A RESEARCH METHOD FOR THE ANALYSIS OF ORGANIZATIONAL GOAL-SETTING AND ACTION IN THE PAKISTAN ACADEMY FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Thesis for the Degree of Master of Arts

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

JAHANGIR KHAN

1969

ABSTRACT

A RESEARCH METHOD FOR THE ANALYSIS OF ORGANIZATIONAL
GOAL-SETTING AND ACTION IN THE PAKISTAN
ACADEMY FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT

By

Jahangir Khan

The study, reported in the following pages, is an attempt to identify the goal selection and goal action processes of a development organization, namely the Pakistan Academy for Rural Development at Peshawar. A review of the Academy's Annual Reports seems to indicate that the organization lacks consensus about its goal, as well as individual and group roles affecting the achievement of the perceived organizational goal. In as much as the management of these processes of goal selection and goal action is done through a complex of role relationships and expectations, the problem that the study focuses attention on is the investigation of the differences or likenesses in goal and role definition of the various component parts of the organization.

In conducting the study of the problem proposed above, three methodological techniques are used. The first one is the "opinionnaire", which may be referred to as an open-ended question device. This opinionnaire is constructed with the view kept in mind of the different set of perceptions the various segments may have regarding the goal of the organization and their own segmented role. The second technique used in the study is "the depth interviews", designed primarily to get the views of one of the components of the organization, i.e. the advisors. The study of the Academy's literature was the third technique used in the study. The review and analysis of this literature was attempted with the

ۓ

view of illustrating the sources of disagreement within the organization
under study, and their possible affects. The data used in the study is
primarily based on the opinions given by the faculty and the advisors in
reply to the questions in the opinionnaire as well as the responses of
the advisors during the course of the depth interviews.

The major findings of the study are:

1. The various components have a dissimilar estimation of
   and orientation to the Academy's goals.

2. There are differences in the components' assessment of
   the organizational goal achievement.

3. The individual components differ in the definition of
   their respective roles in relation to the organizational
   goal.

4. The various components differ in their estimation of
   the fulfillment of role expectations about each other.

A RESEARCH METHOD FOR THE ANALYSIS OF ORGANIZATIONAL
GOAL-SETTING AND ACTION IN THE PAKISTAN
ACADEMY FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT

By

Jahangir Khan

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Sociology

1969

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In completing this thesis, I gratefully acknowledge the valuable help, guidance and encouragement from Drs. Christopher Sower, William Faunce and Cole Brembeck. Without their continued interest, it would not have been possible to present this study in its present form.

I am grateful to Barbara Khandelwal for her immense help in proof reading the original draft.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

THEORY OF DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

Introduction

A special feature of the industrial urban order is the establishment of small and large scale bureaucratic organizations within which the major functions of the society are performed and channelized. Not only have the developed nations recognized the important role of these formal structures, but the developing nations have also realized that their efforts of progress must be carried out within these organizations. As a consequence, the study of organization and the behavior of these involved in their operation has received considerable attention from sociologists. From Max Weber to Blau, March and Simon, organizational behavior analysis has become an important topic of study in sociology.

It is beyond the scope of the present study to present the point of view of the various bureaucratic analysts. In this chapter, therefore, an effort is made to present at some length a special point of view and theory about large scale organization, i.e. the theory of development organization. This is done because of its special application to the present study endeavor.

Theory of Development Organizations

The idea of "Development Organization" as a theoretical model for organizational analysis and predicting organizational behavior has been

1

developed from within the broad framework of the "positive social organization" concept first used by Parsons. Whereas the term 'social organization' in its social anthropological meaning and context has been used for quite a number of years, Parsons was the first to formulate it during the course of his discussion and criticism of the assumptions underlying C. Wright Mills' analysis of power. In Mills' scheme of thinking, power appears to be essentially a negative phenomenon which, in effect, is exercised by the holder for the preservation of his power to the detriment of others. In redefining the role of power in modern society, Parsons suggested that " . . . power, while of course subject to abuses and in need of many controls, is an essential and desirable component of a highly organized society."[1] In fact what Parsons suggested is that whether power is misused is an empirical question and not definitional. Definitionally speaking, power can be positively exercised for exhancing the objectives which the individual and the society have set forth. Hence, the concept of "positive social organization." Sower and Miller in offering an explanation for the vast agriculture organizational establishments during the last century used this concept and as a result evolved a new set of organizational principles which, they contend, can predictably affect the achievement of goals desired by the society. In place of "positive social organization" they use the concept of "development organization," a discussion about which follows.[2]

_____

[1]Talcott Parsons, _Structure and Process in Modern Societies_ (Illinois: Free Press, 1960), p. 220.

[2]Christopher Sower and Paul A. Miller, "The Changing Power Structure in Agriculture," _Our Changing Rural Society: Perspectives and Trends_, ed. by James H. Copp (Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University, 1964).

Basic Principles

Two sets of organizational principles originate in Sower's "develop-
ment organization" theory. These are, the principle of inter-organiza-
tional structure and the principle of intra-organizational situations.

We would be concerned here only with the second set of principles
and not the first. This is because the present study is based only on
the intra-organizational variables. As such, a discussion of inter-organ-
izational structure and linkages seems to be unnecessary. Furthermore,
the first set of principles in Sower's theory are readily available for
anybody interested in studying them.[3]

However, the intra-organizational aspect of Sower's theory which
forms the primary theoretical basis for the present study is still in
skeletal form and therefore needs explanation.

The "development organization theory" stated in terms of intra-or-
ganizational principles holds that any organization is only something in
the minds of people.* An organization is a collectivity of various in-
dividuals drawn together for achieving some goals. These individuals
form a network of both formal and informal relationships among themselves.
They act and relate to each other in terms of the values and sentiments
which each one of them brings into the organization. In this sense then,
we can perceive an organization as not only containing the 'most immedi-
ate' individuals involved in the operation of an organization, but we
can also recognize the distant and the far off 'relevant others' associ-
ated in varying degrees of involvement with the organization. In other

---

*The author is primarily following Sower henceforth.

[3]Christopher Sower, et al., Community Involvement (Glencoe, Illinois:
The Free Press, 1957).

words, if we regard an organization as an 'environmental manipulative system' then we can recognize not only the very immediate actors as important, but also the outside and distant, but yet related, set of office holders as necessary components of organizational behavior. Some people tend to make a pseudo-distinction between the 'variables' and 'parameters' on the basis of difference in the environmental position of various factors.[4] Sower resolves this dilemma by offering the concept of 'organization anchor points of legitimation' which he has taken from Parsons' "three levels in the hierarchical structure of the organization."[5] In essence, this concept states that an organization is composed of three parts or levels which legitimately exercise control over its actors. These three are examined below.

(a)   The Resource Input System:

An organization must obtain resources, and for that purpose it must have an appropriate body that can offer these resources. These resource allocations are made with a degree of respect to norms and values that constitute the social system of the appropriating body.

(b)   The Resource Receiving System:

The resources receiving system tends to develop some standards in the shape of rules and regulations which determine the allocation of resources within the sub-structure.

---

[4]For example, see: Gwen Andrew, "An Analytical System Model for Organization Theory," (unpublished paper, East Lansing: Michigan Department of Mental Health, 1963).

[5]Talcott Parsons, "Suggestions for a Sociological Approach to the Theory of Organization," Part I and II, Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. I and II (June and September 1956), pp. 63-65 and 225-239.

(c) The Product Using System:

This level represents those people in the organization who use the product of the organization and who place evaluation on the product in terms of the product's utility in meeting their needs.

