

ORGANIZATIONAL ANALYSIS

Organizational Analysis: A Case of Kohinoor Weaving Mills

Umer Ayub
Assistant Professor
School of Business and Economics
University of Management and Technology
Lahore, Pakistan
umer.ayub@umt.edu.pk

Mubashar Majeed
e-Lecturer
Virtual University of Pakistan
Lahore, Pakistan

Dr. Hasan Sohaib Murad
Professor of Management & Philosophy
School of Business and Economics
University of Management and Technology
Lahore, Pakistan

This paper has been presented in the



organized by

School of Business and Economics
University of Management and Technology, Lahore, Pakistan

This paper has been included in the conference proceedings with good intentions, where the conference and its organizers are not liable at all for the contents of this paper and / or any part of it. For more information about the conference please visit the conference website: <http://cgr.umt.edu.pk/icobm2013/index.html> or write the organizers at icobm@umt.edu.pk

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this article is to analyze a real world organization in the light of theoretical framework developed by Lee & Terrence (2003). Recently organizations have become pervasive and dominant and look like puzzling terrain because they lend themselves to multiple conflicting interpretations, all of which are plausible and create confusion. Rich qualitative information that has the ability to change understanding within a time interval can reduce this confusion. Rich information can clarify ambiguous issues with short timeframe to enhance understanding and cover diverse perspectives. These perspectives become formidably difficult to understand and manage due to increase complexities, surprises, deceptiveness and ambiguities. Organizations have changed about as much in the past decade or two as in the previous century. To survive, they had to. Revolutionary changes in technology, the rise of the global economy, and shortened product life cycles have spawned a flurry of activity to design more fluid more flexible organizational forms (Lee & Terrence, 2003). Managers, consultants, and policy makers inspired by a variety of theories put forward by researchers in an effort to change or improve organizations. In the social sciences, several major schools of thoughts have evolved and each has its own concepts and assumptions and espouses a view of how to bring social collectives under control. Each school provides theories that easily become theologies, preaching a single, parochial scripture offers a definite set of strategies for reaching the Promised Land. Recent managers are trying to climb on top of things encounter a cacophony of voices and visions. To reduce the cluelessness of managers and to avoid this myopic management, in this paper, different schools of thoughts are consolidated into four different perspectives identified by Lee & Terrence (2003): *first* organizations as **factory**; *second*, organizations as **family**; *third*, organizations as **jungle** and finally *fourth*, organizations as **temple** or **theatre**. There are many ways to label these viewpoints like mental models, mental maps or cognitive lenses but in this paper, the label “frame” is used. A frame is a set of ideas that one carries in his/her mind to develop understanding, aid navigation and to solve problems. Frames are as windows or “Navigational tools” just like modern computerized navigation system installed in automobiles that tell where driver is and guide turn-by-turn to destination. It would be great help if organizations provide the same thing to managers but

manager still need to develop and carry accurate maps in their heads. This paper is making an attempt to analyze the navigational power of frames in an organization. The article is organized around four frames; each frame has its own image of reality. In table 1, a snapshot of each frame and associative organizational perspective is presented.

Table 1

Metaphor	Frame	Focus	Central Concepts
Factory	Structural	Architecture	Rules, Roles, Goals, Policies, Technology, Environment
Family	Human Resource	People	Needs, Skills, Relationships
Jungle	Political	Arena	Power, Conflict, Competition, Organizational Politics
Theatre	Symbolic	Faith	Culture, Meaning, Ritual, Ceremony, Heroes

The **structural frame** focuses on the architecture of organization – the design of units and subunit, rules and roles, goals and policies – that shape and channel decisions and activities. The **human resource frame** emphasizes an understanding of people, with their strengths and foibles, reasons and emotion, desires and fears. The **political frame** sees organizations as competitive arenas characterized by scarce resources, competing interests and struggles for power and advantage. Finally, the **symbolic frame** focuses on issues of meaning and faith. It puts ritual, ceremony, story, play and culture at the heart of organizational life.

