firms would ideally have included relatively extensive enquiries and research into environmental and communal factors that impinged upon these companies. An introduction, however, to the companies, their history, background and situation may give some indications as to the broader contextual factors. The pilot study of a 'leisure furniture' manufacturing company was conducted in an organisation typical of many small manufacturing concerns in the south east of England. Operating from a small industrial estate, the firm employed 150 people, having started with 10 people in 1961. The firm began as the brainchild of two active directors and the progress of the firm appeared to conform to the general entrepreneurial patterns suggested by Stanworth and Curran in their study of small businesses. Manufacturing and selling were significant problems for the directors in the early history of the company; the importance of these difficulties is illustrated by the relatively intense

involvement of the directors in the formative years. The structure of the organisation in those years was to have evolved such that changes were a function of circumstances and personalities and not a consequence of planned progression. A Works Director was initially responsible for the production at the factory site, and the founding directors worked mainly from an outer London base, controlling the administration and selling. However, a rift between the works director and the founding director resulted in the former leaving and a new works manager being recruited. It was this 'new' works manager upon whom the study focused - the impact and effect of this new incumbent upon the organisation.

The firm has tight profit and operating margins with raw materials accounting for over 50% of the sales value of the products. Seasonal trade is fluctuating and being in the leisure industry there is a sense of uncertainty about the organisation. To combat slumps in trade, the firm indulged in speculative buying and selling of heaters and other consumer products. Production methods were relatively straightforward. Little skilled labour was required, precision was gauged by the experienced eye rather than the exact measurement. Light materials, simple task operations and a degree of manual dexterity led to a high proportion of female labour. Management expressed a personal involvement and as will be discussed, was regularly to be seen 'involved' on the shop floor with matters of small detail.

For purposes of identification this firm may be called company 'F' (for Furniture) and our second case study, company 'T' (for Transport). The history of the second company, in the airline industry, is considerably more complex. A highly competitive industry in which survival is a key word, the company that was studied is the largest independent airline in the country. It reached its present size (employing about 6,000 people), by taking-over another, larger airline and 'merging' into an organisation dominating a London airport. In terms of the 'merger' the managers of the company have been much influenced by the recent historical
changes and the remnants of past traditions and practices of
the old companies have proved to be of some importance. The
growth of the company has been most important in influencing
the present form of the organisation. Particularly since the
merger of 1969 (a local takeover) the growth factor has
significantly affected many of the operational facets within
the organisation. Along with the other airlines at the
airport, there has been a 23% increase in the number of
passengers, rising to a total of 7 million per annum and an
import-export activity totalling £81 million worth of trade.
These figures have been sustained by a determined growth and
expansion orientation indicated by the attitude of the
employees as much as by the directors. The implications of
such a policy will shortly be discussed.

The two departments studied in 'T' company, the 'support
services' department and Sales, were both strategically
important departments. Sales as will be seen from the
projected views of the senior managers and directors was seen
as the 'spearhead', not merely of the marketing division, of
which it was a part, but also of the whole company. The
organisation in a competitive situation such as this, evidently
achieved the Sales image indicative of a 'sell or die'
operational department. Its task was to co-ordinate various
functions necessary to enable aircraft to leave the 'ramp'
area (that is the area immediately between the airport
buildings and the runway), punctually, fully equipped and
loaded, clean and preferably with its correct passenger and
cargo load! The department was part of a larger division
called 'traffic' but had been under surveillance because of
the problems of co-ordination and punctuality with regard to
a number of services over which it did not have full control.
Accordingly, a working party was established to report on
these operational aspects of the organisation. Their report
became known as P.I.P., meaning performance and punctuality
improvement programme, and its design was to create a 'support
services' department which with various services under its
direct control would be able to reduce delays and customer complaints. Before the final P.I.P. report was produced the new department had been agreed by the board and was announced on 1st May, 1972. This meant that when the research was conducted, the department was still in its infancy and indeed some of the most important roles had only been filled for a matter of days. Of major significance, therefore, were not only the new role incumbents, and indeed new roles, but also the acceptance and the function of the new department by other departments. Also as the new department had been extracted from one division and added to another, how would this affect the newly arranged inter-departmental relations? This aspect was to prove quite crucial in some of the interface situations.

The Understanding of the Organisation by the Organisational Members.

The extant organisation as it existed in Company 'F' was quite extensively formulated. The organisation charts had been updated by the works director in conjunction with the founding directors. Whilst several of the old charts were available, they did vary in one or two instances. Three departmental heads reported directly to the Works Director. Of these departmental heads, only two, production and stock control, had other managers subordinate to themselves. The Works Director had three other staff responsible directly to his position. All of the positions on the organisational chart also explicitly stated to whom each individual was responsible and the general function of each role.

Certainly, the organisation chart had contracted over a two year period with some roles disappearing and others assuming greater importance. The stock controller had been given larger responsibilities with the addition of raw materials,

2. Appendix B illustrates the three main aspects of the support services operation - The Aircraft, Operational requirements and Revenue Load, each with sub-task features relating to the departure of the flight. See also Appendix C which illustrates the operational problems of co-ordinating many functions to one aircraft. Both of these appendices were taken from the P.I.P. report.

3. See Page 63 for the meaning of 'the extant organisation'.

4. See Appendix 'D'.
incoming goods as well as the storing and despatch of finished products. The previous stock control incumbent was being prematurely retired and accepted what was in effect a demotion. The new stock controller was, however, beginning with an extension of status and was thus experiencing promotion compared to what would otherwise have been a sideways move. A further contraction in the organisation chart had occurred, again to take advantage of a change in personnel, by the removal of the position of Factory 'C' foreman. The new production manager had said that the Factory C foreman had not been replaced. In fact this role is excluded from the latest organisation chart. However, the production manager had produced a 'production organisation chart' and on this the Factory C foreman was still maintained!

The importance of these changes was marked as far as individual actors were concerned. Status elevation and demotion were consciously identified. Whilst it is possible to interpret these specific situations relating to the stock controller role and the ambiguous existence of the Factory C foreman role it should be apparent that the reality of this situation varied according to the perceptual stance of the individual actors. It is perhaps more significant to consider briefly the alternative interpretations which might be applied to situations like these and to evaluate their implications.

The interpretation which Dalton would have been most likely to make of these and other such instances is that they are part of an ongoing power struggle. Dalton felt that management structures were essentially a system of complex power relationships with each manager manipulating the situation to acquire influence and control and enhance his own status and opportunities. This is a Machiavellian analysis of such situations and is a valid viewpoint. It does imply devious and conflict-laden behaviour and raises issues about human-motivation, survival of the most cunning and a prime-ordinate form of action. The frame of reference adopted by Dalton would appear limited. Various authors (Lockwood for example) on organisational behaviour have noted the somewhat surprising ability of individuals to subsume and even deny the impact of conflict. On the basis that actors dislike the effects of conflict and attempt to avoid such effects it is
logical to presume that such behaviour as referred to above is not intentionally designed as part of a power struggle. Indeed a conflict orientation has a counterpart which is a co-operation and integration orientation and the observation of the latter in many managers has led the researcher to believe that such a presumption of non-intended power behaviour is more probable than intentionally contributing to a power struggle. An alternative proposition would, therefore, suggest misdemeanours on behalf of actors concerned, expressed by faulty communication, lack of updating the extant organisation, and an inability to realise the implications of organisational changes.

Another related feature of the extant organisation was job descriptions which existed for the managers mainly in the stock control area. These descriptions covered aspects such as 'organisational relations' and 'authority and decisions,' but in very general terms. For example under the heading 'organisational relationships' in the stock controller job specification it merely said: 'job holder is directly responsible to Works Director.' It was evident that the authority and decision-making constraints however were explicit, especially with relationship to the Works Director who retained an omnipotence befitting a mechanistic structure. One job description relating to Factory 'D' foreman was obviously several years old and indeed the foreman was the only person to have a copy. Whilst sufficiently general and outdated, unlike the other job descriptions, to be of little real value this factory foreman preserved his ancient document with great care.

Other than these main features, the extant organisation was supplemented with written contracts of employment (in conformity with the 1971 Industrial Relations Act) and an outdated, and on the admission of the personnel manager, a condescending, introductory booklet for new employees.

5. See Appendix 'E' for the job description of the Stock Controller.
Organisational procedures were largely simple and routine and did not require explicating, so the essential extant organisation related to the management structure.

The perceptions and explanations of the extant organisation revealed much about the processes and influences which had affected both the management structures and the behaviour within the company. The directors suggested the organisation structure was fixed at any one moment in time and was thus mechanical in nature, but that they would change the structure to suit different conditions, especially different personalities. To quote one of the directors who was referring to their relationship with the Works Director: "we have allowed things to develop as we get to know the personality... our policy has suggested that what is desirable is a 'mental understanding' whereby directives are not necessary." The expression of control but not rigidity is obviously quite feasible with a relatively mechanical structure. Slightly more liberal interpretation was expressed by the production manager who suggested that the organisation chart is a 'guideline' and that there are 'no hard and fast rules.' Certainly, from the response of managers, it appeared that the organisation chart and the explicit organisational relationships were firmly established.

Varied perceptions showed how status differences were expressed. For example the stock controller placed all Foreman at the same hierarchical level whilst the production controller placed the stock control foreman on a lower status to production foremen. Further, the organisation chart had changed with promotions and new personnel and it was evident that the changing authority of the works director had effected many organisational chart changes. The role development of the works director was, therefore, a significant process in this small organisation and in relationship to other roles will be discussed later in some depth.
Company 'T' was throughout, much less overtly mechanical in nature. Indeed, the lack of presence of an omnipotent head, (certainly his geographical and his hierarchical distance from the scene of the operation), the lack of specified relationships and the apparently fluid structure, suggested a considerably more organic organisation than company 'P'. However, as we have earlier suggested, the nature of an organisation's functioning needs an understanding of the complementary relationship between the extant structure, to whatever degree it may exist, and the behaviour by the incumbents of roles. In this respect Company 'T' had a 'real' functioning operation rather different to the 'apparent' form. Its essential extant organisation was again in traditional organisation charts. These charts did exist for the entire company but were only retained for all departments by the training officer. The only organisation chart which was generally available was that concerning the board and the senior executives which was published in the house magazine. The sales organisation chart was divided by geographical 'responsibilities' for certain sales functions. These 'responsibilities' were explicit for most managers mainly in terms of the annual financial objectives determined at board level. The chart itself merely identified the role-titles and the role incumbents. In this department the departmental organisational chart was all that existed of the extant organisation. There were no job descriptions, manuals, nor any explicitly identifiable responsibilities or relationships.

The 'support services' department had an organisation chart carefully designed to indicate a hierarchical order even where a line authority relationship did not exist. Thus for example the 'support services' controllers (a new job title) had a line relationship which only related to the 'support services' manager. The chart, however, conveyed their status as being above everybody else in the department except the departmental managers assistant (called the senior.

7. See Appendix F
8. See Appendix F
The department was strongly influenced in the hierarchical ordering and the status ascribed to roles by the fact that civil airlines still retain in larger parts of their operational function a military-type of organisation. Throughout the 'support services' department, all personnel except the controllers and the manager and his 'senior officer,' wore braided uniforms. Further, all positions carried 'stripes' or 'pips,' so that for example the senior 'support services' officer carried four stripes and a pip whilst his immediate subordinates, the 'duty officers' carried three stripes.

The impact of this militaristic orientation was significant in this part of the extant organisation. The intention of civil airlines is patently not to convey a military type image in its personal dealings with customers but to attempt to maintain an operation which has the precision and efficiency which is supposed to typify the armed services. This, therefore, requires that in the areas directly concerned with the operation of flight arrivals and departures, in this case, substantially the responsibility of the 'support services' department, that there has to be a strict deference to authority. The compliance which the system of operation therefore demands, has to be maintained and perpetuated by a series of ritualistic procedures, many of which are required by legal statutes, internationally agreed. In the face of these pressures, which court rulings have proved to be real and not imaginary, it is necessary to conduct procedures which are watertight. Overtly, therefore, the compliance is of a coercive nature and individuals in the airline take their responsibilities extremely seriously, knowing that the repercussions for failure are extremely severe.

The behaviours ensuing from this military type operation, tend to be directive and not infrequently to rely upon the shadow which the ultimate sanction causes to hang over this part of the industry. There is the not uncommon tendency for decisions and instruction to be told to subordinates and not discussed before being finalized. There is among
management a strong orientation to direct, tell and expect conformity. The culture that is therefore engendered has placed an emphasis on the experience of and ability for conducting the ritualistic procedures.

These points are made in observation and not evaluation. Alternative methods may exist but it is not the place of this research to concern itself with their effectiveness. However, consequent upon such methods are various implications caused by the behaviours conducted in the ritualistic culture. There are, for example, internal contradictions caused between the operational part of the airline and some of the other departments which provide indirect support. The enquiries into Sales expressed these contradictions. Whilst the operational side had a responsibility to conform to regulations, the Sales department had a responsibility to its clients and it was apparent that commercial considerations were seen to clash on occasion with operational considerations. Lying partly behind this problem were industrial relations difficulties which occurred regularly in the area of support services. There was a continuous catalogue of short term, two or three hours usually, industrial action. A tightly scheduled operation, upon which depended a substantial income, meant certain labouring groups such as baggage handlers or catering loaders had a strategic importance and were not afraid to express this by illustrating their 'power' in the situation. This would be an oversimplified analysis of the cause of these problems, but is obviously a significant factor. It is no coincidence that no other area in the airport has anything verging on the industrial relations problems such as exist in the 'support services' department.

The essential point in this department is that with a cultural orientation influencing the managerial style, and an operational system which is unique to the industry, the responses which individuals give to the situation are relatively limited. Whether this is by choice or demand backed by sanction is unclear, but the behavioural framework
is cloistered by an environment which appears normative but has strong coercive overtones. The result appeared to be an ambiguous degree of commitment and various problems for individuals trying to cope with the 'cloisters'.

Some of these problems were illustrated by the creation of the new controllers role in the support services department and the determination of their main areas of responsibility. For the moment, it is intended to discuss the means of communicating such responsibilities as these and the attitude directed towards such means in both 'support services' and Sales. The behaviour responses and the elaboration of the ambiguities referred to above will then be developed in the next subject area of 'the incumbent and his role'.

The director of operations had published the 'support services' department chart and had added to it the allocation of main responsibilities. This was however, a list of tasks and not a circumscription of authority or relationships with other functions. The 'support services' controllers were given a brief to familiarise themselves with the operation of the new department. This did not prove difficult because the appointments were all made internally, however, when the controllers took their operational positions in October 1972 they were given terms of reference. The divisional manager issuing these terms of reference specifically avoided passing them directly to anyone other than company directors and senior executives. A memo accompanied the terms of reference of the controllers and this memo stated that: "It should be noted that they (the terms of reference) explicitly require that priorities be allocated through normal departmental channels." However, whilst this instruction was quite explicit, its enactment was dependent upon other managers in the company who had been carefully screened from seeing the terms of reference. Whilst the divisional manager sought the recognition of the new controllers he was thus either not aware or unconcerned that other managers did not know what was expected of the new role!

9. See Appendix G
The means by which the understanding of structure was achieved was a variable function of what was passed through formal communication channels. The dependency which individuals had upon these formal communications differed considerably. Some individuals, notably in Sales, expressed satisfaction with these formal channels. Such was the view represented by the response of a Route Sales manager to the question:

Interviewer: "Is there any means by which you have learnt the (organisational) structure - how has it been conveyed to you?"

Manager: "Yes. Sales is very good about its internal communication.... When we make internal changes, they notify addresses as quickly as possible. I think I could probably tighten up with some of the ways in which it is done, but as quickly as possible after any change, whether structural or affecting the position of people or tasks. I think everybody in the Company is informed. Normally in writing, and quite often in a very structured way by showing a table of the organisation so that we have a permanent view of what is happening."

The organisation chart affecting each individual was generally available and was the most common means of formal communication used to convey the hierarchical order. However, its interpretation varies widely, and the explanation for such variations are complex. In the companies studied in this research it appeared that where little effort was made to convey very much about role relationship and role definitions, that there was noticeable referral to the apparent security of the authority structure. A nebulous array of roles and role relationships undoubtedly led to a state of uncertainty.

Manager in Sales: "...the route structure was introduced in May of two years ago, 1971, and that was the time you should have been here of course, because there was an awful lot of uncertainty and indecision as to what in fact the responsibilities were and the extent of them and so on."
Certainly the efforts made by organisation members to achieve some clarification where it did not exist were quite remarkable and were referred to several times by different managers, especially in the Sales department. The same manager as above continued:

"It has been a question of everybody feeling their own way. I think that took quite a long period; I think it took between six and nine months before everybody knew where they really were...."

Yet another manager commented:

"When the reorganisation occurred there was chaos!"

and then went on to comment on how order had emerged out of chaos!

The General Manager of Sales department was himself conscious of an historical perspective and of ambiguity and confusion at the beginning of the process:

"I think obviously about two years ago when the two Companies merged there was a great issue of those Organisation Charts so that everybody was aware of the organisation of the Company."

The implication here is that when formality in the traditional sense, is seen to be inadequate to provide basic requirements upon which actors may base their behaviour, then there is an attempt either to build that formal structure by processual means or to exert pressures which demand such a structure. Whichever way it is done, and for whatever reason, it seems that eventually, almost without exception, organisational members feel that they have a clear understanding of what their own role entails and the nature of the organisational structure. This is illustrated by the vagueness with which actors talk about the development
of this knowledge and understanding, but conversely the confidence with which the same actors are able to talk of their current role. This behaviour, of course conforms with the theory of role dissonance and consonance (Festinger) in which ambiguity in roles is an intolerable situation which individuals try and resolve. In the above examples, however, the point is relating not merely to a single role but to an organisational structure in a multi-role situation. In this context it is insufficient to talk of an individual's role ambiguity because the behaviour and changes expressed by individuals seem to be consequent upon a structural ambiguity. An implicit social process could be identified by the actors themselves as the means by which clarification was achieved.

Whilst a process occurred, the nature of this process varied considerably and the eventual situation which had been derived when the issue was discussed for this research showed that each individual had been concerned with a balance between discretion and freedom or prescription and limitation.

Route Sales Manager: "Within a clearly defined sort of organisation one must know where to go, if one has to. It is very difficult if you are operating on a completely free and easy basis because you have to have the assurance that certain jobs are being done whatever happens come what may. So this is very important, but it has limits obviously."

Another Route Sales Manager was also enthusiastic about this freedom:

"...once you tie people into formalising tasks and start applying manual routines to a group of people, outward facing people like Salesmen, you freeze them in their activities. So everybody is left with a great amount of informality and freedom to overlap on other people's functions; so there is very good communication; internally, it is formal and informal..."
The general availability of the Sales organisation chart then, had little to do with such interpretations and the interpretation of the chart itself was seen to vary as a consequence of perceptual frameworks as well as structural impact.

Despite this, the individual perceptions of what the organisation hierarchy should be in theory, was conveyed mechanically in the chart form, and became confused only in the case of some positions which had confusing role titles. These titles were designed merely to impress customers and had nothing to do with internal status. A title such as Senior Sales Control Executive referred to a role which was providing a support service to other managers and which in terms of the hierarchy had low status. It was also evident that one or two roles of the Sales organisation chart existed to provide positions for certain managers which might almost be described as sinecures and which will be discussed shortly.