Sower suggests that goal selection and goal action are managed through the complex of work relationships. These three components hold expectations for and about the organization. The problem then is how groups in these various levels "within an area of interdependence" select a common goal perceived as desirable by these sub-structures. In fact, the selection of a goal for the organization is seen as one of the primary variables in the analysis of organizations. Anderson suggests a proposition based on the principle of "anchor points of legitimation"; namely that:

> "the nature of the goals of an organization, and how these goals are arrived at and set, is one of the most predictive variables for explaining other organizational variables...."[6]

The tri-structual legitimation model offers a theoretical basis of explanation of organizational goal setting in the beginning, as well as during the subsequent stages, of its growth. This is indeed an important point, in as much as it points to the fact that organizational goal setting and organizational goal achievement are not static phenomena. It is rather a dynamic arrangement of expectations which each sub-structure or level holds as basically important to its existence. If it is so, then the legitimation principle offers two benefits for research experimentation. An obvious benefit is that, in this model, we tend to recognize the strength of structural analysis as we focus our major attention

---

[6] Robert Anderson, "A Method and Instrument for Predicting the Consequences of Intra-organizational Action," (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Michigan State University, 1961), p. 45.

on each level and its role relationship in organizational affairs. We, in effect, admit that individuals operate and show their strength as members of these various sub-structures. If, therefore, we can change the sub-unitary perception, we can affect changes in organizational behavior to advantage. This is a departure in Sower's theory from its counterpart line and staff theoretical models, in that it places emphasis on 'whole' or a 'sub-whole' rather than an individual. "It is sufficient to say here that functions of each of these . . . types of sub-structures within a large organization are important to developing the models necessary for predicting such processes as goal achievement."[7]

The other aspects of intra-organizational principles in Sower's theory relate to role expectations, role behavior, and the important concept of role consensus, in as much as they offer scope for looking at organizational behavior and relationships. Since this is an important area not only in Sower's theory but also for the present study, we wish to discuss it in some detail in the chapter which follows.

---

[7]Christopher Sower, "Working Papers: The Role of Organizations in Achieving Development Goals: The Case of Ceylon," (unpublished U. N. Technical Mission Report, 1962). See also: Christopher Sower, et al., "The Role of Organizations in Achieving the Goals of Planned Change," Highway Change and Locality Change, Part IV, (unpublished Michigan State University Report, 1961).

CHAPTER II

POSTULATE OF CONSENSUS

As early as 1924, Park and Burgess were giving thought to the pro-
blem of consensus. In their writing about society, descriptive state-
ments about consensus can be found in explicit and implicit forms. They
suggested that, "Society viewed . . . concretely . . . is a complex of
organized habits, sentiments and social attitudes -- in short, consensus."[8]
These thoughts reflect a theme -- consensus -- which permeates a variety
of sociological writing.

Anthropology draws our attention to it in using the term 'charter'
and by stating that a society is built around a set of mutually agreed
upon patterns of behavior. Linton presents the concept of "ideal culture
patterns" to explain consensus. The concept of "real culture patterns"
implies that the members of a society in actuality develop a configura-
tion of behavior patterns which are " . . . learned and shared."[9] Cul-
ture on the whole is seen, however, to be the binding force in regard to
determining the consensus about individual and group behavior.

Sociology also places emphasis on "consensus" as a variable in the
process of human behavior. In Parson's analysis, for example, there is
implicit reference to the fact that human interaction tends to take place

---

[8]R. E. Park and E. W. Burgess, <u>Introduction to the Science of Man</u>
(2d ed.; Chicago: University of Chicago, 1924), p. 163.

[9]Ralph Linton, <u>The Cultural Background of Personality</u> (New York:
D. Appleton Century Company, Inc., 1945), p. 46.

within a framework of adaptive reality. He suggests that "people inter-
act in terms of a system of culturally structured and shared symbols."[10]
Individuals in interactive situations begin to share common assumptions
and expectations regarding each other's behavior. They wish to engage in
activities which are normatively upheld by the others as desirable and
necessary. Thus, " . . . the more frequently men interact with one an-
other, the more nearly alike they become in the norms they hold, (and)
. . . in their sentiments and activities."[11] These theorists do not
specifically deal with the position of consensus in terms of a bureau-
cratic role, for example. They merely point out the use of consensus in
as much as every individual in his day to day living, makes adaptations
for and agreements on a variety of actions.

In Social Psychology, more specific explanations are offered. Mead
seems to be the first one to illuminate the problem, although attempts
before him were made. We find in his theory of symbolic interaction, and
in his concept of the "generalized other"[12] a brilliant exposition of the
consensus question. The basic viewpoint of symbolic interactionists is
that a person evaluates and performs his actions in terms of his percept-
ion of what others expect him to do. He seeks to engage in action which
others can condone. Newcomb offers a psychological explanation and de-
fines consensus as "the existence, on the part of two or more persons, of

---

[10]Talcott Parsons, The Social System (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press,
1951), pp. 5-6.

[11]George Homans, The Human Groups (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1950),
p. 126.

[12]George H. Mead, Mind, Self and Society (Chicago: University of
Chicago Press, 1959), p. 154.

a similar orientation towards something."[13] According to Newcomb, there is a psychological need in the individual to seek consensus; which reinforces his belief in the action he intends to take, and reduces the chance of his being sanctioned by the group. Newcomb's terminology -- cognitive agreement and cathectic disagreement -- seems to be a useful psychological explanation of the need for consensus. The function of consensus, according to Newcomb, is to serve as an "instigation to communication", in short, to realize mainly cathectic agreement. Cognitively, individuals may or may not agree on certain issues, but the cathectic agreement for human business is of paramount importance.

As has been indicated above, the scheme of various authors contains the broad and general purpose of explaining human behavior in terms of the appropriateness of the symbols and sentiments which people bring with them while interacting with each other. The concern in these writings has been with the culturally prescribed behavior and role performance. Such a concern is well taken, in as much as it attempts to explain human behavior. However, the major concern here is to explain how far bureaucratically defined role behavior and individually defined behavior patterns achieve a consensual state in an organization. Reisman, for example, points out several types of bureaucrats,[14] and this in turn raises the following pertinent questions. Do these types point out the relative significance of consensus variables? Are there variant types of behavior expectations that impinge upon individual position holders in an organization? In short, what does this term 'role' imply? If we can

---

[13]Theodore Newcomb, "The Study of Consensus," Sociology Today, ed. by Robert K. Merton, et al., (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1959), p. 277.

[14]Leonard Reisman, "A Study of Role Conception in Bureaucracy," Social Forces, Vol. XXVII (1949), pp. 305-310.

determine that, we have a fair chance of explaining the validity of a consensus model.

The study of the school superintendent's role by Gross, et al.[15] is a major attempt to forge a linkage between the two sets of inter-related variables of consensus and social roles in a bureaucratic structure. The concept social role according to Gross, is made up of two component parts. Gross identifies them as 'position' and behavior expectations'.

Briefly stated, the position element of social role implies that there is a formally sanctioned and prescribed place held by a position holder who, because of this incumbency, enjoys some rights and status within the structure. "The term position (is) used (therefore) to refer to the location of an actor or class of actors in a system of social re-lationships."[16] Nearly every position is within a network of other posi-tions held by other position incumbents. The second element of social role becomes relevant here. Each social role has some expectations at-tached to it which others trust the position holder will fulfill. Just as the element of 'right' is an important consideration for the position incumbent, what others expect him to do is also equally significant from the standpoint of performing certain roles. This then, is the normative component of social role in which a person feels bound to act according to a prescribed blue print. These expectations can be viewed as "pat-terns of evaluation"[17] providing the orientation and basic framework

---

[15]Neal Gross, et al., Explorations in Role Analysis (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958).

[16]Ibid., p. 48.

[17]Talcott Parsons and Edward Shils, "Value Motives and System of Actions," Towards a Theory of Action, ed. by Talcott Parsons and Edward Shills (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951), p. 180.

within which an individual feels obligated to perform certain roles. It may be recognized, however, that the expectations are not only determined in terms of fulfilling normative criteria, but are also used in a predictive sense. In other words, they help to build up predictions about the future. For example, when one says, "I am expecting him tonight," the person is making a prediction. Whereas the anticipatory or predictive element of expectations is obviously useful for the purpose of understanding the concept, we are nevertheless inclined to place primary emphasis on its evaluative components because of a basic assumption that much of what we do, specifically in bureaucratic role performance, is carried out with due respect to the norms. When a bureaucrat takes an action, he is not as much concerned with predicting its consequences, as he is with the question of whether or not his actions fulfill the evaluative criteria in view. To rephrase and reiterate the same point, it may be proposed that "there is a set of expectations relative to the contingently probable reactions of others"[18] requiring a befitting conduct on the part of an actor.