Each frame is powerful and coherent and collectively viewing the same thing from multiple perspectives. One manager can use one or two frames to describe his/her organization and repel other because a frame may seem to be clear and understandable while others seem puzzling. But applying all four frames deepens one's appreciation and understanding about organization just like when one adds new lens in telescope to get more accurate image of object of galaxy. Effective managers need multiple tools (frames), the skills to use each of them, and the wisdom to cope the situation (Quinn & Cameron, 1983; Morgan, 1986). Successful managers use more than one frame to develop both a diagnosis of what they are against and strategies for moving forward (Dunford & Palmer, 1995). The intent to use multiple frames in

organization is also increasing because organizations are filled with people who have their own interpretation of what is and should be happening, each version of interpretation contains a glimmer of truth, but each is a product of the prejudices and build spots of its maker. No single version is comprehensive enough to make an organization understandable or manageable. In this paper, out of four, three frames structural, human resource and symbolic are employed to analyze the organization under observation. The frame intentionally avoided to exploit in this paper is “Political”. There are multiple reasons for this intention: first the limited access to information center and interaction with employees; second the tool used in this study is silent in this regard; third the time constraint and lastly the word limit.

The tool used in this paper is a questionnaire in conjunction with other information collecting techniques (interview) to get data needed for identifying strengths and weaknesses in the functioning of an organization (KohiNoor Weaving Mills) and/or its subparts. It measures the perceptions of persons in the organization or work unit to determine areas of activity that would benefit from an organizational analysis effort. The questionnaire known as the Organizational Diagnosis Questionnaire (ODQ) is developed by Robert C. Preziosi. Thirty-five items compose the ODQ, five in each of the seven variables (Purposes, Structure, Leadership, Relationships, Rewards, Helpful Mechanisms, Attitude Toward Change – variables are based on Weisbord’s practitioner-oriented theory). Respondents are asked to indicate their current views of their organization on a scale of 1 to 7, with a score of 4 representing a neutral point. The instrument reflects a systematic approach for analyzing relationships among variables that influence how an organization is managed.

KOHINOOR WEAVING MILL (KWM): THE COMPANY’S FOCUS

Incorporated in 1987 with a small weaving mill, now Kohinoor mill has expanded its business to five major businesses weaving, processing, stitching, knitting and power generation. Kohinoor weaving is a form of backward integration to this manufacturing concern with annual turnover of Rs. 7 billion and employing more than 3000 people.

The company believes in democratic leadership style with fair, transparent, ethical and high professional standards of conduct in all areas of business activities. Company has an aim to maintain the goodwill and repute earned through assuring incorporation of values in culture.

The company continuously formulates and monitors its objectives and strategies. Its aim is to provide maximum satisfaction to customers through improving existing quality and research and development. Creativity and innovation is highly appreciated in the firm.

Firm strictly adheres the principles of good corporate governance and is committed to high standards of corporate governance. They also have a good command and control for internal reporting and implementation of strategies.

Kohinoor considers customers, stakeholders and employees its responsibility. It has a strong belief that training and development of its own employees will help it to accomplish its goals. Proper reward system to match the performance with outcomes is incorporated.

ORGANIZATIONAL ANALYSIS: FRAME BY FRAME

Structural Frame

The structural frame emphasizes goals, specialized roles, and formal relationships. Structures are designed to fit an organization's environment and technology. Organizations allocate responsibilities to participants and create rules, policies, procedure and hierarchies to coordinated diverse activities into a unified strategy. This frame has two main intellectual derivations: first is the work of industrial analyst, Frederick W. Taylor (1911), the father of time-and-motion studies; second is economist & sociologist Max Weber, founder of bureaucratic style of management. The structural frame is rooted in traditional rational images (organizational chart) but goes much deeper to develop versatile and powerful was to understand social architecture and it consequences. In following paragraphs different parameters of structural frame are elaborated by applying in real world organization (KWM).

Differentiation and Integration:

The structural perspective promotes a pattern of well-thought-out roles and relationships that can accommodate both collective goals and individual differences. These roles (differentiation) and relationship (integration) issues are at heart of organizational structure. Organization defines roles according to goals of organizations and demand of information technology, customers' expectation and globalization. Once the roles are specified, they are integrated by various methods like integration on the basis of functions, time (shift system), product, process, geography or customer. At KWM, high differentiation is observed as in the organization the roles are clearly formulated like Board of Directors & CEO of whole organization, Director General (DG), General Manager, Deputy Director, Manager, Assistant Manager, Executives for different working units. In spite of all these roles, there also exist role of company secretary and support staff. All these roles are integrated on the basis of functions because KWM has confidence in specialization of tasks.