In the 'support services' department there were some interesting features with regard to perceptions of the hierarchy. Noticeably, the controllers with official senior status by nature of their four stripes, had identified themselves as having lower managerial status than was generally ascribed to them by other managers in the department. It appeared that because these roles had no departmental authority, the incumbents were underrating their managerial status. However, the term 'manager' carries connotations of 'responsibility over others' and may in itself be a misleading term. This problem of 'meaning' did not deter two or the three supervisors, who were interviewed, as identifying themselves with managerial status, whilst none of their superiors gave the supervisors this managerial status. Finally there was an interesting difference in the identified status of the 'support services' duty officers. Response to managerial status here appeared closely related to the length of experience in the role. Longer serving duty officers (it was a role that had continued from the old department) gave themselves relatively higher status than the newer role incumbents, one of whom gave himself lower status than the supervisors had given to themselves.
Both Company 'F' and Company 'T' had organisation charts typical of those held by many complex, modern, organisation. Those represented here would also appear to typify the common generality of such charts with regard to spans of control, authority relations, decision-making powers and other characteristic features of management structures. The purpose of such charts would appear to be essentially to give a guiding image rather than a definitive approach to the tasks confronting incumbents of roles. In this sense the charts shown in this research have not in themselves revealed anything particularly novel. Nevertheless, we have established that in varying degrees, organisations express their 'formality' in explicit forms and that the extant organisation is an important feature transcending the incumbents of an organisation at any one moment. Incumbents may join and leave organisations but leave intact the extant organisations. That incumbents have not changed the extant organisation, however, does not also mean that the social structure has remained unchanged. The extant organisation in itself may be indicative of very little except a broad expectation of an hierarchical order. The significance is more likely to be in the sense in which the extant organisation is a reflection of the hierarchical order and the operational functioning as perceived by role incumbents in relation to their own and other people's roles and their personal experiences of the organisational structure. It is in this sense, in terms of the meaning and perceptions of actions that organisational structure may engender, that we now seek to develop the understanding of organisational behaviour.

The Incumbent and his Role

The roles of Company 'F' were defined in ways consistent with a relatively simple operation where control from the executive was effectively centralised. This did not mean however, that a manager would have clear lines of discretion of authority which would be explicit. Even in

a relatively 'mechanistic' type of organisation such as this, the general consensus about how individuals became familiar with the role, and its 'working' characteristics was by 'on the job learning.' Typical comments from managers in Company 'F' such as 'learning the hard way' and 'things just happened' were in fact, replicated in Company 'T' which projected a much more fluid image of a management structure. In this respect, it was evident that whether the extant organisation was relatively explicit or whether it was vague, the incumbents still had to undergo a 'learning period' which informed them of the necessary functioning aspects of their role.

In Company 'F' the management structure and the explicit formal relationship formed the basis of an 'organisational order.' That is to say, that the structure and the roles had been firmly established by their working effectiveness. The methods and the relationships had moved through a process whereby they were now accepted by the incumbents in the situation. The explicit relationships were, according to conveyed perceptions and observations, those which were accepted and employed by the managers in the organisation. The managers in Company 'F' were committed too, and identified strongly with the organisation. Overt criticism was minimal, although this was no indication of whether criticism was felt by respondents. The significance of such an organisation appeared, therefore, to rest on how such a situation was achieved and how it was maintained.

The nature of the commitment was expressed by the two key managers subordinate to the Works director. The Stock controller, who started as an operative and worked up to the position of Stock controller, saw a relationship between the achievement of his own goals and those of the organisation:

"I see the financial achievement of the company directly related to my own financial success."

The identification of potential by the Works director and his subsequent recognition by a series of rapid

11. Note: The concept of an 'organisational order' has considerable complexity and is further developed in a later part of this section.
promotions was obviously a major determinant influencing this role incumbent and his close identification of organisation with individual goals. Accompanying the Stock controller at this organisation level was a recently recruited Production manager. The new incumbent had had experience of larger organisations and of much political cut and thrust within other management structures and was satisfied that his new position would not create similar problems. The Production manager expressed this satisfaction when we remarked that he worked in the company "because people here don't think - 'is he poaching on my territory?'" The Production manager had also perceived that he had "a much freer hand that my (his) predecessor" and ascribed this to a greater confidence of the Works Director in the new incumbent of the production role.

The third manager on the same level in the organisation chart, but with less organisational status, was the personnel manager. The female incumbent of this role had also achieved internal recognition and promotion, from an initial position as part-time wages clerk. The managers at this organisational level, therefore, were all relatively new role incumbents and thus collectively, were at the most vulnerable stage at which they would experience an assertion of control and imposition of normative expectations over their own positions.

The nature of such control and clarification of expectations clearly emanated from the apparently omnipotent, if benevolently minded, Works director. The Works director had himself been appointed some five years earlier to the position of Works manager. The previous incumbent of this position had been with the founding directors since the company began and was made a company director. However, a rift caused partly by a consultant's report, resulted in the original Works director leaving, and the new role reverted to a Works manager. At the same time the founding directors withdrew much of the autonomy and decision-making powers from the new role. Gradually, however, the new Works manager gained the confidence of the directors, and was increasingly granted authority to make his own decisions.
This process was enhanced by the Works director himself making decisions and then merely seeking approval from the directors. This was reciprocally understood and acknowledged by the owning Directors, leading eventually to the Works manager being made a director. Thus the Works director himself went through a process of extending his authority and enlarging his control over the works. The directors knew of this and allowed it to occur to the degree that they now say that the Works director only comes to them "for security and satisfaction of mind." However, the directors were quite clear that if there was a change in personnel the role would again have less authority and control would be re-centralised. Thus the 'extant' authority was relatively limited and the development of the role was dependent upon the incumbent and the relationship perceived by the incumbent of the Works manager's (now Works director) role and the Founding directors.

The Works director, with developed authority, restructured the factory organisation to enable a more 'effective' operation and also, whether intentionally or not, to secure greater control over the role incumbents. By this method the Works director was able to make clear to new role incumbents what were the normative expectations - for example, the expected authority relationships with himself. Through this approach, whatever was not made explicit in the extant organisation could be conveyed via the normative structure which had been established both by custom and practice and now by the 'design' of the Works director. This process was achieved more rapidly in this organisation than might be anticipated elsewhere, because the 'omnipotent' head of the concern had no rival interests or power groups and more particularly because all of his immediate subordinates, the key organisational roles, were new incumbents. This allowed for flexibility to adapt the roles to suit the restructuring, achieve some reasonable fit between the incumbents and the roles, and establish the relationships the Works director sought.
Interestingly however, some activities were revealed which did not altogether suggest consistency with this 'pattern.' One particular example concerned the Stock controller who, as has been established, had responsibility for despatch of products. A direct relationship, not explicit in the organisational chart, was in existence between the Sales director (one of the founding directors based near London) and the Stock controller. This was created to achieve a rapid processing of orders. Occasionally however, this meant that the Sales director requested a batch, sometimes even just a small batch, of a particular article - for example a certain type and colour of chair. If the Stock controller did not have any of this type and colour in stock he would ask the appropriate line foreman to put them through the production line. In theory this contravened the regular method of production control which was agreed by the Works director, the Production manager and the Stock controller. An agreed production schedule would be temporarily withdrawn in order that a special order might be processed on the direct request of the Stock controller. Both the Works director and the Production manager were aware of this procedure - a procedure which would conventionally have been referred to as an 'informal' method of operation. However, the process by which this method had been achieved was one which had the status support of the Sales director, who had made the request, and the implicit acceptance of the factory management. Whilst regretting the fact that the company was 'sales orientated' the Works director tacitly supported such an orientation by allowing this type of break in procedure to occur.

Essentially this method was a part of the 'normative structure' of the organisation in that it was a commonly expected method of operating and when it occurred it was acceptable to the members of the Stock controller 'role-set.' The behaviour referred to here was, therefore, unprescribed, but formal in the sense that it was a part of the organisation normative structure. It was behaviour that had consensus acceptance, even if the acceptance did not also imply approval. Various other activities were of
such a nature, and also received a consensus acceptance. Examples such as the production manager himself relating directly to the stockroom foreman to obtain stores and the procedure of the service manager liaising directly with the managing director over customer complaints were evidence of by-passing procedure and of a normative flexibility which permitted behaviour conducive to achieving commonly recognised goals.

The nature of such normative, consensus behaviour was significant in this company only in relatively minor deviations from the explicit functioning requirement. However, it was indicative of a process in which normality achieved through consensus expectations, was permeating the structure and the relationships existing in the organisation. Role incumbents were variously finding ways of achieving certain goals which took them outside of explicit, formal activities and procedures. The aforementioned examples referred to such activities that had become normalised and which, therefore, this research contends are elements of the formal structure. However, other activities were apparent which illustrated the process in its earlier stages, where consensus was not so apparent. One such instance was the relationship between the production manager and the maintenance engineer. The production manager suggested that he had 'assumed authority' over the maintenance engineer and the small maintenance department area though this was clearly not the production manager's responsibility. This had occurred because, inevitably, the maintenance engineer was spending much time repairing machinery and working in the production areas. The production manager was aware that this was not his responsibility but had strong designs to have the maintenance department 'officially under his wing' and therefore he was beginning the normalising process by assuming unofficial responsibility.\(^\text{12}\) Another example was

illustrated by the stock controller who achieved an increase in establishment by employing a 'temporary' for a period of time and then having established the necessity for extra labour was able to have the establishment figure increased. Such practices are not unique but are apparent in most organisations in different guises and to varying degrees. They do, however, illustrate an ongoing process, which may be a move toward a normative acceptance and even an explicit prescription, or which may be rejected by various members of the role-set and thus remain indefinitely as dissensus behaviour because of an 'organisational' denial of its value.

Before developing this argument still further in Company 'T' it is worthwhile raising one other important aspect. Part of the acceptance-rejection process is achieved through an 'understanding,' an almost 'mystical' means of knowing when to intervene and when not; when to make a decision and when to ask for higher approval before making the decision; when to change the production programme, or when to seek agreement before altering the flow-line. Thus the Works director remarked with regard to the recruitment that there was an "implied level of personnel" and that the establishment figure was understood. The Production manager said, "it's just with working with people you know - at this stage I must discuss this with someone and action is then taken. At other times I will take action without upsetting the organisational flow - because in fact instructions are not coming down the line in the way they should.... you build up a working arrangement .... it's a matter of instinct." A further illustration with the Works director was that he knew when to break procedure or 'formal methods' because of the 'impact' something was having on the concern.

It is evident that the phraseology used by these respondents was sufficient for them to explain why they could or could not determine certain activities. The significance of the issue of whether they could or could not make decisions was generally unimportant - it was an acceptable part of organisational activity sufficiently bound-up in the
normative behaviour of the managers to be of little conscious concern. However, whilst the organisation undoubtedly had an 'order', a partially implicit and a partially explicit acceptance of normative control, the authority and decision making relationships were, still of a relatively fluid and unspecified nature. The apparent - 'implicit,' 'understanding,' 'knowing', explanations of individuals were in part denying an important process which each manager was involved with from their inception in their respective roles. The nature of such a process is very problematic but is undoubtedly essential in an appreciation of organisational behaviour. It is apparent that there could be much wider variation and impact upon the organisation as a consequence of such 'processes' than was seen in Company 'T'. In this situation would the structure vary again as a consequence of a change in the incumbent of the Works director role? It is possible that two alternative consequences could be effected. The first is that the extant organisation would be changed and that roles, role relationships and authority would be altered quite explicitly. The second alternative might be that the extant organisation remains unaltered but would be operated and interpreted in a different form by the subsequent new incumbent. This is equally true of each of the roles within an organisation although roles lower in the hierarchy have less explicit authority and might, therefore, tend to enact more of the second alternative. Thus there is likely to be a variation in the scopes of these alternative forms of action according to different levels in the hierarchy.

The suggestion being made here is that there is identifiable for every incumbent in a role, an ongoing process in which the individual relates to the role and the situation and develops a relatively unique set of relationships and understandings. This process will be referred to as the 'incumbency development process' and briefly defined for the moment, signifies a social activity by which the individual incumbent of a role determines and has determined for him, the parameters, limitations and nature of the
function which he occupies. The normality of such a process is determined by the degree of consensus provided by the role - set in terms of acceptability and expectations. (It is very apparent therefore, that social action and phenomenological concepts are particularly relevant to such a process in which meaning and perception are central determinants.) At this stage in the research however, the formative concept of the 'incumbency development process' has largely emanated from the activities in Company 'F' and particularly of the omnipotent head of the concern and his immediate subordinates. It is now our intention to examine the nature of such a process and related features of organisational behaviour with regard to the major-field study conducted in Company 'T'. Accordingly, the implications, meaning and possible value of such a concept will be discussed following the appraisal of the research findings in Company 'T'.

Succeeding the initiation of the idea from the pilot study, it was particularly intended to employ methods designed to elicit more knowledge about such 'processes' in the major study and, therefore, interviewing techniques were tailored to seek such information.

As has already been suggested, the incumbent - role relationship was interestingly different in Company 'T'. The greater margin of non-prescribed behaviour was such as to create considerable variations between activities over particular rules and to allow for a dominating, pervasive, normative structure which has evidently developed over an extensive period of time. In Company 'T', therefore, the individual characteristics and personal backgrounds were of more significance, particularly with regard to the maintenance and continuity of the normative structure, than in Company 'F'. However, the development of the normative structure could not be ascribed to the effect of personalities alone. Indeed the essence of the hypotheses and the discussion in preceding sections is that the
development of such a structure is processual and therefore 'causal' factors can only be fully assessed by contextual study over a period of time (thus encompassing different individuals). It is therefore appropriate to develop a little further some of the structural organisational features in which the social action occurred, in order that a qualitative assessment of various factors can be attempted.

The company history of powerful competition and survival by entrepreneurial skill was of some significance. The so-called 'merger' (of 1969/70) was in reality the take-over of a larger airline by a smaller and yet more profitable concern. The major difference between the companies however, was that the larger concern had been charter-flight orientated, whilst the smaller now dominant firm was scheduled flight orientated. This difference had important implications for the Sales department which was a focus on this study. The expertise, knowledge and selling activity of the scheduled flights was markedly different from the charter selling activity. For a while, the newly 'merged' company operated in these functionally separate activities which endured the existing pattern of specialist ability in specific areas. However, some eighteen months prior to the study the Sales department was reorganised on geographical rather than functional lines. A structural reorganisation however, patently does not alter the expertise and experience which individuals have developed and it was apparent even when the research enquiries were made that individuals were still conscious of the pre-merger orientations and many managers still professed a specific functional expertise. This background to the relationships which existed between many managers and their roles was most important.

The historical development of the department could be illustrated in many ways. In general terms the tenure of incumbents was undoubtedly significant. Of twenty Sales managers who were interviewed, twelve had been in the company ten years or more. Indeed, of all the 35 managers
interviewed, there was a total of 351 man-years served. The significance of these service records was continually indicated by an intimate knowledge about many aspects of the organisation and its history and by numerous expressions of normative commitment. Further because many of these managers had been with the company for many years it meant a knowledge of and even relationships with senior directors whose status and importance had increased immeasurably with the growth of the concern. In certain instances, the old ties were held to be sufficiently important to deny formal organisational relationships. The manager of administration and mail for example, self-confessedly the oldest serving member of the organisation, was quite clear that if he had a decision-making or any other problem he would not go to his line director or his general manager but to a personal friend - the director of a different department. The reason for this was quite simply that his department, Sales, was felt, dominated by 'charter people' whilst the director he dealt with was from his old ex-schedule flight-operations company. Such relationships were not extensive throughout the department, but did linger in subtle forms despite the General Sales manager professing they were no longer important.

Traditional loyalties are evidently a contributory factor influencing the nature of relationships and the development of the normative structure. In the previous example, as in others, the reaction to such 'informal' behaviour was excused on the basis of its 'customary practice', despite the fact that procedures were being abused. However, there were means by which such individuals, and indeed such informality, might be dealt. This particular senior Manager had had responsibility for administration and mail, but had recently lost the bulk of the administration function. This function was formally decentralised and the deputy assisting in the operation of this work was transferred to another position. It would be a mistake to read any specifically intended behaviour into such a reorganisation other than it was seen as a more effective method of operation. However, a role and a role incumbent which
fitted awkwardly into the departmental structure were conveniently the focus of a reorganisation which saw a diminution in the role at the 'expense' of the incumbent.

This process was an important feature, therefore, in the relationship between an individual and the role he was occupying. It suggests the sanctions which might be enforced, albeit of an implicit nature, to secure the commitment of an individual to the normative, organisational order, or to prevent that 'order' from being undermined. Such an hypothesis needs relating to other examples however to establish to what degree the action was intentional and how it was received by the incumbents. We need to examine the constraints and barriers which individuals are confronted with in their roles which can restrict the areas of influence and control. Inevitably, however, this is a complex problem. How widely known such constraining behaviour may be, is something which is often maintained in silence. As Dalton has said, "the internal power struggles ... are largely denied and must be cloaked." The problems of intentionality in this sense become nullified because respondents are not prepared to declare their action. Again, and this will be discussed in greater depth a little later, this raises some significant issues of action theory with regard to the meaningfulness and the rationality applied to behavioural acts. 14

Returning to the major case study, the phenomenon of long and stable service from many managers was matched by other interesting if not statistically significant features. These relate to the background of some two thirds of all managers being either within the company or the industry in the previous ten years. Further, educational achievement

14. Note: This is a problem with which this research must be concerned because of its centrality to the subjective methods and the theoretical approach of this study. With regard to this immediate issue see A. Schutz: The Phenomenology of the Social World, North Western U.P. Chicago 1969 PP.215-25.
not being a requisite for any positions analysed in the research, the knowledge and expertise learned and gained within the role acquires increased importance for the individual because such learning and experience may have restricted applicability external to the role. These factors are inter-linked and provide insight into this situation rather than generalisable variables. They serve to illustrate however, how an integration of factors can affect the development and relationship existing between individuals and the roles they occupy.

Should an individual's relationship with a company or a department continue for an extensive period of time, it is obvious that this will have an impact on that individual's understanding and perception of the nature and form of roles within that organisation and especially with regard to the closest role-set. Not only will there be various experiences which will have assisted the process of elaboration, but the individual may have a feeling of 'possession' regarding those experiences, and the way in which the experiences related to and affected him. Examples of such experiences will shortly be developed and shown to be variable both in their essential nature, but more particularly in the manner of impact upon the individual. What is obvious is that the experiential potential of a longer serving member of the organisation may lead that individual into a superior status position and thus to a point of greater influence. It follows that longer serving individuals will develop informal practices and have a knowledge of inexplicit expectations which newer recruits to the situation will not have acquired. These practices and the meaning behind them will be of a varied nature and will be influenced by numerous factors. The way in which they impact on the newer entrant will also vary, although the application of the new entrant to interpersonal relationships appears to be particularly significant. What is evident from these remarks is a 'differential incumbency development' consequent upon what apparently is the key factor of length of service in an organisation.

Before expanding these hypotheses with illustrative examples in the case study there are two other related features which influenced the development of patterns of normative
activity, some organisationally maintained (i.e., rather than only in a small role set or group of role sets). These are firstly, the identification of individual goals and secondly the socialising which individuals are conducting within and outside of formal working hours. Of the managers interviewed, twenty-one identified a promotional orientation as an individual goal. The significance of this is essentially as an expression of the need for self-achievement and for many this was evidently a status orientation and was as much associated with their current status position as with movement to a higher position. This had important implications for the incumbency development processes.

The second feature related closely to that of length of service, because the managers who admitted to spending a considerable time in and out of work socialising with colleagues were largely those with the longest service. This tends to reinforce the suggestion that longer service not only gives individuals a more extensive appreciation of the normative structures in the organisation, but also greater opportunity to influence behaviour and establish non-formalised behaviour within a formal framework. Whilst many managers suggested that the organisational operation was dependent upon extensive personal relationships, for some managers, considerable effort was made to enhance the nature of these relationships, both within and outside of the work context. The establishment of the significance of such 'social' activity and the spill-over effect into the organisational operation is a further research project in itself. In Company 'T' several managers suggested they spent time with colleagues in various gatherings; often marketing or sales occasions for the Sales managers; some in the company club and others in company sports teams. Three managers belonged to an elite London Club for international airline personnel. Other activity was less openly admitted to, such as the socialising of Sales managers in the evening either in the office or local pubs and hotels. As Dalton discovered, social ties are an important means of strengthening the integration and
boundaries of cliques as well as for furthering individual careers in the promotional hierarchy. Dalton found that this rate of interaction and social activity was very much related to the functional dependency. "Having to depend on some more than others their 'interaction rate' is consequently much greater with some than with others.

Hence despite formal equality, prescribed relations and assumed objectivity, they draw closer emotionally to some and share community as well as job experiences with them."