Role Consensus as a Variable in "Development Organization" Theory

We have said that bureaucratic roles do not function in isolation. They are performed in relationship with a series of other roles. Organizational behavior, as such, is determined more by the interlocking variables of role consensus rather than individual roles. After all, an organization is nothing more than "a collectivity of positions with accompanying behavior expectations for the incumbents of each position and

---

[18]Parsons, The Social System, p. 38.

for the unit as a whole."[19] Roles in organizations tend to cluster

around two major nexus points. The first one is personal, composed of

all formal and informal positions occupied by an individual. The second

is organizational, composed of all the roles in any sub-unit of the or-

ganization. There may be a considerable degree of difference in what

each incumbent perceives and expects his role to be and what an organiza-

tion and its various sub-units anticipates and believes is the role of

its members. These prescriptions and proscriptions of individual roles

are problems of cognitive definitions having different meaning and value

for each individual. In short, it is a problem of consensus, i.e. a lack

of it. The problem of consensus[20] can be seen as occurring on two levels.

First, the individual is subject to behavior expectations held in value

by the relevant others in the individual's immediate sub-unit of which

he is a member. Secondly, he holds a position in the total organization

structure and as such is subject to behavior expectations of a totality

of other position incumbents in an organization.

In addition, the actor has a self image of what he should be doing.

Sower postulates that the consequence of these variant demands may be

that " . . . there will not be consistency between the different 'rele-

vant others' who have the legitimative right to hold behavior expecta-

tions for any given position incumbent."[21] The problem of variant

---

[19]Christopher Sower, et al., "The Role of Organizations in Achiev-
ing the Goals of Planned Change," Highway Change and Locality Change, ✓
Part IV, (unpublished Michigan State University Research Report, 1961),
p. 10.

[20]When we talk of consensus from now on, it will be used both in
positive and negative sense.

[21]Christopher Sower, "The Land Grant University, Development Organ-
ization in Transition: The Case of the Extension Service," Proceedings of
Seventh Annual Cooperative Administrative Seminar, (Madison Extension Cen-
ter for Advanced Study, University of Wisconsin, 1962), p. 42.

behavior expectation, Sower suggests, causes the problem of consensus
with two sets of consequences. The first deals with psychological con-
sequences to position incumbents; the second, with the consequences of
achieving organizational goals.[22] It is beyond the scope of this analy-
sis to present the possible ranges of psychological consequences of a
lack of consensus except to suggest the possible emergence of emotional
stresses in a situation of that kind. In as much as the actor's own per-
ception comes into conflict with what others expect him to do, he may ex-
perience detachment, strain, and stress.

The second type of consequence with which we are concerned at this
stage leads us into explaining the relationship between lack of opinion
consensus among the various relevant segments in so far as the organiza-
tional goal is concerned. It is postulated that in a complex organization,
goals may not be clearly defined so that agreement about its role among
those who run it may not exist. There tends to be a degree of difference
in conceptions about the role the complex organization is expected to
perform. "A natural condition of a large scale organization is that
there will not likely be consensus between the goal achievement patterns
of sub-sections and those of the total organization."[23] The problem of
organizational goal consensus is, therefore, a problem of legitimation
and justification of these goals, by various parts of an organization.
Each sub-structure (three anchor points of legitimation) defines and jus-
tifies the goals in terms of their own respective unitary objectives.
This justification in part results from the norms and sentiments which
are believed to be of value to the sub-unit. As a result of this process,

---

[22]Anderson, "Predicting the Consequences," p. 49.

[23]Sower, et al., "The Role of Organization," Part I, p. 27.

the members of a sub-unit may identify goals in their own minds as over-all organizational goals. A contest between the various sub-units may emerge. A large amount of development energy in these cases is spent in justifying sub-unit goals. The organization then becomes basically oriented to fulfill only one function, i.e. that of maintenance. In terms of consensual validity of the organizational goals, we may propose then that the extent to which the organization achieves its goals has some relationship to:

  a) The degree of agreement the relevant segments have about organizational goals, and

  b) The extent to which the organization imposes upon its segments patterns of behavior that are congruent with their own perceptions and expectations.

The developing countries like Pakistan are establishing many of these large scale development organizations to initiate and achieve development objectives. Some of these programs cannot achieve maturity because of this problem of consensus about the goal in view. The involvement of international agencies like U.S. AID may further confuse the issue because of their variant outlook on the goals of an organization. The classical example is the Community Development Program in Pakistan which died after only five years of operation because each segment of the organization held different perceptions of its goal.

We propose to investiage the differences or likenesses in definition of the component parts of the Pakistan Academy for Rural Development, Peshawar, about the organizational goal. This organization seems to have found itself lacking consensus about its goal, as may be observed by reading the Academy's Annual Reports. An effort will also be made to locate

differences in the individual goal definition of the members of various segments.

CHAPTER III

PAKISTAN ACADEMY FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT:
A DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

PART I

The Organization

As indicated earlier, it is proposed to describe here the Pakistan

Academy for Rural Development as a development organization, as well as

analyze its five years of operation in terms of the problem of consensus.

This has been done through a content analysis of the four annual reports

of the Academy. Annual reports, it is assumed, are the best efforts of

any organization to present itself and its activities in as honest a man-

ner as it can. They contain material which is both important for the or-

ganization and for analytical purposes.

The Academy: A Description

At the time when the village AID* program was a dominant theme of

the nation's planning process at the village level, the planners felt

that there was a need for establishing an institution in which the super-

visory staff of the village AID organization could be properly trained.

At that time, there was no such institution competent to provide suitable

training facilities to its (V-AID) officers. There were village AID

---

*AID stands for Agriculture and Industrial Development.

16

institutions established for the purposes of training and preparing the
village level workers for grass root community development work. It was
felt by planners that these institutions were not well enough equipped
to provide the training facilities for the supervisory staff of the or-
ganization[24] and as such they felt that the establishment of a separate
institution for training the higher level staff was needed. With these
considerations in view, the government of Pakistan began negotiations
with the Ford Foundation to tap its help in this project. The Foundation
promised help and sent a team of advisers from the Michigan State Univer-
sity College of Education, headed by Professor Floyd Reeves, to Pakistan
to explore and make recommendations about the nature, purposes and scope
of the institution. The team toured Pakistan and discussed the Academy
and its scope with a cross section of high level government officials.
At the end of these meetings, the team of advisers with Pakistani person-
nel drew up the scheme of the Academy[25] in August, 1956. According to
the original unpublished scheme, "The purpose (of the Academy) will be
to train administrative and supervisory personnel of the village AID and
other nation-building departments as well as CSP (Civil Service of Pakis-
tan) and PCS (Provincial Civil Service) officers for the village level
development program." The main body of recommendations of this team are
quoted by the Peshawar Academy in its 1959-60 annual report. The three

---

[24]One could legitimately raise questions on such a position on the
grounds that instead of creating a new organization, it may have been
more beneficial to equip the existing institutions for training the offi-
cers as well. This would have resulted in a better integrated training
work program for the officers and the workers.

[25]It may be kept in mind that the scheme involved the idea of creat-
ing two academies in both the wings of the country, i.e. East and West.
At present both of them are in existence but have no administrative rela-
tionship with each other which they had at the time of their establish-
ment.

major provisions were:

1) The Academy will be an education and research institute and will be administered by a Board of Governors under the chairmanship of the Prime Minister of Pakistan.

2) Besides the purpose of the Academy as enunciated in the Cabinet Resolution (referred to above),its particular objective will be to prepare the personnel of the several government departments for the task of integrating all the village work to achieve the maximum improvement in the welfare of the people.

3) Because the scope of the training program in the Academy is to attack development problems through the coordinated efforts of several departments of central and provincial governments, the academic program must be set up at a high level, both in terms of training and execution of the program. This requires an instructional staff of highest calibre.

With these points in view, a faculty with the highest possible educational background was selected from within the country and from those scholars studying in the United States and England. Almost all of the members of the selected faculty have had foreign training in their respective fields. The faculty consisted of ten positions and covered the broad range of social science disciplines. The disciplines represented were Sociology, Anthropology, Economics, Public Administration, Education and Communication, Rural Business Management, Social Research, Community Organization and Community Development. As can be recognized from reading the above list of disciplines, the planners placed a great emphasis on the social sciences, which they regarded as a necessary basis for the training and orientation of the clientele who would be coming through the Academy. This social science orientation not only subsequently permeated the training and research program, but also made the Academy's undertaking look like a university type educational program designed to help train the government officers.