Vertical and Horizontal Coordination:

Successful organizations employ variety of methods because by specifying roles organization can seek benefits of specialization but it creates problems of coordination and control. The dilemma of coordination may come into sight horizontally as well as vertically. To deal with the

dilemma vertically, organizations develop clear chain of command, authority and each role is designated to a “boss” but all of these work best when authority is both endorsed by subordinate and authorized by superiors (Dornbusch & Scott, 1975). In KWM, clear hierarchy, tall chain of command & authority is widespread. To sort out vertical dilemma KWT has crafted rules, policies, standards and standard operating procedures (SOPs). All of these reduce ambiguity in roles, reduces the variation in performance and high level of predictability. All above efforts put by KWT are appreciated by workforce – although intensity is not high as the means score is 2.97, best value in structural variable of ODQ. Despite the fact that efficient, vertical coordination is not always effective. Lateral conflict can be a great hurdle in achieving high level of performance. The lateral conflict can be resolved by formal or informal meeting, tasks forces, and coordinating roles (Lee & Terrence, 2003). These modes are more flexible, simple and quick than authority-bound systems. This flexibility is also in the mind of management of KWT, as during interview with a manager, in response to a question about flexibility of structure, manager replies:

“...we believe in strategies that emerge on the spot to tackle the situation, we revisit and review our goals & targets and for that purposes we made the structure flexible because we work in teams, we celebrate our successes together and we make responsible whole team in case of failure...”

KWT is facing problems – not alarming or severe – in this regard. The above thoughts of manager are not well supported by workforce of organization. The mean value (3.97) predicts least flexibility of lateral coordination. The workforce’s perception is more inclined to remain neutral that means they are not validating the efforts of KWM to create lateral coordination.

Structural Implications:

Although developing vertical and lateral strategies for integration & coordination serve the purpose still organizations are encountering uncertainties in the selection and creating balance between these strategies. For this purpose, Table 2 provides some structural imperatives. All of the following dimensions affect organizational structure in certain provisions.

Table 2

Dimensions	Structural Implications
Size & Age	Complexity and formalization increase with size and age.
Core Process	Core processes or technology must align with structure.
Environment	Stable environment rewards simpler structure; uncertain, turbulent environment requires more complex, adaptable structure.
Goal & Strategies	Variation in clarity and consistency of goals requires appropriate structural adaptations.
Information Technology	Information technology permits flatter, more flexible, and more decentralized structure.
Nature of Work Force	More educated and professional workers need and want greater autonomy and discretion.

Size & Age: Organizational size and age influence organizational structural shape and characteristics. A simple entrepreneurial organization typically has very simple arrangement but with increase in size and age, pressure for efficiency spawns greater formalization (Quinn & Cameron, 1983). KWM is getting old (almost 23 years old) and growing in terms of size (financially, workforce, production capacity etc), high formalization is observed. But in KWM, SOPs are formulated not to achieve efficiency rather to create control and this conflicting attribute is well depicted by mean value of 4.17 - worst value in “Helpful Mechanisms” variable of ODQ. Employees are not giving value to control procedures of organization.

Core Process: When core process are clear and predictable, organizations relies on vertical coordination while more complex and less predictable processes require decentralized loosely coordinated structures (Dornbusch & Scott, 1975). The core process of KWM is production/manufacturing (weaving of Greige Fabric) and all production system is fully automated with high predictability. Also due to ISO certification, the whole process is standardized. This kind of process requires vertical integration and KWM is complying the same kind of integration.

Environment: When organizations operating in more complex, uncertain and dynamic environment then it requires high intensity of flexibility and adaptability (Lee & Terrence, 2003). According to manager of KWM, the environment for organization is very dynamic,

uncertain but simple and they scan environment for seeking the opportunities. Again the flexibility is required to cope the situation which is not is best practice in the organization.

Goals: Goals of an organization vary in number and complexity. Few, less complex and less controversial goals can easily align with centralized, top-down structure. The results of variable “Purpose” of ODQ (mean value is 3.12) show that clarity of goals (individual or organization) is not at optimum level. Although there is not severe problem in goal clarity and structure formation but both are not in best exploitation.

Information Technology: Information is a central structural determinant; as uncertainty increases more information is required to reduce ambiguity i.e. innovation and investment in information technology make flatter structures inevitable. Information based organizations need for fewer levels of management. As at KWM, environment is dynamic & uncertain and goals clarity is not optimum, it means there ambiguity of moderate level exists in the organization. To reduce ambiguity, information sharing must be there which is lacking and this is predictable in following statement of manager:

...we do not allow any employee or visitor to have access to our information hub because they can interfere in decision making....”