The same affinity was discovered with 'old timers' who came together because they had 'been through things together.'

Variations in the nature of this social activity in Company 'T' illustrated how individuals could react differently to the same circumstance. The Sales manager for example, said he had only rarely gone to the Company social club - his home was some distance away and this apparently prevented his attendance. For others the social club was a regular meeting place. Some managers in Sales regretted that there were so many functions and social occasions, whilst others regretted that the invitations were not more liberally distributed. It did appear that social integration in the Sales department was often a function of levels in the hierarchy, again supporting Dalton's assessment of cliques (in this case horizontal cliques). This was interesting


16. Note: This idea of variable rates of interaction affecting the learning of different types of behaviour shows an interesting similarity to Sutherland's concept as used in criminology. Sutherland developed an explanation for criminal behaviour by the concept of 'differential association.' This depended on interaction with other criminals conveying their experiences and behaviours to susceptible, potential criminals. Without making the analogy along the lines of deviation it must be apparent that much managerial behaviour is also learnt by the process of 'differential association.' The value of this idea is in its means of partially explaining why some individuals adopt certain behavioural activities and others do not.

because in the same department, authority relations and
tantamount status were apparently not very rigidly defined
and did not delineate the levels of management. However,
in the Support Service department where authority and status
were more overt, even to the point of braided uniforms, there
existed a more relaxed social integration, vertically and
horizontally throughout the department. Different working
environments, varied perceptions of status and relationships
and perhaps a different departmental identification may
have contributed to these mixed patterns of social
relationships. It was not possible to say however, how
such relationships directly influenced operational activities
although in various forms it was obvious that an effect did
exist.

These then were some of the influential factors affecting
the development of the incumbent in his role, and the
assessment of these factors was conducted alongside the
enquiries about activities in specific roles. It follows
that in these examples the meaningfulness of such
circumstances becomes a reality for the incumbents. In
this section about the incumbent and his role, there have
emerged factors of varying significance in the process of
role learning and organisational behaviour. It is these
factors, such as the tenure of employment in the company
the development of normative expectations, restructuring of
the extant organisation, identification of goals and pattern
of socialising which are of significance as contextual
factors influencing the process now labelled the incumbency
development process. These factors cannot be isolated or
held as constant, nor can they or should they be quantified
to illustrate a positive multi-variate relationship. They
are variables which only have importance for incumbents and
the roles to which they relate. The meaningfulness of the
circumstances which these factors create will be illustrated
by the examples which emerged from the case study and which
will now be developed. The immediate intention however,
is to continue to expand upon the contextual significance
of the factors affecting the ongoing role processes which
are of such importance in the understanding of organisational
behaviour.
Some Situational Factors influencing Role Processes

In the Sales department, there were various instances which illustrated how individuals responded to situations and subsequently to a redefinition of their role. The department was, as we know, geographically divided into regions of the globe - routes as they were known - and within each route there was a mix of the different functional responsibilities. Thus each managers with titles such as Passenger Sales Manager and Cargo Sales Manager and Charter Sales Manager. As has already been commented, these functional managers sometimes possessed an expertise which their superiors might not have had and therefore Route Sales Managers in particular tended to delegate extensive responsibility to their subordinate, functional managers. However, this functionally based operation depended upon arrangements and procedures working in the department to achieve effective co-ordination. Where these were perceived as inadequate individual managers supplemented the 'procedures with other methods. Thus for example, the Route Sales Managers reacted in various ways to the dilemma of their own role. They had responsibility for several functions in their route, but may have had poor knowledge of, for example, cargo or charter activities. They were therefore faced with the problem of delegating full responsibility for this to the appropriate subordinate manager or try and keep some control over the activity themselves. The Route Sales Managers also had perceptual and experiential differences regarding the authority vested in their roles. One such manager suggested that because 'up to 20%' of business which he might have realised had been lost because of slow decision making, he now made more decisions himself. He did this extensively, only reporting upwards for a decision on certain occasions, these occasions being determined for him by a 'gut feeling.'

Various reasons were ascribed to this situation - a situation which occurred with other Route Sales Managers.
Several managers were responding to an unspecified decision-making hierarchy, which frequently created problems. Their response was to take decisions themselves:

Manager: "It's often difficult to get hold of somebody who theoretically has authority to make decisions. If that decision has to be made it needs to be made immediately and I find that personal relationships will assist in making the decision — I may go to a colleague and we will make the appropriate decision ourselves."

The same manager felt that despite an 'informal' decision-making process this 'procedure' — "works well enough.... relationships here are very good and enable us to do these things."

The route sales manager for the South Atlantic lines had a particular decision-making orientation, partly determined by a split of authority. His counterpart route sales manager was in Buenos Aires.

Manager: "..... we complicate things by having reversed procedure. The route sales manager in Buenos Aires finds it very difficult obviously to report on any continuous or regular basis to our boss. So I do that, on behalf of the Route; if we have a routes meeting here, Gerry (from Buenos Aires) doesn't necessarily come up to it. I just hold the meeting and report upwards, and in fact I behave like a Route sales manager although I am not he."

Interviewer: "And this is largely because of the geographical splits?"

Manager: "I think so. It would be ludicrous to keep calling him up here to appear at meetings which really do not need his presence, because at the end of the day I suppose the authority emanates from Head Office. So really a decision might be made without him in any case, but he is consulted, obviously regularly on what happens, as it affects him."
Other suggestions were made as to the determination of impact on decision making; suggestions which held less tangible explanation than an excusable geographical split.

Interviewer: "What sort of issues do you go to him (manager's boss) on; what sort of matters?"

Manager: "Well, fairly important things I guess, basic things, which I think would require his attention because they might affect other company activities or they might require company funding to a degree that I might not be able to authorise. Basically I know the things I think I ought to consult him on. I couldn't describe to you. I know basically what is within the limits of my authority, and so I go to him for anything outside of that."

Interviewer: "And you say for example, company funding can be one of the things outside of your limit. Is there a certain point at which you have to go to him to get his agreement?"

Manager: "No, nothing formal."

Interviewer: "How do you know then, when you should go to him?"

Manager: "It is not a question of getting a figure and saying, look if it is over £4,000 I must go to him or something of this nature, it is really saying; well this promotion might get deeper and deeper and I might need greater and greater finance, and more and more resources, which may have to be provided by somebody else in the company. Therefore this way he becomes involved because the company as a whole, rather than a Route, becomes involved, so I go to him for anything that I would personally feel to be outside of my scope."
Interviewer: "But what exactly is this sort of feeling, how do you get to this personal feeling?"

Manager: "I suppose it's a question of past experience, it is a question of knowing the people you are working with; I know how Gordon, feels about a variety of things, various programmes, various types of traffic, various markets; I can think for him because I have seen him make decisions in the past, because we have been working closely with each other for a long time."

Interviewer: "So in a certain area if you know what his decision will be you will make it?"

Manager: "Yes. The idea is to go ahead and make as many as possible without keep referring them because that can bog things down, and it's the old story if things go well you get a pat on the back, and if they don't well every now and again you get a kick anyway!"

A further Route Sales Manager was very dissatisfied with his own role, and again, illustrated by his experience the nature of the processual relationship between the individual and his role. The problem this manager faced related to the fact that he had ideas and strongly held views regarding departmental organisation of marketing, and to satisfy these views he attempted to maintain some self initiated marketing activities.

One such activity was the relationship with travel agents and the maintenance, within the department, of an 'agency' function possessing appropriate information. (Several other managers in Sales had no knowledge that this agency activity even existed and complained about its 'absence.') The same Route Sales Manager also complained of the decision-making hierarchy which he said resulted in "decisions being avoided." Authority relationships, it seems, had always been implicit. His job had been verbally conveyed to him for ten minutes when he was first appointed and since then he had "carried
on somethings because otherwise they wouldn't be done."

This manager had also submitted various reports, with suggestions, to the General Sales Manager, for example, on an agency fares department and on management training and had received no response. He was aware that he was a 'dead duck' and 'redundant' because to save duplication his role could be taken over by other route Sales managers. This lack of response to his attempt to influence and alter organisational operation led eventually to his resignation. Again this is a strong reinforcement of the implicit power lying behind an organisational normative order. If an individual attempts to restructure in ways not deemed of value, not only by the immediate role set where consensus might be power, but also in the higher echelons, then the individual can be rebutted simply by ignoring his efforts.

The subordinate managers in the routes were expected to resolve the relationship dilemmas within the department in so far as they affected their roles. Moving down through the hierarchy therefore, the impression of an increasingly parochial view was apparent. Each unit of activity was only concerned with itself and the units to which it directly related. Any overview of the 'total' organisation which might have been expected came only from the General Sales Manager and the Marketing Director. The effect of this insularity was conveyed most forcibly by the General Sales manager when he commented, "There may be some confusion with the junior managers!" The middle and lower managers therefore not only had to resolve their own role dilemmas but had to reconcile themselves to a situation in which such problems as role ambiguity were attributed to the incumbents of the role s rather than the roles themselves. The General Sales Manager continued, "Experience sorts this one out - they bring a lot of these problems on themselves.... experience counts here, how long he's been with us, how well he knows people."

The General Sales manager expressed an altogether different perspective on many of those issues. Whether for defensive reasons or to appear to be efficient and practicable
to an outsider, the General manager denied the vagueness of authority definition and of the dominating effect of personal and situational impact.

General Manager: ".... So in fact the route sales managers have a very high degree of authority and responsibility. There are specific aspects where they have to obtain higher approval, and these are defined and they vary from route to route.

.... In other words one tends to lay down where they have to refer back, rather than define every aspect of what they are doing and say, "You can't do that without referring back" - it is simpler that way and therefore more flexible. Which is why you won't find much written down; and some of the things that are written down we don't publicise anyway, they are between the Route Sales Managers and their immediate superiors."

Interviewer: ".... Is there a cut off point there?"

General Manager: "Yes, there is .... "

The approach of those subordinate to routes managers again varied as a function of many elements in the situation, length of service, knowledge of other departments and the people in other departments and so forth. In the Cargo function particularly, several role incumbents were faced with the role dilemma of a dual reporting system. One of those incumbents was particularly incensed at the situation he faced which he variously described as "pathetic" and "chaotic" with a "cumbersome structure (in which there are) .... no clearly defined lines of authority." This Cargo manager also received rebuffs for his ideas and felt aggrieved because the function he represented was not developed and suffered due to the attitude of other managers responsible for other functions (such attitudes were expressed by another manager who said, "Cargo is a good fill-in but it wastes a lot of time in flying and administration.")
The Cargo manager in question said he reported to the superior who showed most interest in his work and to whom he could reasonably relate, although this relationship was not strictly that of the organisation chart. Another Cargo manager actually refused to work through one of his superiors because, said the Cargo manager, "He doesn't understand what he's supposed to do and anyway I don't respect him!" Within this complex maze of reporting and line authority relationships, the dependency upon individual personality relations very much influenced the managers in their roles. Thus some Cargo managers operated more easily in their ambiguous dual reporting role than did others.

The 'incensed' Cargo manager recalled other sources of aggravation which had occurred and were more personally related. In one instance he referred to a request to transport tropical fish which senior management rejected as a non-viable proposition. The senior managers and the directors not only lost a large order according to him, but they also "lied" about the situation in the process. When senior management were questioned on this experience they said that research and development costs into effective transportation methods (when a trial was made all the fish died) made the project impracticable. The issue therefore became one of the individual manager interpreting senior management's response to his efforts. Was this a reflection on the importance of the general function which he as a manager represented, or was it due to his perseverance that he was eventually rebuffed? This and similar experiences gave this manager an orientation and a cognitive reasoning for his personalised interpretation of the organisational hierarchy. This experience was one of many which would be construed by managers as in the words of one Sales manager 'finding out' and 'personally fitting into the structure on the basis of who you expected would give advice or make decisions.' The learning process would find barriers; limits beyond which it was expected of the individual that he would not easily trespass. Each individual had to ascertain how 'things were done' by assessing where the limits existed. The process
however, was obviously a function of, indeed a consequence of many factors such as have already been mentioned and therefore each individual experience appeared to possess many unique elements. The process could be dominated by adaptation or by innovation or just learning what normative constraints might be imposed upon individuals.

'Adaptation' was how one manager described the situation when he entered his role as a Charter Manager. Certain forms were adapted by him to suit his needs and he developed his own methods of operation, there being no explicit methods. If problems arose the process by which they were dealt with was by way of a self-determined procedure. On one occasion he was unable to secure an aeroplane because of crewing difficulties. The usual procedure here would be to either accept this decision, or if the request was important then approach higher management within Sales, probably his Routes Manager. In fact he went to the Chief Pilot who was responsible for crewing and subsequently found his crew by that means. Senior management when asked about such breaks in procedure suggested that this was acceptable. It was inappropriate to make strict definitions about such matters they said and to quote the General Manager, "Salesmen have been brought up not to accept (these situations) and to question a little deeper."

The important issue here is that what is ascribed as 'informal' behaviour has been achieved through incumbents using the discretion which implicitly management suggest is accepted. The use of this by-passing approach in this situation was however caused by the fact that the manager concerned had worked in crewing, knew the allocation methods and the departmental staff. In this instance therefore, the label - 'informal' - ought to be retained because the manager is acting independently of the role-set and is therefore neither meeting expectations nor behaving with any degree of regularity. The role however has certain objectives and the individual seeks to achieve these objectives by means which he has ascertained. That such methods may be beyond the scope of formal procedure need not concern the individual unless he has sanctions invoked against him either by members of the role set or by senior management. In fact in this
situation, as in many others, senior management knew nothing of what had happened except in as much as their objectives were being met. In this case therefore there is little likelihood of the method adopted becoming formalised, even by explicit approval (amongst other things such approval might question the ability and autonomy of another department's functional organisation). The informality therefore associated with this event is a function of the role incumbent and in processual terms, the informality will lapse when the incumbent leaves the role. The importance of this can be seen in terms of previously discussed concepts where the action is only of immanent significance to those directly involved. It is not of transcendental significance to the organisation. In other words it is significant in the momentary aspect of how the incumbent behaves and how he may be acting in order to achieve the goals he is seeking to satisfy. The action does not transcend the situation and falls into disuse because of lack of formal continuity.

The Differential Incumbency Development Process

This concept referred to earlier, has had support for its essential idea in the comments of Cunnison, when she remarked that there is an "essentially individualistic basis of the social organisation."\(^\text{18}\) In this sense it is possible to discuss the impact of social structure upon behaviour and about the various factors influencing individuals in their incumbency development process. However, to impose a quantitative meaning upon such processes would destroy the primary significance of the activity. Social science has commonly courted danger in such analyses by imposing a second order meaning and presenting this as a factual order. Cicourel succinctly expressed his dissatisfaction with such methods: "The sociologist's model of actor competence and performance remains implicit and does not address how the

actor perceives and interprets his environment, how certain rules govern exchanges and how the actor recognizes what is taken to be 'strange', familiar', 'acceptable' etc., about someone so as to link these attributes with a preconceived notion of status role.19 Accepting therefore that each process by which an individual relates to his role and role set is distinctly subjective, there are three issues of immediate concern. Firstly the impact of social structure upon the process; secondly the nature of the process itself and any patterns of uniformity and thirdly the contextual significance of these processes in a collective structure. With regard to these important features there will be a discussion on the succeeding section dealing with theoretical implications of the study.

The impact of such a process would, by strong inference, vary particularly according to the length of time the incumbent spent in the company and in the role. The idea of a differential incumbency development process is best examined with regard to new role incumbents when situational experiences are nil and expectations need to be established. In the Sales department, there were two such individuals and both exhibited the problems of learning an implicit formal or normative structure. The first of these was a Passenger Sales Manager for one of the routes. This position dealt entirely with scheduled flights; he "did not understand the language of the others" - others being the charter people. This Passenger Sales Manager summed up the dilemma of his incumbency development problems when he said,

"I get so confused; there's a tremendous overlap; it's ridiculous. It doesn't affect the running of the company, but it just doesn't seem necessary."

As with other managers, this individual blamed problems on the organisation structure when and where it was evident.

Perhaps in this case partly because of a less forceful personality, he evidently did not really understand the normative structure of his department, or indeed the Company. Significantly, this manager ascribed higher status to lower line management than anyone else, and said that the Sales Executives (salesmen) were of managerial status. With regard to his responsibilities concerning personnel, recruitment, disciplining and so forth he admitted he "did not know the answer." As for the decision making structure: "You find out for yourself what happens!"

A small but interesting incident occurred during the discussion with this manager. A Sales Executive with longer service in the department but of no hierarchical standing, entered the office and asked what the manager was doing the following week. When the manager replied that he had one or two half days free he was duly informed how to arrange his timetable to fit in some trips and meetings which had been arranged. The brusque and dictatorial manner of the Sales Executive would have been rudely rebuked by other managers. Another incident occurred when the 'new' manager telephoned the transport department to ask for a car. Told that he could not have a car he informed another manager of equal if not lesser status, but again longer serving. This second manager immediately telephoned again and ordered a car which promptly arrived!

The other new incumbent was a senior Sales Manager, at the so-called System level - that is responsible for a function throughout the entire system or covering all the routes. The problem of this manager was that his responsibilities took him into the domain of the routes managers, so that he would be earning revenue for the individual routes. This could create duplication, indeed this had happened when one external agent was using one manager in the department to bargain against another manager. The 'new' senior Sales Manager, however, was also confused by the structure and the role which he was supposed to be occupying. When interviewed he was shortly going to his director - "To clarify my position."

Other managers were helpful and friendly to the new manager
but were also patronising and several said to the researcher that this particular Sales Manager - "Know nothing about the airline industry." The implication was quite clear that the longer serving managers acted within a protective normative structure which could not easily be explained to "outsiders." The defence of the General Manager to this situation being a "matter of understanding" concealed the point that what had to be understood was a pattern of expectations and behaviours which each individual had to discover, adapt to and basically operate within. In the cases of new incumbents, dissonance between themselves and the departments was accepted by the new managers as part of an awkward induction process. For the senior manager in this case however, the process could be alleviated somewhat by his fortuitous relationships with directors and especially the company chairman who had procured his appointment.

Relationships with significant seniors could evidently affect the differential incumbency development process as was indicated by this senior Sales Manager and by other examples already quoted. Another instance indicated the extensive knowledge and influence a relatively lowly manager had acquired. This particular manager had been with the company many years and his devotion to duty was, in part, reflected by a proud wearing of the Company tie and various other insignia. However, deference to structural authority was expressed by his relationship with the chairman when the chairman wanted some airline tickets for some friends. Tickets could not, under Company rules, be provided at the cheap rate for anyone other than personal family. The chairman, however, decided to use the 'informal' network to secure cheap tickets for his friends. Such a practice is meaningful in several ways. Firstly, because it was 'informal' behaviour which would have been normatively unacceptable were it generally known. However, it was furtive behaviour, directed toward individual goals and could not conceivably have been advantageous to the organisation (the label 'informal' in this context will be dealt with shortly). Accordingly, even though it was behaviour directed by the highest executive, it had no
consensus legitimation and was 'informal', individually, orientated behaviour. However, its very occurrence suggests to the subordinates involved that such behaviour is not impermissible if handled correctly, and indeed the moral of obtaining results without too much concern for the means of attainment was certainly evident.

**Further Factors influencing Role Processes**

The support services department of Company 'T' provided further illustrations of relationships within the department and with others outside the department indicating the efficacy of the incumbency development concept. Much of the dynamics of the study of this department focused upon the support services from within the Company. This had been a deliberate policy based on the assumption that internal appointments would provide the department with men who already possessed a working knowledge of the organisation.

In fact this policy recoiled on the director who had suggested making internal appointments and he admitted to the researcher that the appointments should have been at least partly external. The reason for the failure of the policy was as follows. The function of the new controllers was a co-ordinating, liaison function requiring a determination of priorities on the 'ramp' area. These men needed to remain aloof from the means of handling the operation and merely concern themselves with operational decision making which subordinate managers, the duty officers particularly, would enact. However, because the controllers had had operational experience within the Company themselves they were finding it very difficult in some cases not to "get their hands dirty." As the General Manager said, "If they do get their hands dirty they are not doing their jobs properly."