Besides creating these positions, there were three more positions

which were thought to be an integral part of the faculty. They were Co-ordinator of Training, Librarian, and Administrative Officer. The faculty was then sent to Michigan State University for nine months training. The members spent considerable time in seminars with the view of mapping out a program of the Academy to be pursued by the faculty on its return home. The Academy started its actual operation in July, 1959 at Peshawar and received its first group of trainees in September, 1959.

From the very beginning, Michigan State took an active part in the program of the Academy, with two faculty members serving as advisors to the Academy. A third faculty member was located at the Central Office of the Government of Pakistan in the role of Chief Advisor. Soon after the idea of the Academy was conceived and approved by the Government, an autonomous Board of Governors was established. This Board consisted of top ranking government administrators from various Ministeries both at the central and the provincial level as well as the Establishment Division of the Cabinet Secretariat. There were also non-official representatives on the Board.

Dilemma of Goals

It seems safe to assume that soon after the establishment of the Academy, the faculty and its Director began to feel that somewhere along the line they were not clear about the goal of the Academy. In the words of the Director, "When the Academy started functioning the faculty was quite clear about the responsibilities."[26] After a year, the Director observed in the same report, "the faculty finds that these

[26]Annual Report of the West Pakistan Academy for Rural Development, for the Year 1959-60 (Peshawar: Academy for Rural Development, 1960), p. 34.

responsibilities are no longer as clear and distinct as they were before and for that reason some of them are now being questioned by 'others'." According to them, the Academy began as an institute where officers with sufficient field experience would come to be trained to correlate their field problems with scientific means. In advancing this notion about the goal of the Academy, the internal component stressed that, "The Academy has to help the officers . . . to find . . . reasons why departments do not work together . . . and how the efficiency of these departments can be increased."[27] In the same report, the writer seems to argue against the critics who advocate the down-to-earth training theory by asserting that the faculty members thought that this (the above stated position) was a more practical and realistic method of training than laying agricultural demonstration plots, forming cooperative societies or setting up a cattle breeding farm at the Academy. The same report summarizes the dilemma of the lack of a clear-cut goal, and the unfulfilled expectations thereof by saying, "If any expectations of the outsiders are at variance with those of the insiders, the difference has stemmed from the lack of a clearer definition of the (goal) of the Academy."[28]

The Second Annual Report of the Academy for the year 1960-61, begins with a definition of its goal. The report suggests that "in pursuance of its main objective, namely, to equip the administrators with the necessary techniques, skills and attitudes of working with the people effectively, greater emphasis continued to be placed on training as the major activity of the Academy during this year as well. In fact, all other activities, some of which could be independently viewed as of

[27]Ibid., p. 29.

[28]Ibid.

equal importance, were directed towards that end."[29] The rationale offered by the faculty and its Director for this position was that the personnel coming in for training had already received specialized training and were technically skillful in their respective fields. An animal husbandry official, the faculty thought, had sufficient knowledge of the technical aspects of his job. But what he required was a knowledge of human relations skills to put "those skills across to people in such a way that they adopted them and through them raised the (people's) economic standards."[30] In an exclusive chapter on "Academy Goals" in the same report, the above position of the faculty is reiterated in many different words. The Academy is "primarily intended to train development officers and supervisors, and civil service administrative officers, such as deputy commissioners, instructors of V-AID training institutes and, officers of the nation building departments who were supposed to support the V-AID officers in the Administration of rural development."[31]

The Third Annual Report for the year 1962-63 begins with the same concern and position of the faculty and its Director, who stressed that, "Training continues to be the primary function of the Academy . . . ."[32] However, in this report one can discern the Academy talking of another set of goals to which it had hitherto been indifferent. This relates to the problem of 'demonstration' which the Academy's well wishers had been

[29]Annual Report of the West Pakistan Academy for Rural Development, for the Year 1960-61 (Peshawar: Academy for Rural Development, 1961), p. 3.

[30]Ibid., p. 4.

[31]Ibid., p. 62.

[32]Annual Report of the West Pakistan Academy for Rural Development, for the Year 1962-63 (Peshawar: Academy for Rural Development, 1962), p. 3.

pushing hard to get across to the faculty and the Director. As a result

the staff is seen talking of its "steadily moving in the direction of

continuing training with demonstration."[33] It even undertook some

schemes on paper.

The 1963-64 Annual Report of the Academy presents the same story.

It reaffirms the views of the faculty and the Director about the primary

goal of the organization. It states categorically that "Training has

been and will continue to be the main function of the Academy. All

(other) activities . . . must be such as are designed to assist in the

carrying out of this main function."[34]

The purpose of presenting the short excerpts from the four annual

reports is to identify clearly the Academy's dilemma, an area which still

lurks in the mind of the organization faculty and Director -- an impor-

tant part of the Academy structure. It is clear from the reading of

these reports that the question of the goal of the organization still ex-

ercises the minds of the various people connected with it. The problem,

as can be envisaged, is not that this segment is unclear about the or-

ganizational goal, but rather that this definition of the goal is at

variance with the definitions offered by other relevant segments of the

organization. It has seemingly put the organization on the defensive

and has generated conflict as is admitted by the faculty in its very

first Annual Report. It recognizes this by stating that, "The worst

kind of psychological set-back to an enthusiast is to put him on the

defensive. The faculty was put on the defensive even before it could

---

[33]Ibid., p. 65.

[34]Annual Report of the West Pakistan Academy for Rural Development,
for the Year 1963-64 (Peshawar: Academy for Rural Development, 1964),
p. 69.

measure its (goal in view)."[35]

In contradistinction to this position is another school of thought offered mainly by most of the Michigan State advisors who have been in Pakistan and are now associated with the Pakistan Project on campus either directly or indirectly. The major idea of this group of individuals is that, notwithstanding the training program, the Academy must have the Rural Action Program in which the officers are involved in administering and operating the program along with the village people. This, according to their point of view, will be a more practical and realistic training for the officers. This school of thought, however, does not see this as necessarily a conflict of definition about the goal of the organization, but rather a difference of definition about the means of achieving the goal. They contend that their emphasis on a rural action program should only be taken as a means towards achieving the broader goal of the Academy. The underlying assumption in this view is that if the faculty and officers attain experience in rural development administration and operation, the training program can become more realistic and fulfilling.

According to our view, however, it is not so much a matter of a means - ends controversy as it is a controversy over the goal and scope of the institution. In our estimation, the goal of an organization is perceived to be a legitimate end toward which action is oriented; in essence, what it is going to do. However, the action orientation of an organization towards a legitimate end cannot be seen as separate from the whole range of activities which is the scope (means) of the organization. People, as suggested by some, may agree at a very general level about an organization's goal, but yet they may disagree to a great extent as to

---

[35]Annual Report for 1959-60, p. 28.

the scope of efforts or activities intended to underwrite and achieve

that goal. By a process of displacement, people may begin to recognize

the scope (means) of an organization, as its goal. It is a very subtle

phenomenon in which the goals and scope of an organization may be viewed

by relevant parts as identical.[36] Human beings may not tend to identify

this at a conscious level, but yet these (scope and goal) are very often

taken as one and the same thing.

The question as to how this can be measured quantitatively cannot

be answered. There is probably no quantitative measure discovered so

far. However, the degree of commitment to partial 'means' and the coun-

teracting reactive behavior may give a clue to the occurrence of this

phenomenon. One tentative proposition with regard to a goal - means re-

lationship can be made, namely that, the greater the commitment of the

person to the means, the greater the chances are that the means will be

displaced as goals. Nevertheless, without considering further the 'means -

goals' or goals - scope dimensions of the question, it appears safe to

suggest that this lack of goal agreement has been present throughout the

Academy's life. A very ostensible example of this phenomenon is found

in a ninety-seven page, consolidated report of the Director of the Acad-

emy based on an evaluation conducted by him in 1962. The Director is-

sued a questionnaire to the faculty whose responses form the basis of

this evaluation.