Change in workforce diversity: Change in workforce diversity posing great pressure in designing the structure of an organization. Better educated workforce often expects and demand more discretion in routine work. The average qualification at KWM is master degree holder. The workforce is highly qualified. Due to this reason the flexibility that often organization offers is not validated by employees.

Structural Configuration:

Responding to structural imperatives with an appropriate structure configuration is a recurrent management challenge. Achieving the right balance is tied closely to an organization’s circumstances and past structural commitments of industry in which organization is working. Managers search for options among existing blueprints from their experience or the popular literature. Mintzberg (1979) derived five structural configurations: simple structure (it has two levels: apex and an operating level), machine bureaucracy (many layer between apex and operating level), professional bureaucracy (few managerial level between apex and operating

level but each level is flat and decentralized), divisionalized form (composed of quasi-autonomous levels) and adhocracy (loose, flexible, self-renewing organic form). After multiple visits at KWM, interaction with managers and workforce it is observed that this organization is creating a blend of machine and professional bureaucracy (more machine as compare to professional). There are multiple layers between apex and operating levels; in few layers the routine, repetitive standardized tasks are executing while in some departments control relies heavily on duly trained and indoctrinated specialists for their core process (production) and marketing & Information technology work stations.

CONCLUSION

The current structure is functioning satisfactory but not at its best or optimum level. The analysis of data confirms many thoughts of structural frame and organization seems to be aligned with the intellectual thoughts presented by Lee & Terrence (2003). There also some areas that contradict with structural frame' characteristics or where workforce perceptions are mismatched with managers. It can be summarize in few words that there is no one best way to organize but the right structure depends on prevailing circumstances and take into account all of above dimensions.

THE HUMAN RESOURCE FRAME

This frame of understanding organizational processes is concerned with the human resources and their effective management in an organization. This framework will help us to find that whether our particular organization is dealing with humans as its assets and using them to increase the effectiveness and efficiency in operations or not?

With the increased globalization and turbulent environment the organizations want to not only attain competitive advantage but sustainability is also important and considered an essential part of planning. Many organizations see human resources as the basic determinant of sustainable competitive advantage. If an organization wants to use its human resources to increase effectiveness and efficiency which may lead to the sustainable competitive advantage, it requires a sensitive understanding of people and their symbiotic relationship with organization. (Lee & Terrence, 2003) The human resource frame is based on the following core assumptions:

- Originations exist to serve human needs rather than the reverse
- People and organization need each other
- When the fit between individual and system is poor, one or both suffer
- A good fit benefits both

The organizations having sensitive people management approach to gain and sustain the competitive advantage use following generic human resource strategies (Lee & Terrence, 2003, pp 135-136).

Clear Policies

Goals and purpose of these organizational policies are not clearly stated and usually employees are neutral in answering this question. From questionnaire data it can be interpreted that score which is less than the average score showing that mostly people are clear about the goals and objectives of firm. For example the response of question # 1 of variable "Purpose" of ODQ is 3.23 which are below neutral point i.e. 4, communicating that employee understand the purpose of existence of their organization.

Selection of right person

In interview the Human resource manager said that they hire and select people through a proper procedure and concerned department ensures the appointment of required person for specific task.

Keeping people

To get and retain employees some organizations offer the value added benefits to members. Views taken from employees in this regard are not showing relatively good results. The average score of rewards is 3.44 which are very much near to the neutral score. Scores associated with the question 3 and 5 of reward variable of ODQ are more than 4 showing that members are not contented with the reward system of the firm. According to the management extra facilities are provided to benefit the employees like pick and drop facility. There is a policy of firing people in some severe conditions otherwise they are provided with job security and threats are usually avoided.

In order to increase the trust and loyalty within employees, the organization has the policy to promote from inside. According to the manager's point of view this policy not only utilizes the

human capital and intellect from inside the organization but also the training and error costs are reduced. Manager consider this policy a very good and powerful incentive which increases the longer term vision of employees and increases the satisfaction as well as loyalty with the firm. According to the employee's response, they do not feel comfortable with the promotion from inside policy of the firm (as shown in the average score of question 3 of reward variable of ODQ which is 4.38 considerably higher than neutral score required) and consider it insufficient. This organization has also 5% gain sharing plan implemented to increase the corporate productivity and employee's commitment.

Investing in employees

Learning in an organization takes place when three elements are in place: good mentors who teach each other, a management system that lets people try new things as much as possible and a very good exchange with the environment (Lee & Terrence, 2003). Good organizations believe in on the job as well as class room training. KWM has a very dominant number of permanent employees and it considers outhouse as well as on the job training to increase learning.