This difficult situation met with varying reactions by the controllers, and this in itself was of interest because they had all experienced the same 'on the job' training routine and had the same terms of reference. Whilst one of the controllers in particular was interfering substantially
in the handling of operational activity, another was almost literally doing nothing and waiting for people to contact him on the telephone. That this latter controller had only six telephone calls (and telephones were the main communication link) in two weeks meant he was not very busy! Yet another controller had decided the situation was sufficiently dynamic for him to influence some of the rather vague authority relationships particularly with a department called Movement Control. Movement Control was responsible for all company aircraft and their movement throughout the world. However, at the base airport the support services controllers also required some control over aircraft movement and certainly required information of any movements. There was potentially a source of bitter friction between these departments and yet despite this one controller felt he was "trying to make the job" (by which he meant give it some meaning and status which was initially in general doubt). In 'making the job' he created overt conflict with Movement Control which was seen as and intended as an attack on the authority they exerted over the support services department. The outcome was a meeting arranged between the departments, but the point had been made and the need for changing the focus of local control had been effectively challenged. In this process therefore, the individual concerned was affecting not only his role but the role and function of the support service controller in general. Therefore, the incumbency development process was being influenced for all incumbents by a peer who had decided to examine and extend what he thought to be the necessary authority of the job. He was quite clear about what action he was taking although a little doubtful as to its ultimate purpose. "I do not feel insecure in my job - but am I going the right way?" was how he rhetorically phrased his role dilemma. For this individual, therefore, the situation was seen as being as dynamic and forceful as he was prepared to make.

The role dilemma was fully evident therefore and each individual occupant determined his behaviour within the framework of permissible choices. External to the role and
in relation to other roles, this position obviously had substantial repercussions. Were individuals conforming sufficiently to the norms, and departmental 'rules'? If the judgement was that these new roles were not being enacted as intended (by whom?) then what action could be taken to achieve compliance? This was expressed by one of the senior departmental managers:

Manager: "There are teething troubles at the moment. You see the Controller had no authority over his staff at all, other than to say, "That is the priority, I want all the manpower on there and all the equipment on there.""

Interviewer: "Is that how it operated then?"

Manager: "No, it is half and half. At the moment we have got the individual problem. We have got the individual who is not doing what he should be doing. This is causing aggravation in the ranks and this is fed down to me. Now I am not responsible operationally for the Controllers, I have no control over them at all, other than administrative. I have passed this on to who is responsible, and we are taking steps to get over it - but we do expect it to a degree."

Interviewer: "You expected what, - that they would start making operational decisions?"

Manager: "Well, they are paid to make operational decisions, but they are not paid to get involved with the mundane operations - but they have been!"

This discussion realised the perceptual differences about the role of the controllers. However, in this instance, rather than allowing the role to become self-determined and to create a normative relationship with the immediate role-set, on the basis that controllers had undefined authority and were trying to establish some norms, a senior manager was exerting conformity on the basis of the disharmony and
aggravation felt by the role-set. This lack of clarity and the looseness of norms led to a process either of elaboration or normative expectations, so that individuals were given more precise definitions of situations, or of rules being imposed coercively. The degree to which this process was one of normative elaboration or coercive imposition (or indeed a combination of both) varied in this company as a consequence of the dominant situational culture. The essential point is that there was a process which was initiated by various behaviours and that the labels are much less significant than an understanding of the process and why it is handled differently as a function of different situations. Therefore the normative and coercive categorisations are useful if seen in the sense of social processes and not merely as descriptions of organisational cultures. The social process surrounding the role of the controllers and the respective incumbents was a fundamental process on the basis that a pattern of relationships, a history of experience and expectation, was just beginning.

Whilst having no direct line responsibilities to the controllers, the support services duty officers were the key men in the operational sense. All supervision in the department reported to the duty officers and these were the men responsible for handling the instructions of the controller. It was evident, however, that some friction existed between the duty officers and the controllers. One or two of the duty officers had failed to obtain promotion to the new controller posts and coupled with this were the feelings, firstly, that the controllers' role was unnecessary and secondly that they, the controllers, had withdrawn authority and part of the function from the duty officers. Two of the five duty officers did not find these problems because they had themselves only recently become duty officers and were finding sufficient problems in learning the role without concern for, or indeed perception of, loss of any authority or functional activity. Thus the difference in relations between the incumbent and their role in this job was very much a function of previous role experience as well as the reorganisation and establishment of a new and generally vague 'senior' role. The response in general, however, to the new situation of having co-ordinators in the form of controllers,
was for the duty officers to express their dissatisfaction in ways which conveyed a latent conflict. Thus 'sloppy behaviour' and general 'slackness' have been sharply criticised by the department managers. (Their response to the new controllers was indeed not untypical of the response sometimes ascribed to supervision in manufacturing industry where there are production controllers. Production Controllers are usually responsible to, or at least accompanied by a production manager and the responsibilities and authority separating the two roles are often ambiguous and vague. Accordingly subordinates find it difficult to relate to one or both of the senior production management and tension can and does develop.)

The duty officers, rather like some of the lower line management, in Sales found that they suffered from the lack of clarity of both authority relationships and functional responsibilities. This led to situations arising in which the duty officers were either isolated and not given support by senior management or were blamed for inefficiency and lack of commitment. Thus, for example, the divisional manager whilst admitting that the "Duty Officers are not receiving support" also commented that "if trivial offences are being reported by duty officers then we will look at the duty officers or the supervision rather than at the department or the offender." The Duty Officer's immediate superior also expressed the view that the responsibility for the problems of the Duty Officer were essentially those of the individuals and not the role - "if the Duty Officers are not committed to the new arrangements (referring to the controllers) then they must have attitudes which are not in accord with the general interests of the Company." There were also incidents which reflected the role situation of the duty officers and how they reacted to certain circumstances.

One important incident which several respondents referred to, related to the 'non-drinking rule.' The ramp area had many vehicles using the marked roads and servicing aircraft, and the danger of a major accident because of an over-indulgent driver was very real. Accordingly a rule had been made that
no drinking was allowed whilst on duty. Over a period of time this was allowed to lapse to a degree whereby drinking was acceptable if it was 'not in excess'. However, on one occasion a duty officer interpreted the rule 'to the letter,' found a driver who had been drinking and suspended him. Subsequently the drivers all 'walked out' and an industrial dispute began. Initially the duty officer was supported by senior management, but eventually when the drivers refused to go back to work, the duty officer's decision was annulled and the driver reinstated. This decision had diverse repercussions for the individual duty officer as well as for the role itself. The other duty officers had experienced this lack of support before and such a situation led to cautious relationships with the unions and (the 'gash hands') their members, the drivers and loaders.

The contradiction here became fully apparent when the Senior Support Services Officer claimed to have clarified what he wanted from his staff and that if they responded he would duly provide support, no matter what the circumstances:

Senior Support Services Manager: "The problem is that it is very difficult to get operational people together, difficult because of the fact of the work. I have made it clear when I have spoken to these gentlemen (duty officers) that I am not happy with the standard at the moment, far from it, and that I am expecting a lot from them. But in return I will back them up, and if they have any problems I will do anything I can to help, even if they are in the wrong I will back them up."

The whole issue of support related to role understanding and the determination of parameters appears vital to the process of socialisation to organisational life. It is not just a matter of role learning or role-taking but a complex arrangement of individuals relating to roles and role-sets within and in relationship to a 'total' organisational context.
The example above expresses how one individual was influencing the process in an immediate role set and the expectations he was elaborating so that people had a greater understanding of their roles. Similar examples were provided in the Sales department and in Company 'F' where managers were imposing a definition of the situation by confirmation of boundaries concerning role behaviour. The basis for such clarification came from the variations in behaviour which were commonly exhibited and recognised, and which led to responses accordingly to the attitudes and feelings of the more influential managers. The creation of tensions and strains which were also exhibited were accordingly related to the variation in intervention by these managers, and by their interpretation of why there was flexibility. This process inevitably sometimes questioned the normatively determined boundaries of behaviour.

The divisional manager, for example, philosophically accepted this interpretation of role situation affecting the duty officers as an inconsistency, commenting: "If you employ humans they are going to work as humans!" He continued:

There is a band (which he referred to as accounting for about \( \frac{1}{3} \)rd of individual behaviour) within which people operate - they have flexibility within that band which is accounted for by human differences." The validity of such an explanation might well be questioned, although the significance of comments such as those of the senior support services officer and of the divisional manager are important in as much as these comments express their own reactions and behaviour in relation to their subordinates. Indeed, throughout the study there emerged from senior management and directors the general explanation of organisational behaviour as emanating from the formal organisation which was clearly established and achieved its objectives. They knew or claimed they knew of so-called informal behaviour and could provide their own rationalisations of why such behaviour occurred. In both Sales and Support Services the most common reasons for informality and breaking procedure were ascribed to personalities and individual differences, coupled with an inadequacy to cope with many of the problems at middle and junior management. At the same time
senior management did not anticipate a more highly formalised situation, in terms of the extant organisation, would be any more effective.

This situation has been noted elsewhere by Emery when he said, "It is undesirable to 'overstructure' the role system because of the rigidity and lack of responsibility this engenders. Contingencies, by their very nature cannot be planned so that they occur when a particular class of persons is present and able to deal with them; if everyone is made formally responsible then in practice, no one is responsible. The inadequacies of formal role definition are likely to become more obvious the more detailed and precise the division of labour."\textsuperscript{20}

Difference in orientation was, then, apparent in Company 'T' at different levels of management. And without easily finding explanations of individual commitment to the varying normative approaches, it was nevertheless possible to see how such variations influenced individual behaviour and the relationship with their role. However, whilst varying normative approaches existed between different departments and different levels of the organisation, it was apparent that they were required, of necessity, to co-exist together. Thus the sanctions (authority control systems) which could and had been enforced, if an individual acted in contradiction to his immediate normative expectations, essentially served the purpose of maintaining an organisational order. Ironically, it was apparent that certain goals, some of which all levels of management identified (i.e. financial/profitability) and which might reasonably be classed as organisational goals, were not necessarily serviced by such an organisational order. The survival of such an order is in fact due to reasons other than merely direct organisational goal achievement. In the airline company, most of the incidents referred to earlier in

this thesis were verbally recalled, by the researcher, to the
directors and senior managers and in no case was the response
from these individuals indicative of the suggestion that
controls or sanctions should have been imposed upon the
'deviants,' or the culprits of informal behaviour, who had
not conformed to formally prescribed procedures. But, further
to Emery, not only would increased formality be inadequate to
cope with such strains it would not be desirable because of
the concern for other aspects of the organisational activity.

A further example will illustrate this point. In the Support
services department a supervisor noted and reported an
important sign that had been knocked over and destroyed whilst
in place on the ramp area. According to senior management
there existed a strict procedure that, for dealings with
another department, in this case for replacements or repairs,
there should be internal departmental approval. This the
supervisor proceeded to follow, however after some two or
three months of delay, he decided to pursue the replacement
directly. Thus the supervisor had recognised the procedure
proved too cumbersome and tardy at which time he used a
'contact' in the maintenance department and obtained a new
sign.

The divisional director, during conversation regarding this
example, was able to rationalise the behaviour of the
supervisor on the basis that initiative had been shown and
results achieved. On criteria of role achievement therefore,
the supervisor had been successful. However, such achievement
had been at the expense of the recognised procedure, although
whilst contravening this procedure the supervisor was never
rebuked. In itself this was an incident that could be as
significant as the role incumbent was prepared to make. If
the individual decided that such practices are desirable on
the basis of exhibiting initiative, perhaps impressing
managers who are looking for promotion material or achieving
certain individual objectives, it is possible that his general
role behaviour could alter on the basis that what he had done
in a specific instance was not impermissible. If this
happened, with even only implicit approval of his role set,
the establishment of a further behavioural norm may be the
outcome. The new norm would suggest that such relations with
other departments are acceptable if the individual is expressing personal initiative!

Again this particular example should be identified as 'dissensus' behaviour, despite having an organisational goal objective. This is, however, a categorisation which is very much part of the processual activity and it would appear more likely that behaviour of an informal nature would eventually become acceptable to a role set if it was perceived to be directed toward goal achievement. The research problem, however, is to observe the development of such 'normative' activity if indeed it is replicated sufficiently often and ultimately accepted by the role set. In a short term study this was not possible. The very differentiation of such behaviours, however, is quite significant and does, whilst only portraying a short aspect of the processual activity, give a number of indications as to how such behaviour might fit into a broader theoretical understanding of organisational behaviour. The organisationally orientated behaviour of this supervisor, for example, whilst identified as being informal in nature, is markedly different from behaviour specifically seeking to further or maintain individual objectives within the organisation. A duty officer indicated the type of behaviour in support services when he recalled a situation where an aircraft's exhaust was splaying stones over the cars parked in a nearby carpark. Being a stationary aircraft on the 'ramp', the incident was the duty officer's responsibility and he therefore prepared a report. The duty officer privately admitted to the researcher that the fault was not due to the position of the aircraft near the carpark but to the captain of the aircraft over-revving. Nevertheless the first reason was conveyed in the report and the incident was closed. Informal behaviour in this example therefore was used to protect an individual and could not be interpreted as having an organisational objective. Furthermore the duty officer concerned would obviously not try and project this as something which could receive consent of the role set for he knew the consequences would be stringently enforced sanctions. The
imposition of such sanctions was not in question as long as the role-set remained uninformed, whilst if the captain of the aircraft was aware of his error he would be appreciative of the duty officer's report. Thus again personal relationships, supposedly important in the organisation and indirectly essential to achieve organisational objectives, are hereby strengthened on an informal non-organisational basis.

The 'consensus' in this situation only existed between two people - the duty officer and the captain. Other individuals in the duty officer's role-set provided no support because in the main they lacked any knowledge of the incident. Therefore, on the basis that this was 'dissensus' behaviour it could be classified as 'informal.' However, because it was also directed toward achieving individual goals as opposed to 'organisational' goals it was 'individually orientated informal behaviour.' In this sense such behaviour is extra organisations - or beyond what we have referred to as an 'organisational order' in terms of the co-existence of various normative systems. We have now discovered several examples of such informal behaviour and these forms of behaviour should be distinguished from those which may become part of the formalising process, largely by virtue of their closer affinity with organisational goals. The term suggested for such 'individually orientated informal behaviour' is 'inordinate' behaviour. The basic implication of this term is that it is behaviour beyond the scope of that consistent with the implicit 'organisational order.' The individual recognises this by maintaining a degree of secrecy and furtiveness about such behaviour and thus himself denying the possibility of its organisational acceptance. The term 'inordinate' is not meant to imply deviant behaviour however, for this suggests that it is anti-organisational and no such value orientation is made in this concept.

The influence of 'authority' upon Role Processes.

An area requiring further examination before moving into an appraisal of the concepts and the hypotheses is with regard to the understanding and use of authority. Within Company 'T' there was a strong degree of consistency on certain areas of
authority, for example all managers, except one, stated quite adamantly that they could not create a new position. The exception was again the aged senior Sales manager with personal contacts on the board. To an extent this manager projected the image of a 'toothless bulldog' and therefore not too much effort need be made to explain this 'discrepancy.' With regard to authority to allocate work the almost unanimous response was that the individual manager allocate work relating to his own department, although there was considerable vagueness regarding what type of work and the definition of departmental boundaries was usually sufficiently loosely described as to inhibit much insight on this question. The authority to reorganise work programmes, was again a question found to be very relative to the individual managers' situation. Of all managers in both Sales and Support Services only five said they could not reorganise work programmes. All five managers were in roles with considerable isolation in the sense that they were relatively self-dependent roles. The incumbents of these roles evidently found it harder to specify their authority limits because their relationships with other roles are limited, thus restricting the process which assists the individual in identifying his authority.

Some inconsistency was found with regard to 'authority to change the duties prescribed for particular functions.' Again the full implications are difficult to gauge as different 'system sales managers' interpreted their ability to change prescribed role duties in varying ways. Authority to discipline also exposed some differences in role interpretation (and were an expression of the problems the company was having with industrial relations). Twenty managers said they could discipline although the extent of the discipline they felt they could impose varied from a verbal warning to suspension from the job. An example has already been given (concerning the drinking of alcohol rule) illustrating what can happen when suspending, even if, apparently, there is an authorised right to suspend! In the same department, 'support services,' one of the 'non-line' managers, a controller, still identified the authority to discipline. This could hardly be 'legitimate' if theoretically he has no line relationship over other people. Nevertheless that was his preception and whether or not it had been formalised he believed he had the authority to discipline.
According to the board of directors and to the industrial relations manager there is a disciplinary procedure though nobody could provide details as to its operation or formal nature. The industrial relations manager was not very interested in such formality, saying that "the more formal you are the more you confuse!" The same manager confessed that industrial relations is an "unprecise subject" and that the extensive use of 'unofficial channels' was dependent upon the 'quality of relationships.' Without suggesting too great an inflection upon such an industrial relations policy, this research has already made extensive comments about how the 'quality of relationships' is a function of a wide range of variables and therefore the susceptible nature of these 'relationships.'

The variations in individually identified authority continued with regard to dismissals; particularly in Sales where several managers below general manager said they had authority to dismiss. However, board level policy is that dismissals can only be made from above and including, the General manager level.

The ability to alter conditions of employment and to spend money were quite strictly controlled and understood by all managers. No-one below the board confessed authority to alter conditions of employment. The spending of money, even small amounts, where it was permissible was, by admission of the managers, strictly within the budget. The only exception to this rule was the new Senior Sales Manager who stated that there were no budgets in the department! In his case he lacked a knowledge of both organisationally normative activities as well as of formal procedures.

Response to questions on authority to make decisions over departments was mainly of the nature - "I don't tell them what to do, I just work with another department." Several managers, however, conveyed a positive reply and three of these were the managers mentioned above who had little departmental attachment. It would appear that a possible reaction to having little control within a particular department or functional activity is to ascribe more authority
with regard to relations with other departments. This
reaction is again, therefore, very much a function of the
incumbents perceptions and experiences in his role and is
likely to determine the behaviour associated with whatever
role set of which he is a part.

Insufficient 'role' authority was expressed by three managers
and was clearly a reflection of the dissatisfaction and
dissatisfaction these individuals were experiencing with their
roles. In fact there was a relatively high level of
frustration among Company 'T' managers who were interviewed.
Some ten managers out of twenty-seven commented that they
were frustrated in their jobs, although the degree of
frustration varied both in their expressions and the effect
upon their behaviour. Whilst these managers were those who
had identified role clarification and role adaptation problems,
it should now be evident that what has been advanced in
this research is the concept of processual role incumbency
development. In this respect the identification of a single
variable or even of several correlations, as an explanation
of any particular role response is denying the contextual
significance of a complex role and role incumbent relationship.