In response to a question as to the impediments in the way of ef-

fective performance of a job, the respondents indicated a "lack of clear

---

[36]Sower's theory gives due consideration to goal as a variable in
organizational behavior, but does not seem to talk about its goal - scope
elements. As such the above description is, perhaps, an extension of
that idea.

cut direction."[37] In another question in this report, five respondents out of the twelve indicated that the "absence of any definite goals"[38] is considered as harmful to the interest of the Academy. The faculty was also asked to "describe the atmosphere in which you can work most productively and creatively."[39] The respondents again observed that they could work more productively and creatively if they were provided with "specific and prescribed institutional directions."[40] One of the functions of the existence of a clear goal is that it legitimately clarifies and justifies the role each position incumbent plays. In the absence of an organizational goal, the activities of an individual position incumbent may be evaluated by others as useless, impertinent or even harmful to the interest of the organization. In other words, the expectation for individual actors in terms of their own perceptions of the goal of the organization may be dissimilar from others. Where the organizational goal is not clear, there tends to develop a variety of conceptions among individuals about their own role in the organization. The activities of others are then looked at and evaluated in terms of this perceived goal. A necessary corollary of this is that even the individual role may begin to be taken as non-productive and conflicting. The role of both the evaluator and the evaluatee can begin to become unclear, less determined and unwarranted by others. When asked about the defects in the Academy administration, the respondents, during the same survey, indicated that

---

[37]Annual Report for 1962-63, Appendix E, "Questionnaire With Consolidated Replies," p. 133.

[38]Ibid.

[39]Ibid., p. 208.

[40]Ibid.

" . . . no one (in the Academy) seems to be sure of his job."[41] The

Director suggests that " . . . presumably everyone (the respondents)

knows what his job requirements are but feels that others don't."[42]

It is to explore this lack of consensus regarding organizational

goal definitions and inconsistency about the roles of actors in the or-

ganization, that the second part of this chapter is directed.

PART II

Methodology

A major focus of organizational analysts relates to the construc-

tion of methodological tools to be used toward the discovery of how var-

ious components within the organization relate to each other. Parsons,

for example, attempted to focus attention on the constituent elements of

relationships, and he took their interdependence as given.[43] Merton's

suggestion about the degree of interdependence of organizational parts

is a further attempt to give empirical importance to the constituent ele-

ments.[44] For the purpose of developing a schematic model for systemati-

cally determining the degree of importance of these elements, no sound

tools have been developed. A significantly useful attempt has been made

in that direction by Anderson. A portion of the model developed by

---

[41]Ibid., p. 173.

[42]Ibid.

[43]Talcott Parsons, The Structure of Social Action (New York: McGraw Hill, 1937), pp. 65-80.

[44]Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957), p. 25.

Anderson has been used in the present study.[45]

The Anderson method is in line with Sower's theory of development organization and the consensus model. It seems that within the framework of Sower's organization analysis scheme, greater emphasis is placed on the sub-structural variables which are recognized to be important constituents of the organization. In respect to these considerations, the following methodological tools were evolved for conducting the inquiry.

The Construction of an Opinionnaire

This device is close to what Anderson calls an "open-ended question device."[46] The opinionnaire was constructed, keeping in view the different set of perceptions the various segments may have regarding the goal of the Academy and their own segmented role. These were mailed to the faculty and Board members and were also administered to the advisors.

The Depth Interviews

These interviews were held with one segment of the population: the advisors. The attempt was made to get their views regarding the various issues involved.

The Study of the Academy's Literature

In terms of gaining some insight into the conflicts involved, it was thought a good technique to study the literature produced by the Academy. This analysis was attempted with the view of illustrating the sources of disagreement within the organization under study, and its possible effects.

---

[45]Anderson, "Predicting the Consequences."

[46]Ibid., p. 73.

In terms of the problem at hand, the following hypotheses were constructed. A few testable deductions were also delineated and are presented below:

Hypothesis I

There will be a lack of agreement between various segments about the over-all goal definition of the organization.

Sub-Hypothesis I

There will be an intra-segmental agreement about the organizational goal definition.

Hypothesis II

There will be inter-segmental non-agreement about the extent of achievement of the organizational goal.

Hypothesis III

Intra-segmental definition of the organizational goal determines the individual incumbent's definition of his own role.

Sub-Hypothesis I

Members will have intra-segmental agreement about the role they assume for themselves.

Sub-Hypothesis II

Members will have inter-segmental non-agreement about the role they assume for themselves.

Hypothesis IV

Intra-segmental agreement on role definition determines the fulfillment of mutual expectations within that segment.

Sub-Hypothesis I

There will be a lack of inter-segmental fulfillment of expectations.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF DATA

It appears difficult to try to quantify the presentation and analy-
sis of data here. The population consisted of a total of thirty respon-
dents, out of which only seventeen replied. All members of the two sub-
units -- advisors and faculty replied, except for the Director of the
Academy, who is a member of the Board of Governors as well. The members
of the Board of Governors did not reply at all, although they were sent
two follow-up letters. The indifferent response of the Board was some-
what expected and was in line with the image which the counterpart group -
the advisors - had about it. This suggests that the Board, as an im-
portant segment of the total system of the Academy, may not have an active
interest and responsibility in the program.

The following presentation will be more in straight report style
than in statistical form. Since the emphasis is on the differential per-
ception of each group, with respect to the organizational goal and its
effect, an effort has been made to analyze and bring these differences to
the surface.

Academy's Goal: Faculty and Advisors' Perception

The first attempt made in the study was toward ascertaining the
perceptions of the respondents about the goal of the Academy. "There will
be a lack of agreement between various segments about over-all goal defi-
nition of the organization" is the hypothesis tested for this purpose.

30

A testable sub-hypothesis in this case is that, "there will be an intra-segmental agreement about the organizational goal definition". A series of responses were given which were categorized in relation to the degree of approximation to each other. These are presented below:

TABLE 1

COMPARATIVE DISTRIBUTION OF THE RESPONDENTS IN RELATION
TO THEIR VIEWS ABOUT THE GOAL OF THE ACADEMY

Goal in View	Advisor	Faculty	Total
Action Program	5	1	6
Training	2	9	11
Total	7	10	17

The responses of the advisors represent a practical goal-oriented viewpoint with some tangible results in view. A majority of them (5 out of 7) believe that the goal of the Academy should be "a rural development program." When they were asked about the activity of the Academy as a training institution, they suggested that training could best be imparted by involving the officers and faculty in development programs in villages. Some of the respondents indicated that there had existed some difference of opinion among the advisors regarding the goal of the Academy in the initial stages, but that most of them now agreed upon this fundamental goal, i.e. "a viable rural development program." One of the respondents summed up these various perceptions of the advisors by saying that the real goal of the Academy was "how to enhance human development of the villagers." "Unless the Academy has a village project," they observed, "it cannot even train the officers."

A majority of the respondents in the other group, i.e. faculty (9 out of 10) suggested that the goal of the Academy was "training of the public servants and carrying out research from a social science perspective." The tenth respondent mentioned "promoting rural development" as the goal of the institution. The training, the respondents believe, should primarily contain a social science bias. The data offered above indicate that whereas members in each segment possess agreement in defining the organizational goal, the definition of both the groups are dissimilar from each other. As such the hypothesis, i.e. "there will be a lack of agreement between various segments about overall goal definition of the organization," is accepted. The sub-hypothesis was also tested and is to be accepted on the basis of the data presented above.

Since the above responses were only a projection of the feelings of the respondents, it was considered necessary to have them assess the projects the Academy had engaged in from time to time. The question was in two parts. The respondents were first asked to list the projects they regarded as most important and then evaluate each one of them on a successful, unsuccessful score. The hypothesis examined in this regard is that "there will be inter-segmental non-agreement about the extent of achievement of the organization goal."

Table 2 indicates the pattern of agreement about the goal definition given by individual respondents in the two segments as well as the assessment of the respondents about the extent of achievement made by the Academy.

When asked how many of the other respondents would agree with their definition of the goal of the Academy, most respondents in the advisors' group were of the opinion that others would agree. They were further asked to state the extent of the Academy's goal achievement. Most of

them (6 out of 7) observed that the Academy had achieved its goals only to a little extent. They felt that in terms of establishing a viable rural action program, the Academy had not been very successful. "The Academy has been mainly concerned with research and analysis," the respondent indicated, "and not with opening the new frontiers." As such, they estimated the goal achievement as small.