Empowerment

Information sharing and support is a very effective tool to increase the motivation level of employees. It also enables members to participate in decision making. It also increases autonomy and redesigning work etc. Employees are provided the information to the extent of required, not all information is shared, and there is no Open Book Management system in KWM.

People are provided proper information about the tasks performance and they also get support from management to accomplish the tasks. Management style is not strict and bossy rather just deadlines and tasks are specified. Employees are responsible of carrying out the tasks and meeting deadlines. They are free to invent their own ways of working. This management's point of view is also supported by employee's response as reply of 1 and 2 of mechanism variable of ODQ are showing very good scores indicating a satisfactory implementation of helping mechanisms.

Diversity

In KWM, managers are held responsible for the success and failure of an idea. This may be due to the bad implementation or execution of a good strategy.

CONCLUSION

There seems a gap between the clear stated vision and mission of this organization. Goals are usually not comprehensible and understandable by organizational members. People are not clear about the strategies of the firm. Organization itself is committed to communicate the purpose of existence but employees are not satisfied. Either there is a lack of explicit philosophy or organization is ignoring its explicit statement.

There is also gap between the rewards system implementation and requirement of employees. Members expect more than the given/realized reward system. This may reduce the long term loyalty and vision of the employees. It may also affect the trust of employees on the organizational systems and processes. Overall there is a neutral impact of reward system, in general they are “just satisfied” but specifically they are not happy with incentives provided and growth opportunities in the organization.

ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE AND SYMBOLS

Lee & Terrence (2003) describe that symbols carrying powerful intellectual and emotional messages; they speak to both the mind the heart. The symbolic frame focuses on how humans make sense of the messy, ambiguous world in which they live. Meaning, belief, and faith are its central concerns. Meaning is not given to us; we have to create it. Symbols are the basic building blocks of the meaning systems, or culture that we inhabit. We live in culture in the same way that fish live in water. Just as fish are said to discover water last, our own cultural ways are often invisible to us.

The symbolic frame seeks to interpret and illuminate basic issues of meaning and belief that make symbols so powerful. It depicts a world far different from traditional canons of rationality, certainty, and linearity.

The frame forms a conceptual umbrella for ideas from a variety of disciplines, including organizational theory and sociology (Selznick, 1957; Blumer, 1969; Weick, 1976; Hofstede, 1984) and political science (Dittmer, 1977). Freud and Jung relied heavily on symbolic concepts

in attempting to understand the human psyche. Anthropologists have traditionally focused on symbols and their place in the culture and lives of humans (Ortner, 1973).

SYMBOLIC ASSUMPTIONS

The symbolic frame distills ideas from these diverse sources into several core assumptions:

- What is most important is not what happens but what it means.
- Activity and meaning are loosely coupled; events have multiple meanings because people interpret experience differently.
- In face of widespread uncertainty and ambiguity, people create symbols to resolve confusion, increase predictability, find direction, and anchor hope and faith.
- Many events and processes are more important for what is expressed than what is produced. They form a cultural tapestry of secular myths, heroes and heroines, rituals, ceremonies, and stories that help people find purpose and passion in their personal and work lives.
- Culture is the glue that holds an organization together and unites people around shared values and beliefs.

The symbolic frame sees life as more serendipitous than linear. Organizations function like complex, constantly changing, organic pinball machines. Decisions, actors, plans, and issues continuously carom through an elastic, ever-changing labyrinth of cushions, barriers, and traps. Managers who turn to Peter Drucker's *Effective Executive* for guidance might do better to study Lewis Carroll's *Through the Looking Glass*. But all the apparent Chaos has a deeper sense of emblematic order. In recent years, the importance of symbols has become more widely appreciated.

ORGANIZATIONS AS CULTURES

Some people argue that organizations have cultures; others insist that organizations are cultures. Schein (1992, p. 12) offers a more formal definition of culture: "a pattern of shared basic assumptions that a group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and therefore to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems."

Deal and Kennedy (1982, p. 4) define culture more succinctly as “the way we do things around here.” Culture is both a product and a process. As a product, it embodies accumulated wisdom from those who came before us. As a process it is constantly renewed and re-created as newcomers learn the old ways and eventually become teachers themselves.

Prevailing mythology depicts managers as rational men and women, who plan, organize, coordinate, and control the activities of subordinates. Periodicals, books, and business schools portray a certain image modern managers: unruffled, well organized, with clean desks, power suits, and sophisticated information systems. Such “super managers” develop and implement farsighted strategies, producing predictable and effective results. It is a reassuring picture of clarity and order. Unfortunately, it’s wrong.