The variation in this approach from other organisational
studies of role behaviour may be expressed by a brief reference
to the work of Snoek and others in their book "Organisational
Stress: studies in role conflict and ambiguity." With regard
to the critical areas of perceptions and expectations
surrounding role incumbents, Snoek and his colleagues studied
the relationship between role senders and a focal role. They
concluded "these perceptions and expectations are specifically
affected by three types of formal role relations: the
functional dependence of the role sender's office on that of
the focal person: the organisational proximity of the focal
person and the role sender, and the relative organisational
statuses of the focal person and role sender."21

21. R. Kuhn, D. Wolfe, R. Quinn and J.D. Snoek: 'Organisational
Stress: studies in role conflict and ambiguity.' Wiley
1964.
This research could possibly conclude with such a convenient summary. However, such a quote suggests that perceptions and expectations are largely affected by formal role relations, such as functional dependence, without having suggested how to differentiate between an interpersonal relationship and a relationship remaining constant with changes in role incumbents. In other words, the formal aspects of rules, especially as used by Snoek and others, fails to effectively acknowledge a processual relationship between an individual and his role in the milieu of a social organisation. Snoek and his researchers appear to suffer from failing to extrapolate this significant distinction for at no time do they suggest 'informality' does not exist. They acknowledge for example that personal orientations can just as easily be influenced by behaviour seeking "to cover up errors" or to "do favours for friends contrary to company rules." To adopt in the same research a positivist stance suggesting 'a significant multiple correlation between certain characteristics, their related variables and the possession of a rules orientation expectation,' is a regrettable denial of the existence of processual activity in which meaning is ascribed by the incumbent and not ascribed to him. In Company's 'F' and 'T' we have now illustrated various insightful incidents and attempted to convey the setting and structural context in which behaviour is occurring. The nature of these enquiries, their findings and this method of explanation and description has been especially concerned with conveying the importance and meaning of rules to the role incumbent. In the following conclusion, therefore, the emphasis will remain at specifying the type of process that such meaning may pass through without constraining the socialisation of individuals in roles by variables of greater or lesser statistical significance.
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Theoretical Discussion and Conclusion

This research has been concerned with some important issues in the field of organisational sociology. Whilst the basic study which has been discussed and described here has been elucidating only a small fraction of the vast area of sociological concern, it has seemed to the researcher that it is not possible to enter into research without becoming automatically involved in some of the more fundamental problems of the discipline. This may certainly appear as an overview of the difficulties facing the minutiae of an individual researcher. However, in the same way that the removal of a sand grain from a pile will let slip a small avalanche of other sand grains, so it seems the contribution of any study has to be concerned with the minor avalanche surrounding and affected by that study. Thus the founding basis, the research methods, the theories and the concepts are the grains of a research project.

The major problems we have been seeking to clarify in this study have concerned two particular areas. The first is the understanding of behaviour in organisational settings. Organisational studies have dealt with this subject and provided various insights, some essentially descriptive, others apparently providing definitive explanation. In our hopefully unpretentious manner, this study has examined behaviour and used devices to enunciate the significance of that behaviour without subsuming its meaning and importance. The second problem area, therefore, became that of clarifying, defining, and devising concepts which permitted a greater understanding of behaviour without the creation of a second order meaning.

The social world which is the subject of sociology belies an easy transmogrification into easily related variables, which hold true in one instance, need qualifying in another and total re-examination in yet a third situation. Furthermore, behaviour is momentary, fleeting and unique and its quintessential flavour is lost in the cold surroundings of 'folk language' which yields to computed relations. The infamous methods of reductionism and micro study of the nature
of social psychology have tended to decree that sociology lacks the ability to cope with such problems. However, it is possible that we can allay fears by liberating the discussion of the relationship between structure and process and denying that the two cannot be talked about in other than mathematical terms. In other words that it is possible to refer to structure in a theoretical framework which seeks clearer understanding of social process. Cicourel has said how important this approach is and at the same time how difficult it becomes for the researcher or social analyst: "I want to underline the necessity of linking the strategies of interaction among actors with the structural framework employed by the social analyst. The observer must make abstractions from complex sequences of social interaction. How does he decide the role - status - norm relevance of the exchanges about which he observes or interviews? To what extent must he take the actor's typifications, stock of knowledge at hand, presume appearance to others, conception of self, strategies of self presentation, language and the like, into account in deciding the institutionalised character of status relationships, role relationships, and the normatively based expectations employed or imputed?"

The conclusions arrived at in this research are, therefore, constrained by these problems and do not seek to overcome the major difficulties verging on the philosophical regarding the subjectivity of meaning. We have not started from the basis of assuming a primal starting point in terms of individuals possessing meaningful acts. This is an argument still to be clarified and is left to further discussion of the ethnomethodologists. However we have started from the viewpoint that situations possess a meaning for the actors and that it is the task of the social analyst to interpret that meaning. This method has led primarily to a clarification of the devices which facilitate interpretation.

The discussion which ensues considers the concepts and hypotheses in particular regard to an initial model for

2. See however A. Schutz - 'The Phenomenology of the Social World' H.E.B. 1972 especially p.7 and his discussion of Weber's methodological concepts,
understanding organisational behaviour. A fundamental aspect of the concepts should have been conveyed in the notion of complementary concepts which suggests that a dividing line between either opposite or different concepts be replaced by the idea of a processual relationship. This is different in concept from a continuum of polar ideal types because the suggestion here is that behaviour encompassed within organisations is fluid in both nature and intention and that the very existence of a social act brings into being a range of inter-related social phenomena. The processual nature of action therefore in terms of how the individual behaves, why he behaves in a particular manner, the meaning and intention he has construed upon his behaviour and that construed by others are inherent aspects of any conceptual device employed in this research. Such an approach necessitates an implicit qualification of the labelling of any action which may be identified.

The major concepts which have been examined in this respect, and which have long waited some scrutiny as to their heuristic value, have been the formal and informal. The summary model which will be discussed shortly has retained these concepts on the basis that behaviour can be distinguished even if occurring as part of a complex sequence of social interaction of the nature referred to above. The terms however have been redefined to examine their essential constituent parts and to suggest that behaviour can be seen as having a goal orientation as well as being identified under a constituent heading. Thus we have ascribed a central place to the normative recognition of behaviour having distinguished different normative structures within the same organisation. Behaviour which is sufficiently commonly construed (that is, perceived and cognitively appraised) by organisational members, especially within the immediate role set, such as to suggest the behaviour is congruent with the legitimate organisations, we have defined as part of the formal social structure. Formality is, therefore, ascribed to behaviour by its normative acceptability by the role set. Assuming that the role set, which will be organisationally more diverse for example than the work group, has a consensus attitude toward forms of behaviour, we have deduced that such behaviour will be directed toward the achievement of organisational goals.
Conceivably a conspiracy of deviance amongst the role set could still obtain a normative acceptability to behaviour which sought to satisfy individual objectives. This would not appear to be a durable situation on the basis that no role set exists in a vacuum. Any normative behaviour will have, at certain contact points, to relate to other normative structures belonging to other role sets. If these are not compatible then the organisation will probably succumb under the stress of conflicting normative structures. On this basis, this research has referred, on various occasions, to an 'organisational order' which represents the co-existence of different normative structures. The concepts of 'organisational order' as used in this research resembles in various ways, the idea of a 'collective structure' which was put forward by Timperley. This latter concept has been adduced from Weick who refers to the 'emergence of mutually advantageous solutions' and suggests these are a 'prototypic instance of collective structure.' The important feature about an 'order' is that it is also trying to convey the social nature of mutually adapted behaviour. Timperley conveyed this when he said, "in other words individuals converge on shared ideas of how a structure can form and then set in motion a (Weick) 'repetitive cycle of behaviours.' It is these behaviours and the performers' desire to establish a self-closing dependable cycle for them which sets the stage for the formation of a collective structure." An order, however, also suggests the notion of agreed, even if perhaps only implicitly, objectives, and a means system which is orientated toward those objectives. Significantly, however, it is necessary to refer to such an 'order' or a 'collective structure' in context, for an organisation and its incumbents are required to cope with many varying behavioural forms some of which do not have such an affinity to 'collective structure' or mutual advantages for both individuals and the organisation. The problems of conflicting normative structures are in danger of becoming subsumed in this approach under the 'harmonious' implications of a 'total collective structure', or an 'organisational order.'

4. Ibid,
Organisational strains and perhaps even inefficiencies are thus very much affected by the degree to which these different normative structures co-exist. The pressure which exists by nature of controlling behaviour within a role set or series of role sets means that a substantial consensus impinges upon the acceptability of behaviour, and that where that consensus does not exist, then individuals, or cliques must operate independently of the approval, implicit or otherwise of the role set. The ability then, of such divisions and break-away groups to survive will be substantially dependent upon their own internal power to overcome the sanctions which elements of the 'organisational order' may impose.

To be more concrete, we are suggesting that there are various behaviours which require examination, particularly with regard to their goal orientation. An individual or small group of individuals may be operating in such a way as to deny the accepted means of operation in terms of an 'organisational order' the basis of which of course stems from the extant organisation. However, whilst the immediate role set may or may not acknowledge such behaviour as being in accord with established methods, it may nevertheless give tantamount approval by not invoking sanctions on the basis that such behaviour is still directed toward organisational objectives. We have provided examples of this in our empirical studies where individuals have operated in generally non-normative ways, but in doing so, have apparently either shown 'initiative' or 'flexibility' or operated in such a way as to prevent any organisational repercussions. This would be classified as the first of three types of 'informal social behaviour'. It is a classification most likely to form a link between the formal and informal and is, therefore, essential to the complementary concept idea. This first category is described as 'ordinate' behaviour. Such behaviour would be seen as contributing to organisational goals but having only partial consensus, usually deriving from the immediate role set. It may often be that it is this type of behaviour which the immediate role set perceive to be most practical or most satisfactory given the circumstances, although it would necessarily have had approval beyond the role set. This behaviour would become part of the formal organisation if it was given consensus approval within and beyond the immediate role set.
There is, however, a further element with regard to such informal behaviour and that is what has been illustrated in the research and referred to as 'individual orientated behaviour.' Such behaviour has a goal direction which is not only non-organisational but may be directly opposed to organisational interests. It may however be individually orientated and not in opposition to organisational interests, for example, if an individual was trying to project himself into promotional favour. In situations such as this we have categorised behaviour as being 'inordinate' - that is, inconsistent with the 'organisational order.' This assists in differentiating other informal behaviour which may be organisationally deviant behaviour. Deviant behaviour would of necessity remain within the framework of organisational behaviour, but having a meaning ascribed to it by members of the organisation. This means that for research and analytical purposes there is still a dependency upon perceptual distinctions between different types of behaviour and different goal orientations. For this very reason it is necessary to retain this behaviour within the broad framework of the social organisation where it relates to the actors concerned who provide the apparent meaning.

In this analytical framework the distinctions of formal and informal have thus been retained, but refined and closely identified with the social organisation which is the only source by which to ascribe meaning to behaviour. In retaining this distinction however, a conscious effort has been made to suggest fluidity and the processual nature of social action. The existence of normative structures means not only that social action has existed to create such structures but that 'action' (at least perception of meaning) must continue if such structures are to remain. This truism takes on substantial importance in terms of how the structures are able to continue and how different or even new norms become a part of the structures. This research has considered the element of the role behaviour and particularly the nature of the relationship between the incumbent of a role and the social organisation to be of critical importance. The major concept which has been described and discussed in the context
of this relation between structure and process has thus been the 'incumbency development process'.

The label of an 'incumbency development process' is intended to signify the activity which an individual experiences from the moment he assumes a role title in an organisation. This research has indicated the diverse nature of role learning and the establishment of relationships and understandings. Such processes are thus unique in the sense that every individual has personal experiences and subjective perceptions and expectations. Other members within the organisation serve vital roles however in exerting restraints, controls and boundary limitations upon the behaviour the individual is able to exhibit or even use furtively.

The 'process' is a development in the sense that it is a learning activity combining what experience and knowledge an individual brings to a situation and its actors and the interaction which then goes on between the individual and that situation. The individual will learn how to adapt his experience, knowledge, and methods of interaction to suit and accommodate objectives which he either defines or has defined for him by others. This process is therefore one of perceiving, interpreting and applying meaning. The inclusiveness of the concept is meant to encompass behaviour and the associated learning activities. It includes behaviour consistent with the 'organisational order' and the normative structure of which the individual is a part as well as 'inordinate' behaviour and even that which is organisationally deviant.

The 'process' is itself complex and affected by many factors and variables. There is a danger of implying an almost mechanical process whereby individuals determine or have determined for them certain goals either individual or organisational and they adapt their behaviour to achieve these goals. The inference that such behaviour is either intentional

5. Notes: this has been abbreviated to: IDP
or rational is however extremely questionable. Thus whilst there is undoubtedly an element of goal identification and behaviour adaptation we have seen from the research enquiries that such a process is likely to be irrational and unconsidered and that the very existence of normative structures which will influence the process are implicit and retained only in the minds of the actors in the situation. Even where organisations attempt to impose some controls perhaps by increasing the degree of behaviour expectation and goal identification in the 'extant organisation' or by coercing individuals away from 'ordinate', 'inordinate' or 'deviant' behaviour, it would appear that there is still an important process which the 'incumbent' undergoes in relating to what is 'extant'. In Company 'T' where the 'extant' organisation appeared minimal and consisted merely of organisation charts, there were normative adaptations which influenced apparent hierarchies and led to by-passing in decision making processes and varying interpretations of the extent of 'authority' that were implied in the chart.

Each individual undergoes a process which will include for example the appreciation and interpretation of expectations. These expectations of behaviour are again often unclear and may only be discovered by the individual through 'experimenting' with behaviour. Illustrations provided in the current research saw individuals using very subjective assessments to determine whether or not they could make decisions. The expectations in such situations had not been clarified and the individuals undertook their own means of clarification by acting in ways they felt to be appropriate. The research discovered many such activities and 'testing out' methods which were ascertaining whether the role set approved or otherwise and whether such action was consistent with norms which the individual was trying to clarify.

The most interesting expression and illustration of the 'incumbency development process' was in a situation in Company 'T' support services department where managers at the same level in the hierarchy were exhibiting markedly different behavioural characteristics. In such a situation it would appear that the major variation was in terms of what each
individual personally introduced into the role, and that therefore personality was a major variable. In this situation that may have been the case, but then the role was very new and 'testing out' and 'experimenting' was even further complicated by the fact that there was no precedent or history of expectations with regard to the role and therefore the 'role' required establishing as much as the incumbents. Until they had been proven effective, both role and incumbent still had large question-marks concerning their necessity. Accordingly the personality factor was given even greater opportunity for expression than in situations where the 'role' had transcended various incumbents and there were expectations made of the role irrespective of the incumbent.

New role incumbents are obviously undergoing a critical stage in their early days and weeks of the process and it would certainly appear that the individual personality would be more likely to influence or to be influenced by behavioural expectations in this stage than in subsequent months and years. However, the process does not suddenly conclude, but continues, affecting and being affected by the dynamics of the actors in the situation. The 'process' thus assists in the explanation of the continuation of normative structures and of the addition of new norms or the expiration of old ones. In terms of the framework which we have developed it should now be apparent that the process also related to informality and dissensus behaviour moving through a normalising process by the various actions pursued by the role incumbent and becoming part of the formal, consensus organisation. Thus each individual is assisting the shaping of the social organisation by virtue of the nature of the 'incumbency development process' which he undergoes. The contribution to that shaping is again a basically unpredictable phenomena because of its dependency upon circumstance and the relationship between immanent processes and the forces which transcend the situation.

This process would appear ripe for further development and the potential for more research seems to suggest the threshold for revealing far greater knowledge about behaviour in
organisations without adopting an exclusively behaviourist approach. It is possible that there are identifiable stages in the process and that there are variables and factors which are more significant in determining particularly the constraints impinging upon the incumbents. The research, in introducing the concept has attempted to retain the essence of a dynamic process which major variables and significant correlations may conceal. It is hopefully not just a descriptive method, but an analytical tool of heuristic value and integral importance in the building of theories of organisational behaviour. As with other researches, if the effect of this concept and the processual framework suggested in this study contributes to further clarification of organisation studies then a major task has been achieved. Definitive studies are unlikely to meet with other than destructive criticisms whilst perhaps studies with the intention of removing some of the confusion and injecting some stimulants in the form of new concepts may meet with criticism which is more constructive.

The ideas and concepts used in this research have been synthesised in a 'model' of organisational behaviour. This is essentially a diagrammatic representation of the ideas because the emphasis has been away from mechanical relationships. The purpose of such a representation is therefore to clarify, simplify and summarise. The theme of the research remains implicit in this representation and that relates to its processual contextual nature. The labels are notional to the extent that it is the perceptions and meanings which actors ascribe to behaviour which have been constructed in this work to form a generalised framework contributing to the understanding of organisational behaviour.
POSTSCRIPT

Since concluding the empirical studies a substantial period of time has elapsed and there have been developments in the airline company with which the researcher has kept abreast. Indeed, since the original study there has been continued contact with many of the respondents in Company 'T' and with the support services department in particular. This gives at least a partial, longitudinal aspect to the research and allows for a further examination of the 'processual concepts' and their implications. Ironically, and sadly for those concerned, both Company 'T' and the pilot study, Company 'F', have had redundancies. Company 'T' suffered a severe recession in 1974 following increased oil prices and a decline in passenger use of the airlines generally. Accordingly in the autumn of 1974, some 860 staff were made redundant. This had severe repercussions on company morale, particularly because in the process of declaring the redundancies the company appealed to the government for financial support and failed. Until recently it was feared that this series of events could lead to absorption with the major national airline. Government announcements have now shown these fears to be unfounded and the independent future of the company looks more secure.

It would be possible to conjecture about the fact that the company faced hard times and that some of the observations about the organisation referred to in the main text of this research gave some indication of organisational weakness. Such conjecture is not realistic and would hold no substance. Further, this research has partly decried the concern organisational studies have shown for managerial problems of efficiency. Instead, attention will be directed to observations relating to the preceding arguments.

In the support services department of Company 'T', so far as is known only one manager was made redundant. Despite considerable consternation about the role and need for the duty controllers the function was retained, although the redundant manager was a controller. The fact that the
support services department suffered little because of the 
redundancy may well have been due to the departmental 
manager and his reporting director both receiving 
substantially larger empires following a post-redundancy 
re-organisation. The handling of the redundancy was such as 
to avoid any real degree of fantasising or of staff developing 
insecurity about the future. At the time of redundancy and 
shortly after the trauma that it caused, the managers 
appeared to retain their commitment and continued to bemoan 
their organisational inadequacies.

The organisation functioning has not changed that much in 
the last two years. A change of geographical location for 
the support services department has not fundamentally altered 
working relations. The duty officers still feel that they 
lack support for their role and that the authority boundaries 
remain poorly defined. Indeed there remains somewhat the 
contradictory view that to define the authority boundaries 
more rigidly would deny the flexibility of intervention by 
senior management. Senior management tend to refute these 
feelings of lack of support but nevertheless appear to have 
done little to remove the issue. Interestingly, some of the 
duty officers felt that their presence in the job was based 
on inertia and that the internal management relations were 
beaten redemption. A state of semi-normlessness appeared 
prevailing for some and was only overcome by the rejuvenation 
of their ranks with new role incumbents. This state was 
expressed by some duty officers in the tone of 'not really 
caring', of 'having tried in the past but learnt that 
authority has proved stronger' and subsequently deciding that 
a more peaceful existence would be achieved by conforming 
more rigidly to extant expectations. As mentioned in the 
main text of this research, the new incumbents were not 
always aware of the past experiences of their co-role 
incumbents and therefore their behaviour was less contaminated. 
Thus the perpetual battle-ground over what the term 
'authority' stands for and its impersonal nature riding 
roughshod over various actors remained a constant situation.
The norm implicitly conveyed to those incumbents was however, 'try, and discover what it's like to fail!' There exists an essentially defeatist norm which apparently is the environment senior management expect.

The observational difficulty is to know to what degree these norms and behaviors are a function of environmental circumstances and transcend individual variation and the degree to which they are determined by individual attitudes and orientations. In the period of about three years during which this researcher has had contact with those managers there have been few changes of personnel and therefore the same basic personalities have been present. The departmental manager has effectively assumed greater authority and the 'old' divisional manager has been given an apparently sideways move. Thus the political system (Burns) has had a significant impact on relationships and structure. However, the same managers still control the support services department and must evidently have a direct bearing on the interactional and attitudinal climate existing in the department. The extant organisation is bolstered very substantially by a directive managerial style and a significantly personalised situation. It would appear from these observations that the process of development has therefore been very much influenced by cultural organisation norms rather than by the explicit definitions and prescriptions of the 'formal organisation.'