TABLE 2

COMPARATIVE DISTRIBUTION OF THE RESPONDENTS IN RELATION TO
THEIR AGREEMENT ON GOAL DEFINITION
AND THE EXTENT OF ACHIEVEMENT

Agreement About Goal Definition	The Extent of Goal Achievement						Total
	Advisors		Total	Faculty		Total	
	Large	Little		Large	Little		
Most and every one	-	6	6	8	-	8	14
Some and none	1	-	1	1	1	2	3
Total	1	6	7	9	1	10	17

The respondents were further asked to identify the most important projects the Academy had engaged in the past and how far they thought these projects had been successful. The respondents mentioned about ten projects, out of which seven related to the training projects of the Academy. Out of these, six were considered as only "somewhat successful." Another three projects relating to village level work were also mentioned but they were also rated as only "somewhat successful." They felt that village level projects were only "half hearted" attempts of the Academy. Most of these respondents clarified their rating by pointing out that the Academy's program at present was devoid of "an educational program sensitive to the cultural needs of the people." They felt it

essential that the officers (coming for training) should actively do things at the village level. They were apprehensive about the projects and their success in achieving that end.

A majority of the faculty respondents (8 out of 10) felt that others agreed with their definition of the Academy's goal. Two members felt that others would not agree with his definition of the goal. They were further asked to mention the extent to which they thought the goal of the Academy had been achieved. Eight respondents in the faculty group indicated that training and research had been the most important projects the Academy had carried out. All of them also regarded these projects as successful. Out of the two members who observed that others were not likely to agree with their definition of the goal, one felt that the Academy had been largely successful in achieving the goal defined by him and the other felt that the achievement had been little.

An examination of the respective responses of both the groups, i.e. advisors and faculty, indicates that there not only exists a non-agreement between them about goal definition, but that they also tend to disagree about the extent of goal achievement. The hypothesis that "there will be inter-segmental non-agreement about the extent of achievement of the organizational goal" is accepted.

Role Definition of the Respondents

In the construct of Gross et al., "perceived obligation" is equivalent to a legitimate expectation. This obligation may be classified as, "cherished obligation" approximating behavior which is highly valued (value), "mandatory obligation"[47] covering behavior which is

---

[47]This term is drawn from the concept "mandatoriness" used in Gross et al., Explorations.

authoritatively commanded or required (authority) and "santioned obliga-
tion" pertaining to behavior that symbolizes the approval of an action
(approval). According to this classification, role behavior is nothing
more than a fulfillment of obligations seen as value, authority and
approval.[48] It is also recognized here that the goals of an organization,
are taken up as cherished obligations. In other words, an actor recog-
nizes the goal of an organization as his obligation and tends to place
greater value on this in the performance of his role. The authority and
approval dimensions of role are enacted in so far as they may change the
efforts of an actor or a group of actors to fulfill valued obligations
effectively.

An attempt was made in the present study to explore the individual's
role definition in the Academy. The hypothesis examined in this connec-
tion was that "intra-segmental definition of the organizational goal de-
termines the individual incumbent's definition of his own role." In
this connection, two sub-hypotheses examined were that the "members will
have intra-segmental agreement about the role they assume for themselves;"
and that "members will have an inter-segmental non-agreement about the
role they assume for themselves."

Table 3 presents respondents' opinions about their role in the
Academy. The opinions of the respondents in both the groups, i.e. advi-
sors and the faculty are given.

In terms of the advisor's role at the Academy, there seems to be
a general agreement that his role is to "help the faculty to work with

---

[48]The typology is a take off on classification of "moral orienta-
tion", "expedient orientation", and "moral expedient orientation" used
by Gross et al., Ibid. It may be recognized that Gross' terminology is
dissimilar from the one used in this study, not in usage but in the words.
The coinage of present terminology is warranted by the simplicity of the
words used, i.e. 'cherished', 'mandatory', and 'approval'.

officers and villagers." All the advisors (seven) recognized that to
help the faculty to work at village level was their major role. In this
connection such definitions of their role as "faculty associate," or
"learner of practical problems" were mostly used. None of the respon-
dents identified his role as training agent. In terms of the typology
used above it seems that the respondents had a "cherished obligation"
for their role as "faculty associate" to help the faculty members and
officers in either developing or carrying on village level work.

TABLE 3

COMPARATIVE DISTRIBUTION OF THE RESPONDENTS IN RELATION
TO DEFINITION OF RESPONDENT'S ROLE IN THE ACADEMY

Definition of Role	Advisors	Faculty	Total
Instructions of Trainees	-	8	8
Engagement in Action Program	7	2	9
Total	7	10	17

The faculty were asked to state their own definition of their role
in the Academy. Eight respondents indicated their role as teaching - the
word used at times was "tutoring" - and doing research in their individual
fields. It may be recognized here that the definition of their individual
roles is again made within the context of the goal of the Academy, which
they had identified as training. In as much as tutoring fits well into
that goal, the respondents looked at teaching as their cherished obligation.
The other two respondents described their role as "doing a lot of

practical experimentation" in as much as it enhanced the scope of train-
ing the officers. In terms of typological considerations, it seems that
the cherished obligation of the major proportion of the faculty is for
teaching and research. They not only perceive teaching and research as the
Academy's goals, but seem to define their own role within that context.

The examination of the responses of the faculty members and advi-
sors indicated that their role definition as units was different from
each other. Furthermore, members of the both groups defined their role
in terms of their respective segmental definition of the Academy's goal.
It seems, therefore, that whereas there is an intra-segmental agreement
about role definition, there exists an inter-segmental non-agreement
about it. Both of the sub-hypotheses posed above are, therefore, ac-
cepted.

It was also hypothesized that "intra-segmental agreement on role
definition determines the fulfillment of mutual expectations within that
segment."

In this connection the respondents were asked to relate how far
they thought they had come up to the expectations that others had about
them. Their responses are given in Table 4.

When asked as to the expectation which others had for them, most
of the advisors (6 out of 7) indicated that others expected them to en-
hance the scope of achievement of the goals which they had stated, i.e.
establishing a rural development program. They felt, however, that they
were not successful in helping the faculty carry out practical village
level work. Whereas mutual expectations of the advisors within their
own segment were fulfilled, they indicated that they could not fulfill
the expectations that faculty members had for them.

When the advisors were asked in what ways they failed to fulfill

TABLE 4

COMPARATIVE DISTRIBUTION OF THE RESPONDENTS IN RELATION TO AGREEMENT ON THE ROLE
DEFINITION AND THE EXTENT OF EFFECTIVE ROLE PERFORMANCE EXPECTED BY OTHERS

Agreement about Role Definition	The extent of fulfillment of others' expectation											Total
	Advisors					Faculty						
	Large Extent		Little Extent		Total Advisors	Large Extent		Little Extent		Total Faculty		
	Intra	Inter	Intra	Inter		Intra	Inter	Intra	Inter			
Most, Everyone	6	0	0	6	6	8	0	0	8	8		14
Some & None	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	2		2
Total												16

others' expectations for them, they mentioned that:

1. They were prevented by others from engaging in direct rural programs.

2. They could not forge a link between advisor and faculty programs.

3. There was no working relationship between the advisors and the faculty.

4. Decisions were not made by mutual consultation.

The respondents in the faculty group were asked to relate the degree of fulfillment of those expectations which other faculty members had about them. Eight out of 10 respondents felt that they came up to the expectations of the others to a large extent. They were also asked another question, to ascertain what proportion of the other faculty members came up to their expectations for them. Most of them (8 out of 10) believed that the others came up to their expectations. Two respondents indicated that "some do not offer challenge in the sense that their presentations in the class are not up to the mark professionally."

The respective responses of the faculty and the advisors offer a conclusion that respondents in both groups believe themselves to be successful in fulfilling expectations within their own segments. As such, the hypothesis posed above is accepted.

At the same time, their responses indicate a lack of fulfillment of expectations between groups. Therefore, the sub-hypothesis, "there will be a lack of inter-segmental fulfillment of expecations," is also accepted.

The Board

As already expressed, not a single member of the Board responded to the questionnaire. It seems relevant, therefore, to describe in brief, the Board's position in the Academy's structure.