Another picture emerges if you watch managers at work (Kotter, 1982; Mintzberg, 1973). It’s a hectic life, shifting rapidly from one situation to another, each with its own blend of challenges. In months of observing senior managers, Kotter (1982) rarely saw them making a decision. Decisions emerged from a fluid, swirling vortex of conversations, meetings, and memos. Information systems ensure an overload of detail about what happened last month or last year. Yet they fail to answer a far more important question: What will happen tomorrow? In deciding what to do next, managers operate mostly on the basis of intuition. Like Giuliani, they draw on hunches and judgment derived from prior experience. Too busy to spend time thinking or reading, they get most of their information orally, in meetings or over the phone. They are hassled priests, modern meddlers, and corporate wheeler-dealers.

ACROSS FRAMES: ORGANIZATIONS AS MULTIPLE REALITIES

A Case of KWM :

Organizational life is full of events that can be interpreted in a number of ways and any event can be framed in several ways and serve multiple purposes. Planning, for example, produces specific objectives. But it also creates arenas for airing conflicts and becomes a sacred occasion to negotiate symbolic meanings. Multiple realities produce confusion and conflict as the individuals view the same event through their own lenses.

Strategic Planning

In order to know about the first component of organizational process which is strategic planning, when asked to one of their managers about how often you use ritual to signal responsibility, produce symbols and negotiate meanings in your organization, the response was neutral neither in favor nor against it, whereas another manager responded highly in favor of the aforementioned question. Although a question about the need of creating strategies to set objectives and coordinate resources was never asked from the above two managers yet their response reflects the presence of symbolic frame in their organization.

Decision Making

To cover the second component of organizational process which is decision making, when asked about how often rituals to be used to confirm values and create opportunities for bonding in your organization to two managers, the both responded in highly favor of this, again confirming dominance of symbolic frame in their organization.

Reorganizing

For reorganizing purposes of organizational process when a question was asked about whether you think an image of accountability and responsiveness to negotiate new social order is maintained in your organization, the response of one manager was quite different from the second one. For the sake of further clarification when the same question was asked from another manager, he emphasized the need of realigning roles and responsibilities to fit tasks and environment, hence favoring the structural frame in the organization.

Evaluation

To know about the fourth component of organizational process which is evaluating, a question containing the statement of how often occasions have been used to play roles in shared drama for evaluation purposes in your organization when asked to two managers, their response was in negative reflecting the presence of structural frame.

Conflict Resolution

In order to check how they approach the conflict in their organization, a question containing the statement how often you develop shared values and use conflict to negotiate meaning in

your organization was asked to their managers. The managers again responded negatively so there by one again confirming about the structural frame in their organization.

Goal Setting

In order to know about goal setting, an other important component of organizational process, in their organization, a question of do you think while setting goal developing symbols and shared values are given due consideration in your organization when asked to two managers. One responded in favor whereas the second one slightly disagreed.

Telling Stories

A question of whether telling stories of the past have been a successful means of communication in your organization when asked to two managers. Both responded in favor of this. Most of the managers use this as a mean of communication in their organization.

When asked whether meeting are considered sacred occasions to celebrate and transform the culture in your organization, one of the manager quite disagreed with this whereas the second one agreed slightly, hence not favoring the presence of symbolic frame in the organization.

Finally, when asked about whether Symbols and celebrations are considered highly significant for motivation in their organization, the managers differed slightly in their responses indicating as if economic incentives also carrying the importance.

So from the above responses of the managers to different questions some sort of a mixed opinion has been developed neither fully favoring structural nor favoring the symbolic frame. Since KWM is mainly a manufacturing organization, so it can not afford to completely operate in structural or symbolic frame. Hence some sort of contingent approach has been adopted in the organization for creating strategies, assigning tasks, creating opportunities, motivating through incentives, and finely for achieving goals.

ABOUT GOOD LEADERSHIP

According to Lee G. Bolman, in “Reframing Organizations” describes the two most widely accepted propositions about leadership as all good leaders must have the right stuff - such qualities as vision, strength, and commitment that are essential to leadership - and that good leadership is situational; what works in one setting will not work in another. A proposition from the “effective schools” literature illustrates the right-stuff perspective: a good school is headed

by a strong and visionary instructional leader. An example of the situational view is an assumption like “It takes a different kind of person to lead when you are growing and adding staff than when you are cutting budgets and laying people off.”