Indications of some of those normative expectations persisted especially in the area of industrial relations. In the support services department the industrial relations record is distinctly poor. Scapegooting is commonplace, with each level of management denying its responsibility for the situation. In classical 'Donovan' terms, problems are usually solved 'informally.' Nevertheless, there are clear normative expectations throughout the hierarchy and apparently between management and unions. The most obvious of these is the need to express strength in different situations, thus creating conflict and win-lose orientations.
Despite having a fairly sophisticated system of formal procedures, a pattern of normatively acknowledged behaviour has emerged, much of which ignores formal arrangements. It was revealed to the researcher for example, that restrictive practice agreements existed quite extensively in some sections of support services. Examples were rife, although referred to with some caution by managers, especially in the catering and baggage handling sections. Refusal to assist in rushed situations, refusal to lift items above a certain weight, demands for minimum manning and lack of co-operation were all typical restrictive practices supported by 'agreements.' Using the categories of this research these 'agreements,' (which are probably not written and are therefore implicit understandings) would be considered as 'ordinate' informal social behaviour lacking total consensus. In fact they verge almost on the 'deviant' because the reason they failed to achieve consensus was through the disapproval of higher management. This disapproval exists because the restrictive practices negate the achievement of organisational goals. However, higher management is not included in the 'immediate role set' and for the significant actors in these localised agreements, the limited consensus is apparent and some notion of peaceful co-existence is temporarily achieved.

Further problems with management and industrial relations occurred over the lack of clarity of authority already extensively referred to in the main text. Thus middle and lower line managers still found themselves being overruled, and failing to gain respect from shop stewards because they felt they were undermined by senior management. This very much explained the disillusionment referred to earlier.

At the same time the controllers who, it should be remembered, had only just been appointed at the commencement of this research, remained somewhat enigmatic in their organisational role. Junior line management and supervision had come to treat the controllers as a rather unnecessary addition to the operation, and failed to see why they existed. In a sense this was to the credit of the controllers in carrying out their explicit function with the minimum of interference although it therefore meant giving the impression of being superfluous.
Some difficulties persisted in the relationships with other departments and it is in this respect that various significant changes were being sought. These changes had elements of political in-fighting, of personal achievement and of logical role extension. They concerned the Cargo and Engineering departments both of whom had regular contact with support services in the latter's area of responsibility. If the controllers could demand more direct control over Cargo and Engineering at their source rather than just on the 'ramp' area then this would enhance the status of the controller role and of the role incumbents. The potential gains were thus significant for this particular department, just as the potential loss of authority was significant for the other departments. Evidently, in the first instance this was to be of sufficient importance to warrant a board decision.

Meantime, the informal, processual activities were making an impact on the political argument. These informal activities took the form of interdepartmental haggles over incidents of overlapping responsibility and impingement of decisions on each other's departments. Essentially, these issues were expressions of the process of pushing and resisting transfer of departmental authority. They were often trivial daily issues of a simple interactive nature, but were interpreted as part of a larger framework.

It can be seen therefore, that activities mentioned in the main text continued temporally to illustrate the importance of the informal and formal relationship. Formal organisation, it is maintained, can only be effectively appreciated and understood if the interactions and meaningful activities of the actors are respectively associated with the nature of the formal organisation. It appears important to acknowledge a personalised aspect as an inherent but continuously changing element of the formal organisation. This changing element is then most significantly affected by the behaviours enacted by various individuals as a part of the complementary concept of the informal. By such an analysis it may be possible to see value and relevance not merely through the revival of these much used and abused concepts, but also through the conceptual enrichment achieved by elaboration and the suggested fluid interaction of complementing one concept with the other.
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EXPLANATORY NOTES FOR APPENDICES

These appendices are largely self-explanatory. The hypotheses (Appendix 'A') were those originally identified in the earliest days of the research and are of value in the sense of illustrating the initial areas of focus. Subsequently, many of the hypotheses were discarded as being irrelevant or too simplified. Others however, have been referred to in the main text.

Appendix 'B' illustrates the major functional responsibilities of the support services department in the 'ramp' area.

Appendix 'C' illustrates how the services provided on the 'ramp' area are seen to relate to the aircraft. It is not difficult to observe the importance of organising the co-ordination of the services. The F.I.P. report analysed the time required for each of these services and reports are made every day for any delays.

Appendix 'F' is an abbreviated version of the company organisation charts.

Appendix 'I' is part of an interview recorded with a middle manager in support services.

Appendix 'J' is a complete interview recorded with one of the Routes Sales Managers.
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**HYPOTHESES**

**APPENDIX 'A'**

**INDIVIDUAL/CORPORATE GOALS**

1. That the element of informal behaviour within organizations is related to the extent to which individual and organizational goals complement one another.

2. That individual goals and corporate goals will be identified as being complementary only when the informal system is weak. When the informal system is influential and strong the division between individual goals and corporate goals is more likely to be greater.

3. That the reason why corporate goals and individual goals may give rise to a greater corporate identity relative to the position of the individual in the management hierarchy is a function of differences in the identification of what the corporate goals may be.

4. That where 'stated' organizational goals command few organizational resources, individual goals are substituted which at times of conflict between goals will have priority over the 'stated' goals.

**AUTHORITY/FORMALITY/LEGITIMACY**

5. That the authority of specific roles may be frequently altered by means of a process of non-normative behaviour becoming normatively accepted over a period of time.

6. That authority is only meaningful in an organization in terms of how it is perceived and used as related to specific roles. To this extent, authority is as much
a function of the incumbent as of the role.

7. That the limits of authority of specific roles remain indeterminate until sanctions are brought to bear. Such sanctions will then make explicit the limits of such authority.

GROUPS

8. The formation of groups may merely be a process of institutionalizing the non-normative behaviour in a manner effectively contributing to organizational ends.

9. That "the maintenance needs of the sub-units (groups) dictate a commitment to the sub-unit goals over and above their contribution to the total organization programme," (March & Simon)

Power

10. The stronger the basis of power the greater the power.

11. Range of power may vary greatly but in general, referent power has the broadest range.

12. Any attempt to utilize power outside the range will tend to reduce the power.

13. That the ability to increase power in the situation is determined by the nature of the dependency relationship indicative of that power.

14. That the incumbency development pattern is a function of the power relationship affecting the incumbent.

15. The degree to which the incumbent of a role may be able to change aspects of the situation is determined largely by the relationship of the "immanent" to the "transcendental".

Role/Role Relationships

16. That the understanding of a role and its relationships with other roles is the function of a number of unspecified or unstructured processes, implicitly conveying meaning and understanding to the incumbent of that role.
17. That an extensive informal system denies role continuity and affects the process of role learning.

18. That the process of learning job relationships is essentially a cognitive function of incumbents of roles understanding normatively acceptable behaviour.
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VC 10 MID TURING ROUND

- Security
- Catering
- Maintenance
- Maintenance Service
- Control
- Ancillary Veh.

- Water
- Toilet
- Catering
- Loading

- Fork Lift as Required
- Oil
- Loading

- Fuel
JOB SPECIFICATION

1. Title of Job: Stock Controller

2. Objectives of the Job: To ensure that Component and Finished Goods Stocks are controlled at the correct level. To organise and supervise the efficient running of Stores and Warehouses.

3. Organisation Relationship: Job holder is directly responsible to Works Director.

4. Main Duties:

   i) To constantly observe and analyse the relationship between incoming advice notes and finished goods stock levels.

   ii) To relate the requirement for finished goods with planned production and suggest such alterations as may be necessary.

   iii) To constantly check raw material stock levels and forward orders against the requirement of planned production.

   iv) To maintain liaison with Richmond Office for advice note progressing and van delivery schedule.

   v) To organise and maintain an efficient Component Stores.

   vi) To maintain existing methods and layout of Warehouse operation.

   vii) To initiate chasing of incoming material when necessary and also to suggest the reduction of incoming material when necessary.

   viii) Security of Warehouse and Stores.

   ix) Overall responsibility for drivers and state of vehicles and other statutory requirements on transport operations.

   x) To minimise the cost of transporting goods to customers.

5. Authority and Decisions:

   i) Authority for control of Stores, Warehouse personnel
through the respective Foreman.

ii) Assessing priorities, planning of daily work programmes.

iii) Layout of Stores and Warehouse in conjunction with Works Director.

iv) Discipline of Stores and Warehouse personnel in line with Works Director's policy.

6. Limits of Authority:

i) Authority limited to control of Stores and Warehouse and Stock Control personnel and execution of main duties.

ii) Level of stocks to be agreed in all cases with Works Director.

iii) Apart from minor shortages all requests for alterations to the weekly production schedule to be made to the Works Director.

iv) Can only dismiss or engage personnel after prior authority from Works Director.

v) Shortages and overstocking to be reported to Works Director.

vi) No authority whatsoever over Production Personnel.

vii) Any requests for alteration in Sewing Room Programme to be made to Works Director.

7. Effects of Unsatisfactory Decisions:

i) Delay in despatching finished goods.

ii) Stoppage of production.

iii) Wastage of Company resources.

iv) Increase in indirect labour costs.

v) Increased cost of transportation.

8. Performance Criteria:

i) Speed with which orders are despatched.

ii) Amount of interruptions to Production due to shortage of components.

iii) Comparison of actual and stipulated stock levels.

iv) Comparison of Labour cost of Warehouse and Stores with previous year.

v) Tidiness of Warehouse and Stores.

vi) Amount of physical damage of Components and Finished Goods.
vii) Losses of Components and Finished Goods.
viii) Morale of Warehouse, Stores and Stock Control personnel.
ix) Cost of despatching goods.
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SUPPORT SERVICES DUTY OFFICERS
INTERNAL MEMORANDUM

From: Manager Ground Operation To: Directors
Date: 19th October, 1972
Subject/ref: File: 150

DUTY RAMP CONTROLLERS

The training programme for Duty Ramp Controllers has now been completed and coverage will start immediately.

Initially Duty Ramp Controllers will be on duty from 0700-2300L daily, full 24-hour coverage will be given in due course. They will be based in Service Control and contractable through the usual Service Control facilities.

A copy of the Terms of Reference issued to the Duty Ramp Controllers is attached for your information. It should be noted that they explicitly require that priorities be allocated through normal Departmental channels.

I am sending extra copies of this memorandum to the Heads of Department actively involved in the Ramp Operation so that copies can be passed to junior management and other staff levels as is felt necessary by the Department Heads concerned.

Signed...........
Manager Ground Operations
TERMS OF REFERENCE

DUTY RAMP CONTROLLERS

1. The Duty Ramp Controller is a member of the Ramp Operations Branch of Ground Operations and is directly responsible to the Manager Ramp Operations. However, when on duty he is required to act in an impartial multi-departmental capacity in order best to serve the overall interest of the Company.

2. Whilst on duty the Duty Ramp Controller is responsible for:

   (a) Planning and Directing the overall deployment of resources in the Gatwick ramp area so as to achieve the planned and/or amended ramp operational programmes of and other operators handled by.

   (b) Allocation of priorities, through normal Departmental channels, for work on the ramp and for the associated deployment of manpower, facilities and equipment.

   (c) Foreseeing the effect of programme developments that could disrupt the Gatwick ramp operation and planning and initiating, in conjunction with Manager Movement Control, the necessary preventive action.

   (d) Co-operating in full with the Manager Movement Control who has overall responsibility for the Company programme, to ensure that operations on the Gatwick ramp contribute maximum assistance to the execution of that programme.

3. Duty Ramp Controller must, specifically:

   (a) Maintain a visual display of the actual planned programme of ramp operations on a continuous 48-hour basis.

   (b) Maintain suitable contact on ramp matters with:

       1) Managers Movement Control and/or Flight Watch Duty Officer.

       2) Line Maintenance Superintendent and/or Station Engineer.
(c) Ensure that their contact with Manager Movement Control includes advice as to the inability of the ramp to cope with planned and/or amended programme requirements.

(d) Ensure that the requirements of the customer have at all times their rightful place in his priority considerations.

(e) Ensure that ..... maintains the best possible relations with the BAA and other agencies in respect of operations on the Gatwick ramp and that we receive the co-operation due to us.
From: Executive Director Industrial Relations and Personnel

To: See Distribution

Date: 26.9.72

Ref: RFHD/KWG/rt

---

RESEARCH PROJECT

Mr. Pat Colville of Roffey Park Institute of Management Training is conducting research into various aspects of Management for the purposes of a higher degree at the University of Surrey. have agreed, through the Managing Director, to co-operate with these enquiries and to give such reasonable assistance as may be possible.

The departments of particular interest to Mr. Colville are the Sales Division, Commercial Division, and Support Services of Ground Operations. The researcher is particularly interested in examining the roles of managers at all levels and the relationships of managers to their jobs and to other managers. The enquiries will entail interviewing with most managers in the departments concerned. These interviews will be of an informal nature.

It should be emphasised that information revealed by the research will be strictly confidential and that there will be no reference to either individual or company identity.

Mr. Colville will be visiting the Company to tour the Departments on the afternoon of Monday 2nd October. You are asked to assist his meeting the Managers of the appropriate Departments and to provide reasonable access in the future.
If further information is desired or there is an interest in discussing the research please contact either Mr. Colville at Roffey Park Institute or the Training Officer, Personnel Dept.

Signed.............

Distribution:
Managing Director
Marketing Director
Production Director
Operations Director
Commercial Director
General Sales Manager
Manager Ground Operations
All Managers - Commercial Division
All Managers - Sales Division
Manager Ramp Operations
Interviewer: Can you explain your impression of the order of hierarchy in the company?

Manager: The Chairman of course in One.
Do you want to start at the top with......?
Or just as far as Support Services is concerned?
We have Mr. ........., Chairman; Managing Director, Mr. Guy ........., then we have Mr. ........., he would go in number Two; then we have Mr. ........ who would also go in Two; then we have Mr. ........ Manager Ground Operations, he would go in number Three — no I will change that — he will go in Two; I think if you put those last three in Two, that would be a fair comment. In Three you would have Mr. ........ Do you want all the other Managers within the Department?

Interviewer: Their positions, yes, working down.

Manager: Well Ground Operations takes in quite a few Managers. Mr. ........ would be in Three, I would go in Four, under Four you have Duty Controllers, although Duty Controllers are an anomaly themselves because they are not responsible for any Department at all. They are only responsible for determined priorities and for placing manpower and equipment at any given time to achieve the Company's programme. So to a degree they are an anomaly I think. Five would be for the Duty Officers who are responsible overall for the operation, and under them in Five you would have the Supervisors.

Interviewer: You consider both of these as levels of Management?

Manager: Yes, because the Supervisors of each Department have one of the hardest junior management jobs. By that, I mean they are responsible for the staff and they are responsible to the Management, they also have a very high relationship with the
staff because they are their immediate working boss. So to a degree they are split right down the middle between Management and staff, but they must, by their title lean towards the Management. On Managerial number Six would come the Assistant Supervisors and So4, SA, So5's plus the Industrial staff.

Interviewer: Is there any way in which you could have learnt that Management structure or any way in which it was conveyed to you? How do you know that is the structure?

Manager: I suppose because of my working relationship with them. I deal with, at certain times, almost all of them except for Mr. .......... Mr. .......... tends to delegate through Mr. .......... (the director), I have dealt with Mr. .......... I have stood in for (my boss) because on one occasion Mr. .......... was on leave and I had to deal direct with (the director). As a working relationship I suppose we have quite a close relationship, because all our problems, if we are going to have problems, it is usually an industrial problem, and then we start worrying a bit, a tremor is felt, and I would say we have a very close working relationship really.

Interviewer: But nobody has actually spoken to you with regard to the structure of your working relationship?

Manager: Yes, I have seen the family tree, it has been published.

Interviewer: But as far as that goes, has this been explained to you at any stage in your working relationship?

Manager: Yes, we had a shake-up not so long ago with (a Director) who was, I am not sure of his title,
but he was in fact what Mr. .... is now, he has gone up to Managing Director. Mr. .... has gone down into his slot, or across and up to his slot, and that only happened a couple of months ago, but it hasn’t affected us so much because we still have got an intermediate Management that we had before.

Interviewer: Who did this explanation, when did it happen?

Manager: It was published in the Company Paper, it was also sent round in the Bulletin. I also had a chat with, well I heard about it before (my boss) because he was on leave and I told him about it.

Interviewer: You had a chat with the Directors?

Manager: Yes, they came round and introduced themselves as well.

Interviewer: What would you describe as the major objectives of the Company?

Manager: To offer an efficient and safe passage to the general public and to cargo, to the general public for passenger services as well as freight, basically that is it. We have to compete and we have to be competitive, and basically the way to be competitive is to prove how good we are. The only way to do that is to try and achieve scheduled departures and arrivals.

Interviewer: So the service for you is paramount, really?

Manager: Well it must be, there are so many Airlines in the World, it doesn’t matter whether you travel on Quantas, BOAC, Pan American, TWA, you have got to have good services. By service I am not talking about Air Hostesses necessarily, the passenger, when he goes along, possibly to an Agent, and the first time if he has never flown with us, the first impression he gets is when he checks in. If you have got a girl who basically isn’t really that interested on that
day, then you can disillusion that man for a
long time from the word go about our handling.
Likewise, it is the little things that could -
if you just smile at somebody, I know this from
when I was in Traffic upstairs. If you go to a
passenger, that to him is a lot, but to you is
next to nothing; by that I mean if you just go
and have a chat, possibly, or you explain something
to him like you give him every assistance,
obviously, but the little things because every
airline is basically the same, it is the little
things that count. Every Airline gives the same
rubbishy, goods. Flying, really is the Public
Relations Man's dream: because it's so boring
that every advert you see; fly the smooth VC10;
the beautiful jumbo, they are just selling an idea.

Interviewer: May I ask you then a few questions specifically
about your own job now, what are your particular
duties?

Manager: I am responsible for all the staff of Support
Services, administratively: I am responsible
operationally for the Duty Officers down, taking
in all the people I would normally call clerical
grades and the industrial side.

Interviewer: Can you go into a little more depth - this
responsibility what does it entail on a day to
day basis?

Manager: On a day to day basis, it is monitoring leave,
sickness, privilege flights, rosters, at all
times, discussing or negotiating with Unions,
and responsibility really for effective
communication between myself and the staff that
I am responsible for. My job at the moment is
to reach them, the communication must come up,
obviously it is going to come out from me, but
I am trying to teach them, in fact I can say it
better by saying what I have said to them; that
the Duty Officers are very good at listening, they
are extremely good at talking, they are good at
looking, but they are very, very bad at writing.
They do not give me enough information, I must
have information to do anything, at the moment I
am being starved of it, I am trying to get them
on a wavelength as a working group, as a working
group of men to communication from the Supervisor,
to the DO, the Duty Officer to the Duty Controller,
that is on the operational basis. On the
administrative side I want them to tell me anything
that they think I should know about.

Interviewer: Does this also go for their relationship with the
Controllers, because their function is dependent
upon information?

Manager: No I don't agree. This is another thing I am
taking up with them. If you have a situation
where you have the pyramid; you go from the
Supervisor, or say the Cleric, who then passes
information to his number One, the number One to
the Supervisor, Supervisor, Supervisor to the DO
and the DO to the Controller. Now if everybody
is voluntarily giving information, feeding
information to the man above, you have a flow of
constructive, detailed information. By this
constructing of detail, this would be sieved as
it went up, the necessary would be taken out by
the person who should take it out, so that in
fact the DC (controllers) should only receive
concise reports that are constructive points and
all the Departments it has gone through would
have sieved out that which they required. You
have voluntary information going all the way up,
but if you change it round where the DC is
chasing the DO for information you are over
working him because he must be in communication
with other Departments, he must be in contact
with the Manager, Group Control, Engineering, and various other areas. So he hasn't got time to chase around he must be fed the information.

Now, likewise, if he is chasing the DO, the DO must be chasing the Supervisor, so it is a vicious circle on the way down, because if the Controller is overworking himself, the DO is going to have a damn sight harder job because he has got a much bigger area of responsibility and he is going to have his work dealt with and certainly the Supervisors are not feeding information, he is having a hell of a job chasing around everybody instead of doing the work he should be.

Interviewer: So it's important that the Controller gets information, that it comes up to him? In the same way as it comes up to yourself?

Manager: Information is imperative. I come in in the morning, at 9:00 o'clock. Now let's just say for example, the Loaders have had a problem, that they decided to walk off a job, even if it is only for an hour, I must know, I have to know, one assumes that they would telephone me at home, if it happened, but they don't necessarily. This is where it goes wrong, this is where the system breaks down, and if (my boss) or (the Divisional Manager) was to say, "Why did the Loaders go off the job for an hour?", I would have to bluff, and try to find out, cover up; I shouldn't be put on a spot. My attitude is that these men have got responsible jobs, they are paid adequate salaries for it. I don't think they have been brought into line enough to show where their faults are. But this is my job now. The Company has had a very bad past where I don't think they have told people where they are going wrong. I think if you don't tell people where they are going wrong as well as when they are going right, then they always think they are right. Praise
where praise is due, but at least tell the bloke when he is going wrong.