The Board is primarily constituted to underwrite the budgetary requirements as well as to make some policy decisions in regard to the Academy's program. It has already been stated that not a single member of the Board responded, although reminders were sent. The Board consists of top provincial government officials, who seemed to have little interest in this "second-rate" duty given to them. The respondents in the advisory group were asked to give their views about the Board. They all felt that the Board members had neither time and interest in the Academy's program, nor did they know the goal of the Academy. "The Board did not exist for a long time,"[49] one of the respondents said. "There were only two meetings (of the Board) during the two years," another one indicated. Another said that the Academy's program was of secondary importance to them - "it is a lazy body". They all indicated that there had never been any working relationship between the Board and the rest of the members of the Academy.

Interpretation and Conclusions

As identified earlier, faculty, advisors and the Board represent three different sub-units which form the main action component of the Academy. The data analysis presented above focuses attention on the

---

[49]Since its inception, the membership of the Board of Governors has changed many times. Its linkage to the level of government has also changed; once a central government body, it is presently a provincial subject.

different expectations which they have about the institutional goal.

It seems safe to conclude that the faculty as a group has a pure university type of training program in view. They tend to justify it in terms of their academic orientation. The goal in the mind of this sub-unit is to create a number of trained officials who may have some sort of a "human relations" outlook toward the problems of development in Pakistan. This group, consequently, stresses a lot of classroom type training which should have an overall social sciences bias. It believes that the real value of the Academy's program lies in its training efforts. It is, therefore, convinced that the Academy is successful in imparting sound training to the government officers. This assessment of the faculty's goal is in line with the observation of an advisor, who indicated that "the faculty was well trained in the U. S. and has a traditional mind with respect to education and training." In as much as this is true, the faculty seems to be building up the Academy along university lines so that they can produce work which will "please their 'reference group' in the universities." Thus the beliefs expressed by the faculty, along with their actual practice, and the corresponding commitment of the faculty to a traditional educationist role (i.e. a social scientist), significantly points out that the faculty's goal is training of goverment officers in rural development, with an overwhelming theoretical emphasis. For them, training is a "cherished obligation."

On the other hand, the input system, i.e. the advisors, from as early as 1960-61, has had some very definite practical goals in view which, according to them, may bring some tangible results both in terms of training and rural development. To this unit, there is no disagreement that the goal of a "rural development Academy" is to develop the

rural areas. Therefore, for them, a direct rural action program is, and should be, the primary goal of the Academy. The Academy, they believe, was not established to impart classroom training, but to help the officers work out solutions for rural development. In this process of working out solutions, the officers can also be given actual training. Yet, this sub-unit maintains that the major goal and objective of the Academy should be "opening new frontiers which would forge a link between villagers and officers." All of them except one maintain that they have never had any fundamental difference on this. However, it was brought to notice, that in the early period there were definite signs of differences with respect to whether the Academy's goal should be training in, what was then termed as, "development administration," or whether it should concern itself primarily with initiating, "rural development."[50] At present, however, they all indicate an overall agreement on rural development as the Academy's goal. Classroom training, according to this group, is desirable; yet, an action program is indispensible. A practical explanation of this greater concern for an action type of rural devolpment program lies in what one of the respondents describes as "financial expediencies". "We can only underwrite programs which are believed to be making an overall impact," the respondent states.

Whereas these two sub-structures of the Academy organization have some goal in view - howsoever variant - the Board of Governors has very little idea of the goal. The lack of response on the part of the Board and the general expectations about it by its counterpart unit, i.e.

---

[50]A fact of serendipity character was brought to notice while looking at the early differences. The advisors with theoretical orientation were biased more toward training in development administration, whereas, the advisors with practical experiences favored action rural development.

advisors, pin point the Board's complacency in relation to organizational
goal definition and goal setting, and to its own role in it. The Board
seems to have very little concern with the objective of the Academy and
is involved only with periodic sanctioning of the Academy's budget, and
with the under-writing some of its activities. The Board's periodic ses-
sions, once or twice a year, are convened more to formalize the Academy's
activities and to allocate resources, such as advisory services and fin-
nance, etc. It does not seem to have concern for the setting up of the
objective or the definition of the Academy's goal. For its members, it
is a "sanction obligation" to attend its periodic sessions. It is not a
"cherished obligation" with them to look at the goal of the Academy it-
self.[51]

The analysis of the data also indicates that the variant defini-
tions of these units with respect to the institutional goal, become ref-
erence points in the assumption and performance of their respective in-
dividual roles within the organization. Within the scope of data avail-
able, it seems that the role of the Board members is that of more or less
sanctifying the name of the organization. In other words, the fact that
the members are all high officials provides sanctity to the Academy's
goal, whatever that goal may be; yet it has not been its role to define
the objective or goal. The advisory group on the other hand has a defi-
nite set of expectations with respect to their role relationship in the
Academy. They see their role as helping the faculty and officers in
doing actual rural development work. In contrast to this, the faculty

_____

[51]This brings to light one important issue: in the case of semi-
government autonomous organizations, e.g. the Academy, would it not be
more functional to have a Board which is constituted by people who are
basically interested in the organization, rather than by people who have
a secondary attachment to their membership on a Board?

members believe that their role is that of teacher or tutor, with a concern towards the accomplishment of the training requirements of the Academy in a classroom situation.

Such differences of goal definitions do not necessarily warrant a conclusion that the various sub-systems are in some way "displeased" with each other. The word "displeased" is purposely substituted for "in contest". It is a mutual displeasure which the actors earn if they find their expectations at variance. They may enter into a "contest", which is an open manifestation of their displeasure. However, the contest usually remains latent, e.g. displeasure with each other. It is likely that this displeasure, generated by the three sub-system's variant definitions of institutional goals, may have resulted in a steadily decreasing interest in one another. One test of this may be to adjudge how far the sub-units come into contact with one another after they cease to remain officially associated with each other. An effort was made during the interviews to locate how often and in what ways the advisors, who were no longer officially related to the Academy, continued to take any interest whatsoever in the faculty activities, and vice versa. No traces of interest could be observed, although this could be due to other reasons, e.g. their heavy responsibilities in new assignments. This interpretation may be correct, however, to the extent that during the interviews, some respondents expressed that, even while officially associated with one another, the faculty and advisors had very limited sharing of interests. The Board, on the other hand, obviously had minimum interest and link with either faculty or advisors.

A conclusion of major significance in this research, which can be drawn with a fair amount of certainty, is that the various sub-units have a dissimilar estimation of and orientation to the Academy's goals,

as well as having their own individual definitions of their respective

roles therein. These differences are not merely terminal points in them-

selves. They tend to prevent the action component from reaching an over-

all agreement about the organizational goal, with a resultant wastage of

potential organizational development energy. A side effect of these dif-

ferences is the creation of an attitude of uncertainty and doubt about

one another's proposals, whatever the merits of these proposals may be.

As an example of this, about three years ago, under the pressure of opin-

ions of the advisory group, the faculty group formulated a proposal for

a rural "development laboratory" to carry out rural development work.

Since then, however, the proposal has mainly remained on paper. In other

words, the faculty had only a "manatory obligation" to the proposal.

Further Concerns

It seems necessary to re-examine and/or reinterpret the theoretical

position of the "development organization theory" in the light of the

data and analysis presented above.

A post factum glance shows that the theoretical model is helpful

in identifying the structure of the organization. The input - output

model, as it may be called, demonstrates its analytical usefulness in

looking at the composition of patterned structures within the organiza-

tion. It emphasizes the importance of sub-units in the organization

rather than individual strongholds. The Board, the faculty, and the ad-

visors are the important sub-systems of the organization under study.

The segmentalized definitions of the organizational goal, by the various

sub-units, has been seen to affect the total orientation and action di-

mensions of the organization, as well as the role relationship between

various sub-units.[52]

In the light of the results of this study, the "development organization model" seems to be particularly applicable in the case of those organizations which have both indigenous and foreign groups in their list of legitimizers. It must be admitted, however, that the present research did not include certain variables which, if taken into consideration, may have helped in identifying the greater (or lesser) analytical scope of the model. One of the areas which has not been explored is, for example, the informal relationship between the position incumbents as it affects the goal orientation of the organization. Furthermore, it does not say that there may exist individuals who exercise <u>latent</u> <u>control</u>, which may be more important for research considerations than even the collective sub-system control to which the individual belongs. One could even raise a fundamental question as to whether or not it is necessary to regard all three sub-systems as equally important. For example, in this case, where the Board possesses only a sanctioning and policy control over the Academy, does the opinion of its members in terms of goal orientation and goal setting really matter? Is it too far removed both physically and organizationally that, for analytical purposes, its presence may be of little significance? The role of individuals who "restrain" and who

---

[52]It is a deduction to be tested that, insofar as much of the attitude formation of the resource receiving system-the local people-in regard to the resource input system (the foreigners) takes place within the framework of the working role relationship between the two, the lack of clear objectives among the sub-systems not only generates the professional strains between the two, but also develops attitudes and images which are not very favorable for international understanding.