Despite the apparent tension between the one-best way and contingency views of leadership, both capture part of the truth. Studies have found shared characteristics among unusually effective leaders across a variety of sectors and situations. Another body of research has identified situational variables that critically influence the kind of leadership that works best.

In structural frame, leadership is effective when leader is analyst, and architect and leadership process is of analysis and design. In this frame leadership is ineffective when leader is somewhat autocrat and leadership process is management by detail and fiat.

In human resource frame, leadership is effective when leader is catalyst as well as servant and leadership process is of support and empowerment. In this frame leadership is ineffective when leader is weakling or pushover and leadership process is handing over.

In political frame, leadership is effective when leader is advocate and negotiator and leadership process is of advocacy and coalition building. In this frame leadership is ineffective when leader is con artist and thug and leadership process is manipulation and fraud.

Finally, in symbolic frame, leadership is effective when leader is prophet, or poet and leadership process is of inspiration, and framing experience. In this frame leadership is ineffective when leader is fanatic or fool and leadership process is illusion, smoke and mirrors.

LEADERSHIP AT KWM

Questions like the structural leaders often evokes images of oppressor and rigid bureaucrats in the organization, the structural leaders often rethink the relationship of structure, strategy, and environment in the organization, structural leaders focus on implementation mainly by putting their design in place in the organization, structural leaders first experiment, then evaluate, and finally adapt the strategy in the organization, when asked to different top level managers responded not much in favor of this. Thus, confirming not in favor of structural leadership frame in KWM .

Questions like the human resource leaders believe in people and communicate their belief in the organization, human resource leaders are visible and accessible to every one who is working in the organization, the effective human resource leaders empower others in the organization, when asked to different top level managers responded much in favor of this. Hence, confirming in favor of human resource leadership frame in KWM .

Questions like the political leaders clarify what they want and what they can in the organization, the political leaders assess the distribution of power and interests in the organization, the political leaders often rethink the relationship of structure, strategy, and environment in the organization, the political leaders build linkages to key stakeholders in the organization, the political leaders persuade first, negotiate second, and coerce only if necessary in the organization, when asked to different top level managers also responded in favor of this. Thus, confirming also in favor of political leadership frame in KWM .

Finally, questions like the symbolic leaders always lead by an example in the organization, they always use symbols to capture the attention in the organization, the symbolic leaders offer plausible interpretation of experience in situation of uncertainty and ambiguity in the organization, the symbolic leaders communicate a vision to every individual in the organization, clarify what they want and what they can in the organization, the symbolic leaders often embed their vision in as story - a story about “us” and about “our” past, present and future, and the symbolic leaders respect and use history in the organization, when asked to different top level managers not responded much in favor of this. Thus, confirming not in favor of symbolic leadership frame in KWM .

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

For a given time and situation, one perspective may be more helpful than others. At a strategic crossroads, a rational process focused on gathering and analyzing information may be exactly what is needed. At other times, developing commitment or building a power base may be more critical. In times of great stress, such as what AT&T experienced after divesting its regional operating companies, decision processes may become a form of rituals that brings comfort and support. Choosing a frame or understanding other’s perspectives, involves a combination of analysis, intuition and artistry.

Now following questions facilitate analysis and stimulate intuition.

1. Are individual commitment and motivation essential to success?
2. Is the technical quality of the decision important in your organization?
3. Is there a high level of ambiguity and uncertainty in your organization?
4. Are conflict and scarce resources significant in your organization?
5. Are you working from the bottom up in your organization?

According to the questions asked and an analysis of the above condition requirements of KMW, we came to the conclusion that this organization should use structural and human resource frame for increasing its efficiency. However from analysis we found a gap between the theorized and realized practices. For example, structural frame argues that when organization become complex, grow in size & age, environment is dynamic and/or workforce is highly qualified, flexible structure should be adopted but here in KWM, in spite of claim of management, the structure is not as flexible as it must be. Similarly, human resource frame is not fully applied as there is a gap between management's and employees interests and perceptions. Employees are anxious about the job security and are not satisfied with the reward system. There seems poor fit between people and organizational goals. However the interests are not so disperse that to make it impossible to use this frame. Rather there is a need of some improved strategies to be taken into consideration. For example this organization should involve people in decision making and introduce an open book management system to increase the trust. Also growth opportunities should be provided to make the vision of member broader. People are anxious and uncertain about the future. Intensive training programs should introduce along with participation and involvement in organizational processes.