Interviewer: What you are trying to do then is to get them to tell you when things are happening?

Manager: Not only that, I am trying to do two things. I am trying to get the administrative side up to the higher standard. At this particular time it is a little difficult because we're involved in so many other problems in the Operation Section. That's One, the administrative side. The other side is that I am just trying to get the Supervisory levels, the junior Management levels, to realise what their responsibility is, which they haven't really done as a group. As individuals possibly, but it is very difficult working on a 24 hour plot. Because you get Mr. 'A' come in, or finish his shift, Mr. 'B' goes in to take over and really all they say is, "Well, this is the problem, this has got to be done", they don't really have a chance to sit down and discuss the job as a group, and this is where it fails. They are not on the same wavelength, they are all doing their jobs, and I am not saying break down their personalities, because you have to have personalities on the job otherwise you have zombies, but they must, somewhere on their wave patterns, cross.

Interviewer: Do you think that there is a difficulty in sections of these people as to the support they are receiving from higher Management?

Manager: I think there has been in the past. The first thing I did when I got this job was to interview all the Duty Officers and the Supervisors individually. I told them what they could expect from me and what I wanted from them. I have also lined up meetings once a month as a group when the Supervisors can meet, I have asked them to
submit the Agenda and it can be open house after we have discussed the Agenda for about fifteen minutes, and they can fire questions that they want to fire. I think basically that this is where it went wrong before, they have been starved of information.

Interviewer: And also the ability to communicate with higher Management?

Manager: That's right.

Interviewer: So as far as you are concerned has there been inconsistency between the way one Duty Officer operates and how another Duty Officer operates and also in the sort of support they are getting from higher Management? Is this a fair assessment of what is happening?

Manager: The problem is that it is very difficult to get operational people together, difficult because of the fact of the work, I have made it clear when I have spoken to these gentlemen, that I am not happy with the standard at the moment, far from it, and that I am expecting a lot from them, but in return I will back them up, and if they have any problems I will do anything I can to help, even if they are in the wrong I will back them up.

Interviewer: At the same time as you have come in as a Senior Support Services Officer, to try to get some clarification of relationships and communications, they have also had another level made up as it were in the Support Services Control Office.

Manager: There are teething troubles at the moment, you see the new Controller had no authority over his staff at all, other than to say: "that is the priority, I want all the manpower on there and all the equipment on there."

Interviewer: Is that how it is operated then?
Manager: No, it is half and half. At the moment we have got the individual problem. We have got the individual who is not doing what he should be doing. This causes aggravation in the ranks and this is fed down to me. Now I am not responsible operationally for the Support Services Controllers, I have no control over them at all, other than administrative, I have passed this on to who is responsible, and we are taking steps to get over it. But we do expect it to a degree.

Interviewer: You expected what, that they would start making operational decisions?

Manager: Well, they are paid to make operational decisions, but they are not paid to get involved with the mundane operation, but they have been. This is fed back to me, which I am quite pleased about because at least it shows that communications have at least started to flow a bit, which at certain times it hasn't, but this was fed down to me quite rapidly, about five times now.

Interviewer: To your office?

Manager: Yes. But on that score I do not think that the communication at the moment is good, I have told them all that I will not be putting any undue pressure on them, I don't like the work pressure, but they know what I want, and I know what I want and I know what I can get out of them, because I know their attitude and their way of work because I have worked with most of them.

Interviewer: But as I see it the whole purpose really of having a Controller is that he is able to sit up in the Service Control, he is the king pin in terms of the operation, in terms of liaison, he is not floating around in the way a Duty Officer is, so that people do not have to look for him. He is always supposed to be contactable, but I have heard of occasions when the DO was urgently required and could not be contacted and then sometimes the controllers have taken over.
Manager: The Duty Officer should at all times be contactable, he has a staff phone which he carries around the whole time.

There are some things that are happening that a Controller decides he is able to do something about quickly, something he can see in Service Control. But he should not do it; the Supervisor in Service Control is the one who should do it. You are talking about a very little thing, I should think, going by what I said that he could see through the window the Supervisor in Service Control is responsible for all the Services area, he is responsible for running his Department efficiency, for the required amount of manpower and equipment. That is his job to run that Department on his operational shift. It is not the responsibility of the Duty Controller to run it for him.

Interviewer: So how are these things happening?

Manager: Basically I can give two reasons, they are not an excuse, but I am sympathetic towards them. One, is the accommodation alone, which is diabolical, but we are looking into that at the moment, trying to find where it would most probably benefit the Duty Controllers; it is in a shocking situation, it has no privacy whatsoever, or any really good working area, and he is, by physical presence alone, in the way up there. Obviously, and everybody's human, if you have got a Supervisor up there who, over the radio says to one of the Red Caps "Oh do this", now through experience alone the Duty Officer thinks, well that is a stupid thing to say, and suddenly chips in, that is wrong. This is where the aggravation come in.

Interviewer: Is it the case that the DO should be making the decisions, in relationship to the Supervisors, but if you make a decision it goes to the Duty Officer, and not the Controller?
Manager: That's right. This is where you have the situation, and it is an unfortunate one, because the duty controllers job is only two months old and I expected it, only because I know the personalities of the Duty Controllers. We have got one or two who are very enthusiastic, have a great deal of experience.

Interviewer: But there has been an extensive process of explanation as to what the Duty Controller's job is, which few other people seem to have, and they have had this long familiarisation,

Manager: Too much familiarisation.

Interviewer: Is it a misperception of what their role is, perhaps by other people?

Manager: No it is not. It is that I have turned round to the Supervisors and said to them in every Department, as far as I am concerned you are responsible for your Department. You are the Supervisor. I think basically the problem where you have this little bit of aggravation between the Controller and the Service Control Supervisor one, by the sheer physical presence alone, and two, because you have got the individual characters coming out of the Controller in certain instances, and also because they don't think or because of their past experience in the company, and most of them are quite experienced men, they tend to jump in and what they've got to do is not jump in. They mustn't because the worst you can do against any Supervisor is to go against him in front of his staff. Once you do that they are deflated and this is what is happening. Even if it is just to say, "Oh I wouldn't do that, I would do something else," it doesn't matter how nicely you say it, his ego goes. I don't think this is a long term problem. I know that (my boss) is having a meeting with them on the 1st December, basically because they have been having problems with the communication of the Managers in
Movement Control as well. There is a little bit of aggravation there. I do not think it is a group problem I think it is an individual problem. Of course it is a matter for (my boss) to take up rather than myself. My Supervisors know how I feel and I am backing them up to the hilt on this, and I don't envy them or the Controller, because the Controller is in such a bad position really, he is in the right place, but there are too many people.

Interviewer: I have a few more questions to ask, but I can see you are going to be called away so perhaps we can come back again.

Continued later

Interviewer: We were saying about the relationship between Duty Officers and the Controller, over which there seemed to be a certain degree of confusion. I believe that there was an incident recently where the morale of the Duty Officer and the Supervisors was felt to be a bit suspect because of the changes that had gone on. Was this expected?

Manager: Basically I think there were two reasons for this. One is the first reaction would be from certain Duty Officers who applied for the position and didn't get it and, secondly, a lot of people may not have agreed with the decisions, of the people who had got the job and by their job alone they realised that they were going to be under a little more pressure because it would be felt all the way down.

Interviewer: Was there also a certain degree of lack of commitment to the Controller's position? Do you think everybody's committed to the idea?

Manager: No, I think everybody, if they are honest, is committed to it. Some of the Supervisors may not realise this because they are not in the position to realise the overall effect. If they are not, then there is something wrong with their
general outlook with the Company's requirements. I think at first the Duty Officers tended to feel a lot of their responsibility was being taken away from them. It's not, they've got more responsibility. It depends on which way they look at it. Because they feel that the Controller is taking it away from them they are, in fact, looking at his position in completely the wrong light. The DO is still operationally responsible although, as I was saying yesterday, there are times when that responsibility is rather denied him because the Controller might become involved when he sees things.

The only reason that would be, would be because the Controller is in the position where he knows the overall position of the Company throughout - engineering, catering, crew-wise, every aspect he would know. The DO wouldn't.
Interviewer: Now, what I would like to start off with is some details of your personal background and just also to put you in the picture. First of all how old you are?
Manager: Thirty-seven.
Interviewer: And your education; what is your educational background including, higher education?
Manager: It would be the equivalent of, I am not very up on terms, the equivalent of American High School, because I was partly educated in Brazil and partly in Britain. And American School standards which I am not sure what they are equivalent to over here.
Interviewer: Any higher education, other education?
Manager: No.
Interviewer: Qualifications?
Manager: None.
Interviewer: Previous employment before going to your present employer.
Manager: It was within the air transport industry with two other employers, ...
Interviewer: In America or.....?
Manager: In Britain and Canada.
Interviewer: And then to your present company.
Manager: I have been with (............) on and off since the Company started in 1961. I joined it, left it for a short while and then rejoined it. The Total of my service is something like ten years.
Interviewer: Any reason why you joined (............) at that stage?
Manager: Yes, it was being started by people I knew and had worked with in one of my previous companies and I was invited to join shortly after they had started up, and it seemed like an interesting thing to do at the time.
Interviewer: It was pretty small at that time wasn't it?
Manager: Yes, I think there were about forty or fifty people on the operation. We had one leased aeroplane and everything contracted out, we had our maintenance contracted out, the only thing we did was buy our own aeroplane, basically.

Interviewer: A bit different now.
Manager: Yes, quite a bit.

Interviewer: And you joined in 1961 in what position?
Manager: As a salesman. Yes, one year I went to Canada to open their new office - there was no office there previously,... then, I went to run the North Atlantic operation, the service operation from here. And then one year after that I switched from the North Atlantic to the South Atlantic.

Interviewer: And they were progressive moves in the hierarchy were they, when you went from the North Atlantic to the South?
Manager: Yes.

Interviewer: Are there any personal ambitions you have at the moment, within the Company or outside it?
Manager: No big thing at the end of the road, just to do extremely well in what I am trying to do.

Interviewer: No seeking higher positions, even?
Manager: Well, I hope that they will come as a result of high application.

Interviewer: But they are not sights as it were, not things you are particularly aiming for?
Manager: I haven't got one particular aim, I don't want to be President of the Country necessarily.

Interviewer: OK, And are there any activities you pursue out of working hours? Sports, hobbies?
Manager: They are mainly placid, spectator roles, I don't find myself getting involved in too many sporting
activities; visiting friends, talking, read, reading a lot.

Interviewer: Your friends, are they largely people you meet outside the company?

Manager: I am afraid they are people inside the company or largely...

Interviewer: People in the industry.

Manager: Yes. The transport industry, the travel industry.

Interviewer: Is this because in any way the sales department is socially orientated, as a part of its activities?

Manager: I think so, I think it is a little hard to define which comes first, where you associated with people because you do business with them or you become friendly with them and then do business with them. It's a two way thing, it is a lot simpler because of the length of the working day, basically, a salesman traditionally is never asleep on his job, because of the amount of time involved in what you are doing. It is a lot easier and the line of least resistance to associate with people within the industry, because it is very difficult to meet anyone outside it.

Interviewer: Is this literally in your own time, I know there are quite a lot of functions going on including receptions, etc. Do you spend much time on that?

Manager: Yes, well that's if you like. The Company allocate time because someone is required to be at social functions and promotions at certain times because we are keeping our client along.

We want to hit him from all angles, air cargo, selling him seats, whatever he wants, and whatever services we have to offer. That is sort of company allocated but you also get involved in self imposed deadlines I guess, meetings and activities, like some of the silly social activities which you do when you do committee work of any kind, and
industry oriented organisations.

Interviewer: What sort of things were you thinking of?

Manager: I don't do this too much, because I haven't got involved with it over here, but overseas and in Canada I found myself sitting on various committees for improving customer receptions, at the airport.

Interviewer: Within the company?

Manager: No, as an industry, community relations I guess you would call it, but it's within the industry. And, of course, also one gets involved to a great extent in North America in things like fund raising and this sort of thing. It has become a part of the working life you want to use the working facilities to take these tasks forward.

Interviewer: Do you find that these friendships and social relationships that you have with the company members overlap to a certain extent into the work you do? Does it affect with your work relationships because you have a personal contact?

Manager: Oh yes! Particularly within the company.

Interviewer: How far reaching is that, I mean how far does it affect your daily operations?

Manager: Pretty much, to start with purely from the efficiency point of view, there are an awful lot of people that you don't have to write to so you buzz them or you can phone them, and very quickly reach an agreement about something without getting involved in meetings and programmes. Of course, it is an awful lot easier if you are talking to the chief of another activity, it is very much easier to talk with him very quickly and have it all implemented rather than starting with his people and working up. I find it is very important to be on a good basis with all of your colleagues.

Interviewer: Does this sometimes alter a decision making process? If there is nobody available to contact, having a personal relationship might mean leapfrogging in
order to get a decision?

Manager: Yes, that is fair, it is very difficult occasionally because the people in this operation travel a lot, and this goes right up to the top, the Chairman and the Board of Directors. It is quite often difficult to get hold of someone, who theoretically has the right to make a decision - say "X" and as decision "X" has to be made anyway, that is the time for making it, and so it is made. Then I find I use these relationships for decision. In the absence of my own boss, I will go along and talk to a colleague about it and decide what it is that we ought to do.

Interviewer: Perhaps we can expand on that a little in a moment, those decision making acts without authority. But before we do let me just show you this, it is a description in general terms of levels in an organisation, not specifically this one. On one side, the left side, there are one to six levels, starting with the Chairman of the Executive Board, the Chairman of the Company, the Managing Director, and so on, one can fit everyone into there. What I want to try and do is to ask you to say which level on the Management side from the Directors' down, approximately meets these levels specified here. So from the Director, at level one to the Marketing Director, the General Management and so forth. Through your own position and then down to the lowest managerial function.

Manager: You mean in this division?

Interviewer: That's right, are you with me?

Manager: Not quite!

Interviewer: This level then approximates to the Managing Director and the Chairman, OK?

Manager: Right.

Interviewer: Working down through the Sales Division, the Marketing Director, the General Manager, and so
forth, which each of those levels on the structure goes in which position here?

Manager: Where do they fall? Obviously, the Chairman of the Board up there, position level one, and in level two in relation to this division I would put the Marketing Director, it is a bit difficult to equate, because it doesn't quite describe what he really is, with regards to duties, and so on. I would have to in that same level put the General Manager of the Sales Division. In levels, accommodating three and four, because it does seem to describe the function, I am going to put the System and Route Sales Managers of the Sales Division - across three and four.

Interviewer: Is there anything between the General Manager and the System and Route Sales Managers?

Manager: Yes, these guys from the Hemispheres. Well, these are the System Sales Managers, as well I would say, the two fairly smart fellows are System Managers. And then below the Route Sales Managers we would have the passenger and cargo sales managers, for each particular route, and I would put them here. Also in the same level any Sales Executives, because that is a dual function there.

Interviewer: OK, and then your own staff?

Manager: Then secretarial and what we call Control Staff, the Administration people.

Interviewer: Is there any means by which you have learnt that structure, whereby it has been conveyed to you?

Manager: Yes, Sales is very good about its internal and particularly external communications, and information communications. I think we pay more attention to external communications, but that translates itself into revenue; if they are operating a new service - you must tell as many people as possible. When we make internal changes, they notify addressees as quickly as possible.
I think I could probably tighten up with some of the ways in which it is done, but as quickly as possible after any change whether structural or affecting the position of people or tasks, I think everybody in the Company is informed normally in writing, and quite often in a very structured way by showing a table of organisation so that we have a permanent view of what is happening.

Interviewer: It is through this process then .......... mainly in the routed form though, memos and so forth are they?

Manager: Yes, they take the shape of memos quite often, we attach a family tree thing which will tell everybody what reorganisation has just happened.

Interviewer: Is there much of a formal communication structure, meeting of managers at regular times?

Manager: Yes, they happen, but I wouldn't call them formal, we do tend to try and keep them informal, particularly in the Sales Division, but it has to be that way, once you tie people into formalising tasks and start applying manual routines to a group of people, outward facing people like salesmen, you freeze them in their activities; so everybody is left with a great amount of informality and freedom to overlap on other people's functions; so there is very good communication, internally, it is formal and informal, you get a piece of paper and if necessary we get a chart along with it.

Interviewer: But there are times when the General Manager would call the people together or see the Managing Director?

Manager: Yes, obviously these meetings are all called when there are very important opportunities or problems to discuss. Obviously we will get summoned once a month to discuss the latest actual revenue figures, as against targets, budgets and things, this happens, and that can be good or bad depending on what sort of month is being reported on. But also
in the meetings we try to discuss new and changing things. The Air Transport Industry is going through a lot of change right now, new rules and regulations, new ideas, to promote traffic basically, so we must have meetings to hear what is being discussed. Our level one people there, with the Chairman and his immediate deputies have almost daily discussions with regulatory bodies not only here in Britain but in the USA, Canada, and these new formula for handling air traffic, cargo, this has to be transmitted to us and this is how it is done.

Interviewer: What would you describe as the major objectives of the Company?

Manager: The major objective of this company is to return an investment to its shareholders, it is as simple as that.

Interviewer: That is the end goal is it?

Manager: If it must be stated in one sentence then that is it, but obviously other things go along with that. It won't be achieved if the people who are trying to do it don't go along with the progress of the company, and so on, so all the high blown phrases about taking our people with us and growing with the company up as you go along with that, but basically it is a return on investment.

Interviewer: And now can I ask you a few things about the particular role you are now in, and the relationships you have. First of all the duties of your particular job, can you outline what they are?

Manager: Yes, they are both administrative and sales, that is the accent. Nowadays it is more the administrative than the actual going out and confronting an actual sales situation, but they are to a large degree a liaison of the senior manager structure and the overseas based sales people, and information and interpretation are the dual set of functions. From that point of view, allied to that
and the administration of the sales of this particular sales division, there is also the responsibility for revenue to be generated in Europe and Britain.

Interviewer: And that is within a specific area?

Manager: It is a very difficult area to define, we call this particular area Route South Atlantic; our scheduled operation between here and Santiago, S. American. And any revenue generated on that Route is my responsibility. At the end of the day we come back to revenue because that is what the end responsibility is.

Interviewer: And this is within an operational sales, an operation concerned in the South Atlantic is it?

Manager: Yes, that is correct.

Interviewer: What is the structure of that?

Manager: On this side of the world, it is quite a simple one, it is a question of a Manager, myself, a sales executive and a secretary and general assistant, that is the people side of it, the functions are as I have described them already, the revenue and a certain amount of administration.

Interviewer: So you are totally responsible for the South Atlantic?

Manager: Yes responsible here, we have dual strip on the South Atlantic, in that instead of making all the responsibility for revenue rest on one set of shoulders, we split it up into two and we have a General Manager for South America who is based in Buenos Aires whose responsibility is Northbound generated revenue.

Interviewer: How do you mean by that?

Manager: Revenue generated within South America.

Interviewer: And this is Mr. ........?

Manager: Mr. ..........., yes.
Interviewer: What is your relationship to him?

Manager: I report to him and am responsible for the Southbound revenue, the UK and Europe revenue, he is responsible at the ultimate for the entire revenue on the Route. We do tend to split it into two because it is a convenient way to handle the problem.

Interviewer: When you say you report to him, is that difficult?

Manager: It is a little difficult because our structure calls for a Route Sales Manager to be based in Head Office and report directly to the General Manager. However, in this case our Route Sales Manager happens to be based in Buenos Aires for historical reasons. The Route has always been, the revenue on the Route has always been, produced in the majority in South America, and therefore this is a logical place where the responsibility for the revenue should lie. However, we still need a constant reporting situation within the Head Office structure, therefore I fulfill that.

Interviewer: When you say you report to him though, what sort of matters are you reporting to him on?