"license"[53] the objectives, and their persuance in the organization, have not been dealt with because of the limitations of the present research. In certain areas even the identification of the product using system and its place in goal orientation may become difficult. For example, the product of a university - the graduates - is used by the various private and public agencies. Do all these agencies place valuation and gradations on this product, and does this really affect the goal setting processes of a university? These and other areas are open for further explorations. The present study can be best seen as a direction indicator for future endeavors.

---

[53]The 'restrain - license' continum for structural analysis has been used by Alan Howard, "On the Structural Analysis of Inter-personal Relations," South Western Journal of Anthropology, Vol. 20, No. 3, Autumn, 1964, pp. 261-266. Howard's analysis seems to offer sound explanation for control behavior in an organization.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ahmed, Jaleel. The Expert and The Administrator. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1959.

Anderson, R. C. "A Method and Instrument for Predicting the Consequences of Intra-Organizational Action." An unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Michigan State University, 1961.

Andrew, Gwen. "Analytical System for Organization Theory." An unpublished paper, Michigan Department of Mental Health, 1963.

Bernard, Chester I. The Function of the Executive. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1958.

Blau, Peter M. The Dynamics of Bureaucracy. Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press, 1955.

_____ and Scott, W. R. Formal Organization: A Comparative Analysis. San Francisco: Chandier Publishing Co., 1962.

Boulding, Kenneth E. The Image. Ann Arbor: Ann Arbor Paperbacks, The University of Michigan Press, 1961.

Dalton, Melvilln. "Conflict Between Staff and Line Managerial Officers." American Sociological Review, Vol. 16, 1950.

Dearhorn, and Simon, Herbert A. "Selective Perception: A Note on the Departmental Identification of Executives." Sociometry, Vol. 21, 1959.

Etzioni, Amitai. A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1961.

Gerth, H. M. and Mills, C. W. eds. From Max Weber's Essays in Sociology. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Gouldner, Alvin W. "Organizational Analysis." Sociology Today. Robert K. Merton, Leonard Bloom, and Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr., eds. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1959.

Gross, Neal; Mason, Ward and McEacher, Alexander N. Explorations in Role Analysis. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.

Gulick, L. H. and Urwick, L., eds. Papers on the Science of Administration. New York: 1937.

Homans, G. C. The Human Group. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1950.

Howard, Alan. "On the Structural Analysis of Inter-personal Relations." South Western Journal of Anthropology, Vol. 20, No. 3, Autumn, 1964.

Linton, Ralph. The Cultural Background of Personality. New York: Appleton - Century - Crofts, Inc., 1945.

MacIver, Robert M. and Page, Charles M. Society. New York: Rinehart and Co., 1937.

March, James G. and Simon, Herbert A. Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.

Mayer, J. P. Max Weber and German Politics. London: Faber and Faber, 1953.

Mead, G. H. Mind, Self and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959.

Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure. Rev. Ed. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957.

Miller, Paul. Community Health Action. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1953.

Mills, C. Wright. "Introduction." Images of Man. New York: George Brazillor, Inc., 1960.

Newcomb, T. W. "The Study of Consensus." Sociology Today, Robert K. Merton, et al., eds. New York: Basic Books, 1959.

Park, R. W. and Burgess, E. W. Introduction to the Science of Man. 2nd ed., Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1924.

Parsons, Talcott. Structure and Process in Modern Societies. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1960.

_____. "Suggestions for a Sociological Approach to a Theory of Organizations." Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. I-II, Parts I-II, 1956.

_____. The Structure of Social Action. New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., Inc., 1937.

_____ and Shils, Edward. "Value, Motives and System of Actions." Toward a Theory of Action, T. Parsons and E. Shills eds. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951.

Reisman, Leonard. "Study of Role Conception in Bureaucracy." Social Forces, Vol. XXVII, 1949.

Selznick, Philip. "An Approach to a Theory of Bureaucracy." American Sociological Review, Vol. 8, 1943.

_____. TVA and the Grass Roots. Berkley: University of California Press, 1949.

Simon, Herbert A. Administrative Behaviour. New York: Macmillan and Co., 1961.

_____ et al. Determining Work Load for Professional Staff in Public Welfare Agency. Berkley: University of California Press, 1964.

Sower, Christopher. "The Ceylon Village Development Program: A Sociological Analysis." An unpublished Michigan State University Research Report, 1957.

_____. "The Land Grant University, 'Development Organization' in Transition: The Case of the Cooperative Extension Service." Proceedings Seventh Annual Cooperatives Administrative Seminar. Extension Center for Advance Study, University of Wisconsin, 1962.

_____. "Working Papers: The Role of Organizations in Achieving Development Goals: The Ceylon Case." An unpublished United Nations Technical Assistance Mission Report, 1962.

_____; Hanson, Robert; Westby, David and Wiley, Norbert. "The Role of Organizations in Achieving the Goals of Planned Change." Highway and Locality Change, Part IV, an unpublished Michigan State University Research Report, 1961.

_____; Holland, John; Tiedke, Kenneth and Freeman, Walter. Community Involvement. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957.

_____ and Miller, Paul A. "The Changing Power Structure in Agriculture: An Analysis of Negative Versus Positive Organization Power." Our Changing Rural Society: Perspectives and Trends. James H. Copp, ed. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press, 1964.

Weber, Max, translated by Talcott Parsons. The Theory of Social and Economic Organization. New York: Oxford University Press, 1947.

APPENDIX

OPINIONNAIRE

A.   As a member of the Academy faculty what do you personally believe
     to be the goal of the institution? (Please give your personal
     beliefs and not necessarily what is laid down or prescribed as
     the official goal of the Academy.)

B.   In your opinion what proportion of other faculty would agree with
     your definition of the goal of the institution? (Check one below:)

     Everyone_____About half_____Most_____

     Some_____None_____

C.   In case the other faculty members differ with you, please indicate
     how they differ. (Kindly state your perceptions of the broad dif-
     ferences the others hold about the goal of the Academy.)

51

D.   How far do you think the goals of the Academy which you have mentioned have been achieved? (Check one below:)

To large extent_____To some extent_____

To little extent_____

E.   To what extent do you think the differences, which other faculty members have about the goals of the Academy, have been responsible for less goal achievement? (Check one below:)

To large extent_____To some extent_____

To little extent_____

F.   In your opinion, what are the most important projects that the Academy has engaged in? (Please name and describe the projects briefly, stating the grounds you think were responsible for its success or lack of it. For each project a ranking order has been provided. Indicate your choice by checking the rank of the project. In case you do not know about any project, please indicate accordingly.)

PROJECT	RANKING ORDER		
	Very successful	Somewhat successful	Unsuccessful
1.	_____	_____	_____
2.	_____	_____	_____
3.	_____	_____	_____
4.	_____	_____	_____

G.   What do you think you should be doing in your role as an instructor at the Academy?

H.   What do other faculty members expect you personally to do as an instructor at the Academy? (Please mention your perception of what others expect you to do.)

I.   How far do you think you are doing what other faculty members expect you to do? (Check one below:)

To large extent_____To some extent_____

To little extent_____

J.   To what extent do you think you could be more effective in the performance of your role, if there was greater agreement about your role? (Check one below:)

To large extent_____To some extent_____

To little extent_____

K.   What proportions of the other faculty members come up to the expectations you have about their roles?   (Check one below:)

Everyone_____About half_____Most_____

Some_____None_____

L.   In what way do the other faculty members fail to come up to your expectations?

M.   How often does your role within the Academy, as you define it, necessarily bring you into conflict with other faculty members? (Check one below:)

Always_____Frequently_____

Seldon_____Many times_____

Never_____