Manager: In fact, I find myself reporting to him very little because we basically get on with our own things, and I find myself more in a position of helping decisions, helping him get the appropriate decisions from the Head Office, and he will ask me to intercede for him on something or other. I report to him because that is the way the structure lies, but in fact we have interpreted it in a different way if you like, because it is more convenient for him to be responsible for Southbound revenue and me Northbound. Even though at the end of the day he is responsible for the whole business, it just happens this way because we are so far apart geographically.
Interviewer: What then is the relationship between yourself and the Hemispheric Manager?

Manager: Again, probably it is easier to take a normal Route, of course, a normal route, we have a Route Sales Manager for Europe and he reports to ............... the Eastern Hemisphere people, it is quite simple, they are right across the road from each other in town. However, we complicate things by having reversed procedure. The Route Sales Manager in Buenos Aires finds it very difficult obviously to report on any continuous or regular basis to ........... So I do that, on behalf of the Route; if we have a Routes meeting here, .... doesn't necessarily come up to it, I just hold the meeting and report to .......... and ..........., and in fact behave like a Route Sales Manager although I am not here.

Interviewer: And this is largely because of the geographical splits?

Manager: I think so, it would be ludicrous to keep calling him up here to appear at meetings which really do not need his presence because at the end of the day I suppose the authority emanates from Head Office, so really a decision might be made without him in any case, but he is consulted obviously regularly on what happens, as it affects him.

Interviewer: But why this structure then in which you are reporting to someone who is geographically absent from the situation as such?

Manager: This particular Route has a revenue split of something like 60/40. 60% of the revenue is generated within the South American side, and therefore the weight if you like must be down there, to take care of that revenue, to guard it and so, whereas the redressing of the imbalance if you will, the raising of the 40% of the revenue up here is regarded as the task of everybody at Head Office basically and everybody knows about the problem of the South Atlantic and
therefore we all take part in solving it, even though we might be allocated to other functions.

Interviewer: In a decision making sense, do you go to your Manager in Buenos Aires or leave it to one of the Hemispheric Managers?

Manager: The latter because it is more convenient.

Interviewer: Do you go to him very often?

Manager: Yes, when he is in town.

Interviewer: What sort of issues do you go to him on, what sort of matters?

Manager: Well fairly important things I guess, basic things which I think would require his attention because they might affect other company activities or they might require company funding to a degree that I might not be able to authorise. Basically, I know the things I think I ought to consult him on, I couldn't describe to you. I know basically what is within the limits of my authority and so I go to him for anything outside of that.

Interviewer: And you say for instance, company funding determines these limits. Is there a certain point at which you have to go to him to get his agreement?

Manager: No nothing formal.

Interviewer: How do you know then, when you should go to him?

Manager: It is not a question of getting a figure and saying, look, it is over £4,000 I must go to him or something of this nature, it is really saying, well this promotion might get deeper and deeper and I might need greater and greater finance, and more and more resources, which may have to be provided by somebody else in the company. Therefore this way he becomes involved because the company as a whole, rather than a Route, becomes involved, so I go to him for anything that I would personally feel to be outside of my scope.

Interviewer: But what exactly is this sort of feeling, how do you get to this personal feeling?
Manager: I suppose it's a question of past experience; it is a question of knowing the people you are working with, I know how feels about a variety of things, various programmes, various types of traffic, various markets; I can think for him because I have seen him make decisions in the past, because we have been working closely with each other for a long time.

Interviewer: So in a certain area if you know what his decision will be you will make it?

Manager: Yes. The idea is to go ahead and make as many as possible without keep referring them because that can bog things down, and it's the old story if things go well you get a pat on the back, and if they don't, well every now and again you get a kick anyway.

Interviewer: Has that been one of the reasons for the recent upbiding by ............?

Manager: No, I don't think so. I am not deterred by that, personally.

Interviewer: You are deterred by other things?

Manager: I think again you are deterred by experience, you know that each certain type of promotion or a certain type of venture into a new market might go like the one that didn't go well at sometime in the past, and therefore you are going to be cautious about it, you want to consult someone about it, I might not consult the Hemispheric Manager about it, I might go to one of the other fellows on the same level.

Interviewer: That again is because you know he might have an answer?

Manager: He might have in his background, or I might not have it in mine, he might have an anwser.

Interviewer: And you discovered this particularly of the relationship you have built up?

Manager: I think so, yes. I think the relationships here in this particular building are very good and enable us to do that sort of thing.
Interviewer: How effectively do you feel this works?

Manager: It works well enough, I don't think there is any magic formula for making decisions, one knows at that certain point a decision would require this type of authority, whatever it is, and at the end of the day if it is a very major one it would need the Chairman's Executive Committee. It is really a question of referring to the appropriate person. I guess that's what it amounts to.

Interviewer: When you say that on some decisions there are implications for other parts of the company, perhaps for the whole of the company, I presume there are some decisions which you make which even so haven't?

Manager: Oh yes that's true; the kind of decision I was talking about would be something where somebody else in another Department who has already, if you like, allocated all his resources, then is asked to produce two more people and we have to make some temporary departmental changes. If there is a charter job though for example, which comes across my way, then I will get Morris to handle it if he is around because he is the expert on that side of the thing. To a certain extent it cuts across because if we put a track on to Rio then it might affect the scheduled service on either side of it, of that particular travel operation, it might or might not. But if it's a specialist thing which charter would be, negotiating charter would be, then I would hand it over to him, if it is a cargo matter.

Interviewer: What is a specialist thing?

Manager: Handling charter is basically a specialist thing, it involves getting the authorities outside the scheduled services authorities. I mean like landing rights and this sort of thing. It means knowing what the basic charter rules are in all of the countries which are being served, this information is more readily available to........
than it would be to me, and I wouldn't like to assume that I was up to date; I really don't think I am on that side of the business, so I would ask him for help on that; similarly with cargo, if some specific cargo authority came my way I am not particularly a cargo expert of any kind so I would go to an expert for that advice; invariably if it was a cargo enquiry it wouldn't come to me in the first place, it would go to the cargo man anyway, because they have got well connected within the industry.

Interviewer: So would you pass on these specialist things; that perhaps you wouldn't be able to get in that particular area, things like charter sales? Suppose for example there was an enquiry for charter, that might come direct to you, or it might come to you through your superior, how would that work out, what would there be to stop two people making enquiries and going through the motions for that particular sale?

Manager: I think the only occasion where there might be duplication for example would be if (the Charter Manager) is out of town. If he was out of town I wouldn't leave the enquiry sitting on his desk I would do something about it. I would tell him as soon as he came back so that he wouldn't do the same thing all over again, and get on with it. But I don't think there is much likelihood of that sort of thing turning into competition, I think it can happen, I don't think it's foolproof, our systems do not preclude us from doing the same business. I think that is not unhealthy, I think it is probably a healthy thing.

Interviewer: Even if someone plays you up a bit?

Manager: Well that of course gets a little dangerous, that is where the close relationships come in, we hope we are telling each other what we are doing.

Interviewer: How about with reference to the cargo, do you not get more confused there because you are not really 'cargo' individuals?
Interviewer: Now I am not looking so much for the competition or even the overlapping, but how you come to get this understanding of your relationship, how you come to know what is a specialist activity and to know what cargo charter you won't handle but somebody else should do or would do.

Manager: I don't know how to explain that to you, it comes from being advised formally in writing of various people's specialist functions. It comes from following those, and it comes from dealing with the people referred to and judging their abilities, and I must admit in some cases cutting people out because you don't think their specialist functions are adequate.

Interviewer: You have done that have you?

Manager: Oh yes. You go to where the job is going to get done. It doesn't happen very often because we don't have too much fat available.

Interviewer: Give me an example will you.

Manager: I wouldn't like to give you an example but it has happened in the past that one particular person is introduced as being an expert on one particular activity and turns out to be not such an expert, and once you have had a disastrous experience of his abilities you go somewhere else in the future. It doesn't take very long to sort those problems out, because too much is at stake to carry any passengers really.

Interviewer: Continue the history of the job will you, do you know any thing of the previous history - oh it was a new job wasn't it you were saying?

Manager: Yes, it is a situation that was established about two years ago, the route structure as it is was introduced in May of two years ago, of 1971, and that was the time when you should of been here of course, because there was an awful lot of uncertainty and indecision as to what in fact the responsibilities were and the extent of them and so on. It has been a question of everybody feeling
their way. I think that took quite a long period, I think it took between six and nine months before everybody knew where they really were, because they had all been posted from the other side of the world and everybody had been switched around. That is the history of it as far as this company is concerned, it is not unusual practice it really relates to the route system as we have it. It also really relates to the common practice they have in the Foreign Office, where you have the Africa desk, the French desk and so on.

Interviewer: So you were in fact the first incumbent of this particular job?

Manager: No, of the North Atlantic which I was previously doing.

Interviewer: And was there a South Atlantic at that stage?

Manager: Yes it's ......., he has been the Route Sales Manager since we introduced the system, the previous sales manager, South Atlantic was ......., our cargo man.

Interviewer: So when you first came in did you then take over the South Atlantic revenue?

Manager: The South Atlantic from ........

Interviewer: I see. And was there any way in which you were told the duties of your job?

Manager: Very briefly and verbally, but I don't think it was completely essential because I think I understood what it was before it was explained to me, there wasn't anything formal, nobody really gets a position paper on his terms of reference, that would tend to circumscribe people a little, it is because of this freedom of action and overlapping which create a lot of the positive things that we do around here, I think if you started to set things up for people it would hold things back.

Interviewer: That is the way you prefer to have it, is it, not circumscribed?
Manager: Within a clearly defined sort of organisation one must know where to go if one has to, it is very difficult if you are operating on a completely free and easy basis because you have to have the assurance that certain jobs are being done whatever happens, come what may. So this is very important, but it has limits obviously.

Interviewer: May we develop this degree of definition? For example, do you have the authority to create new positions?

Manager: No.

Interviewer: Not in any circumstances?

Manager: It is very difficult to say yes or no. I would say no instinctively because I wouldn't tend to do this without consulting. I might set up a situation whereby that would be the eventual result and that would be the eventual decision, but I think I would have to go somewhere else to get it decided.

Interviewer: Have you often had to allocate work and determine work allocation?

Manager: Yes.

Interviewer: Within what circumstances?

Manager: Within the limits of this particular organisation here, which is basically a three person organisation. Although of course one overlaps the other, and the other allocates to other administration people, and other people's staff.

Interviewer: And also in the other divisions?

Manager: And in other divisions yes.

Interviewer: And how does that work out, do you -- ?

Manager: I would doubt that there would be authority for that, but it's done, but whether there is authority for that I don't know, one just goes out and does it.

Interviewer: Are you liaising very often with some of the divisions, some of the production side for example?
Manager: Yes, with all of them really. Because they all impinge on one another, -

Interviewer: You do especially on certain flights though don't you?

Manager: Yes, the ones within this marketing operation of course, commercial division, research and development and I of course, because we are so closely related with the traffic we carry, with Traffic itself, with the passenger handling people. And of course advertising, promotions, and the other people within the division.

Interviewer: How do you feel about how you relate to these people? I see it is not in a strict authority sense but you are determining some of their worth and value; can you also determine priorities?

Manager: For other divisions I think not, that would really be something for their people to decide, but I think you can probably establish priorities in the sense that, where in the Promotions Department is concerned, something needs doing, and you draft it out in a hurry, for one particular reason or another, it is a question of going along to, in this case, ...... in Promotions, and establishing with him that there is a priority for whatever it is you are asking him to do and get his people to do it.

Interviewer: Do you relate at all to Commercial Planning?

Manager: Yes, in so far as Commercial Planning are the people who put into effect the changes of schedules and changes of operations that we need on the route, yes, of course, and they are the notifying authority for one reason or another if we decide to change a timing or a seating figuration on one of our scheduled services. They push out the paper which will tell everybody in the world what is happening in fact. Yes, so possibly we relate to them, and they come to us and we go to them for that sort of function.
Interviewer: Yes, is that a - I am not quite sure of the set-up yet, is that the sort of key board? I mean presumably somewhere is a place where everyone checks in, to find out, where there is - any spare capacity?

Manager: Yes in Commercial Planning we keep the main heading boards, and the forward planning boards for the aircraft, and they are responsible for that, and obtaining landing rights and various other things, and they control the long term planning and the short term planning up to three days before the operation, then it reverts down to operations. So that of course is where the central aircraft plotting chart is kept.

Interviewer: And with these other Divisions, is it determined for you whether you go to them or not, for instance, with Research and Development do you use them as you want to use them or as you need to use them?

Manager: I am not sure that I understand that statement. If I want to get information which is basically statistical, I will go to Research and Development because they keep those records; if I want to establish a trend or want them to establish what a trend is, then I will go to them because you can make some very good guesses when you have good statistics, however, I can ask them for impossible things because I am not always completely quite sure on whether they have or have not a certain set of statistics, or a piece of information and so I might go to R & D and ask them for something which I will eventually get from either Reservations or Traffic because they happen to keep those records. But once having found that you go to the original sources.

Interviewer: Have you the authority to reorganise work programmes and work schedules?

Manager: Yes, within the limits of this organisation.
Interviewer: OK. And to change duties prescribed for particular functions, have you authority to do that?

Manager: Yes, sure, I think I know what you mean.

Interviewer: Yes, not on the day to day basis, but on a permanent role for instance. The permanent role of the individual?

Manager: Well I think from that point of view, no, I don't think I could do that, if a role has been defined it is for a very good reason and if you have agreed to it in the first place you wouldn't tend to change it overnight. So no, I think the answer to that would have to be no. You might ease into it a little bit, you might find that something is done better in another way, and you will do it, but you won't perhaps do it overnight, you might ease into the situation.

Interviewer: Is there anything that has happened there?

Manager: I can't quote you an example, but I think it is the sort of thing that does happen, yes, because it is an easier thing to do perhaps than to set about changing it in a structured way. Which might involve writing reports, or something of this nature.

Interviewer: Have you authority to discipline staff?

Manager: I suppose so; yes, I guess so. Reprimanding people for being late, this kind of thing you mean? Well I suppose so, If it is necessary I just do it, but not suspend people, I would not get involved in a situation like that, I think if it got to that point it would be far too serious, and I don't believe in suspending people, they are either good and do their job or you get rid of them.

It is an issue which isn't quite so relevant for Sales.

Well I don't think anybody lasts here very long who constantly is late, or constantly lazy or constantly anything, it doesn't happen that you
have to say to somebody, "For Christ's sake get your finger out," or whatever, we all keep each other up if you know what I mean.

Interviewer: So a dismissal would be unlikely would it?

Manager: Oh yes, I just wouldn't bother with that type, I'd pass it on to someone else I guess. Terminating employment is something I have never done in this particular job. If a man tended to lose his temper and say get out of here, and I suppose if somebody wasn't doing a very good job, you would just ask for someone else to do the job. That would involve moving them to another part of the company to a function that they are capable of performing, or I suppose in an extreme case getting rid of them, but I think with the size of employment we have there is always a slot for someone, I don't think it is a question of ever getting rid of anyone, unless they are completely incompetent.

Interviewer: How about your authority to recruit somebody?

Manager: Recruitment, that is done strictly through the organisation, although again a little informality creeps in, you might ask the Personnel people to put out a staff opportunity notice, or something, a staff vacancy notice which circulates all over the world. However, on the second day of the notice's appearance you might just informally meet someone who just informally applies for the thing, and you might find the thing is filled before it is even published anyway. Although it is not supposed to happen I think it does happen.

Interviewer: You would virtually make the appointment then?

Manager: Oh yes, sure.

Interviewer: Are there grievances to be dealt with, does anyone have grievances of any sort?

Manager: Oh I am sure everybody has grievances all the time. There is a procedure, a management committee which the company runs, and we have
our own representative on that committee who happens to be the General Manager, Sales Division. So I suspect our grievances, if any, wouldn't reach the Management Committee because we would deal with them within the Division anyway. I don't suppose anybody has that kind of serious problem, if they have a serious problem they are inclined to go and see the man and talk to him about it. Grievance also has overtones of filing reports and asking for committees to meet and things, and holding boards of enquiry and I don't think we ever get that serious, when somebody has a dispute they have a little shout about and that is it.

Interviewer: What authority do you have to promote?
Manager: No I think not. I suppose the decision would be somewhere else up there, having asked for a certain situation to happen it would be approved somewhere else.

Interviewer: How about authority to alter conditions of employment?
Manager: I think not. No.

Interviewer: Are there any bonuses, overtime, additional payments?
Manager: That is a laid down thing. You pick someone's spot on the salary scale in consultation, in my case, with .......... or the General Manager. We don't tend to go out and entice people in the industry, we do it occasionally I suppose on certain levels, but we don't do it as a habit because we are pretty good about the staff vacancies, the notice routine, offering people inside the company the opportunity first. So it is not a question of going to somebody and saying: if you are getting 'x' with this employer we will steal you away for this. Salaries like that are determined basically by the structure, if you have got to fill this slot, this is how much it is worth.
Interviewer: Have you the authority to spend financial resources, and if so to what extent?

Manager: Yes, I don't think I can quote the extent. That would depend on the type of expenditure and the reasons for it. There again the decision would be made by myself as to whether or not it was going to be one of these open ended situations, which might get worse and worse or more and more expensive. But if it is a simple print order or something of this nature, of course just go ahead and do it, but if it's a major promotion involved then of course you refer it.

Interviewer: Have you authority to control or make decisions over other Departments?

Manager: To a limited degree, a very limited degree. And they wouldn't be making decisions, they would be reaching agreements I think.

Interviewer: So say you had a problem with another Department, well one I know better is Commercial Planning, would you go to the Manager over there and tell him or ask him?

Manager: You talk to him on the basis that he is responsible for his operations, and nothing could be achieved without his co-operation.

Interviewer: Are there any other areas of authority that we haven't mentioned? That you have in your job?

Manager: I can't think of any.

Interviewer: Have there been any changes in the extent of your authority since you have been in the job?

Manager: No, I think not.

Interviewer: It's much the same as when you took it over?

Manager: Yes, we are talking about August 1st, so it is only a short while ago, there haven't been any changes since then.

Interviewer: And do you think there is sufficient authority I mean would you prefer a little more authority in certain areas where there isn't sufficient to carry out?
Manager: I would like more authority, but I don't think you make more authority, I think more authority follows on with the functions and the tasks that you are performing; you can't have authority out of proportion to the production if you like. Yes, it would be nice to have authority and to get things done without spending the time in perhaps getting people together to get things done, but that is the way things are.

Interviewer: In Sales or in general?

Manager: Just in general I think. It is an awful lot easier if you have some work to do late at night to just tell someone to stay on and grab three other people from another Department to help out and so on, but it is not possible to do that. What you do is you go along and persuade them to do it. It works just as effectively, in fact it probably works better.

Interviewer: OK. Now finally can I just ask you who would take over the job from you, who would assume responsibility for your job, in the absence of yourself?

Manager: Theoretically the Sales Executive. But as we don't have one right now, in fact the Western Hemisphere System Chief, ......... In other words my boss rather than my next in line.

Interviewer: Because he is the only one?

Manager: Yes, Although again informality creeps in and my colleagues would cover for me if I was on a trip. Because we all know each other's customers they would be able to help with a decision on whether or not to act before my return, because of course my secretary would keep them advised of any problems she would have.

Interviewer: How about to your immediate superior, presumably it is the Western Hemisphere Manager again, who would assume responsibility for his job?
Manager: Sorry, who would assume responsibility for my boss's job if he was away? There is nothing laid down, I think it would be a combination of various people, I think the Eastern Hemisphere manager, would help, I think, .......... would jump in here, .......... would help, I guess we all would, it is just a question of closing ranks when someone is not about.

Interviewer: What about your South American manager?

Manager: Well of course he is geographically unable to assume anything really, he is in Buenos Aires.

Interviewer: Sorry yes, but who would assume responsibility for his role if he were absent for some reason?

Manager: If he were absent in Buenos Aires, his role would be assumed by the Manager, Argentina, because he is based in the same office, Unfortunately it is a very difficult route to parallel with the others because we have this split.
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