REFERENCES

- Blumer, H. *Symbolic Interaction: Perspective and Method*. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1969.
- Deal, T. E., and Kennedy, A. A. *Corporate Cultures*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1982.
- Dittmer, L. "Political Culture and Political Symbolism: Towards a Theoretical Synthesis." *World Politics*, 1977, 29, 552-583.
- Dornbusch, S., & Scott, W. R. (1975). *Evaluation and the exercise of Authority*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Dunford, R. W., & Palmer, I. C. (1995). Claims About Frames: Practitioners' Assessment of Utility of Reframing. *Journal of Management Education*, 19, 96-105.
- Hofstede, G. "Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values, Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage, 1984.
- Kotter, J. P., *The General managers*. New York: Free Press, 1982.
- Lee, G. B., & Terrence, E. D. (2003). *Reframing Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mintzberg, H. *The Nature of Managerial Work*. New York: Harper Collins, 1973.
- Morgan, G. (1986). *Images of Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage.
- Ortner, S. "On Key Symbols." *American Anthropologist*, 1973, 75, 1338-1346.
- Quinn, R. E., & Cameron, K. (1983). Organizational Life Cycles and Shifting Criteria of Effectiveness. *Management Sciences*, 29, 33-51.
- Robert C. Preziosi, *Organizational Diagnosis Questionnaire*, available online; retrieved on February 1 2010; assessed from <http://www.g-rap.org/docs/ICB/Preziosi%20-%20Organ.%20Diagnosis%20Questionnaire%20ODQ.pdf>
- Schein, E. H., *Organizational Culture and Leadership*, (2nd ed.) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1992.
- Weisbord's, M. B. (1976). Organizational diagnosis: Six places to look for trouble with or without a theory. *Group & Organization Studies*, 1 (4), 430-447.
- Weick, K. E., "Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1976, 21, 1-19. 1976

APPENDIX – A

Organizational Diagnosis Questionnaire

Statements		Mean
Purpose		3.12
1	The goals of this organization are clearly stated.	3.23
2	I am personally in agreement with the stated goals of my work unit.	2.86
3	I understand the purpose of this organization.	2.87
4	The priorities of this organization were understood by its employees.	3.52
5	I had enough input in deciding my work-unit goals.	3.1
Structure		3.31
1	The division of labor of this organization is flexible.	3.67
2	The division of labor in this organization is intended to help it reach its goals.	3.07
3	The manner in which work tasks are divided is a logical one.	3.23
4	The structure of my work unit is well designed.	2.97
5	The division of labor in this organization actually helps it to reach its goals.	3.62
Leadership		3.11
1	My immediate supervisor is supportive of my efforts.	2.5
2	The leadership norms of this organization help its progress.	3.54
3	This organization's leadership efforts result in the organization's fulfillment of its purposes.	3.69
4	It is clear to me whenever my boss is attempting to guide my work efforts.	2.7
5	I understand my boss's efforts to influence me and the other members of the work unit.	3.1
Relationship		2.76
1	My relationship with my supervisor was a harmonious one.	2.73
2	I can always talk with someone at work if I have a work-related problem.	2.17
3	My relationships with members of my work group are friendly as well as professional.	2.87
4	I have established the relationships that I need to do my job properly.	2.45
5	There is no evidence of unresolved conflict in this organization.	3.57

APPENDIX – A

Rewards		3.44
1	My job offers me the opportunity to grow as a person.	2.69
2	The pay scale and benefits of this organization treat each employee equitably.	3.21
3	The opportunity for promotion exists in this organization.	4.38
4	The salary that I receive is commensurate with the job that I perform.	2.73
5	All tasks to be accomplished are associated with incentives.	4.17
Helpful Mechanisms		3.27
1	My immediate supervisor has ideas that are helpful to me and my work group.	2.93
2	I have the information that I need to do a good job.	2.97
3	This organization has adequate mechanisms for binding itself together.	3.24
4	Other work units are helpful to my work unit whenever assistance is requested.	3.07
5	This organization's planning and control efforts are helpful to its growth and development.	4.17
Attitude Toward Change		3.61
1	This organization is not resistant to change.	3.31
2	This organization introduces enough new policies and procedures.	3.73
3	This organization favors change.	3.7
4	Occasionally I like to change things about my job.	3.03
5	This organization has the ability to change.	4.27

APPENDIX – B

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

- Please describe KohiNoor as an organization. What purpose it serves?
- What are your core process (production, supply chain, research, etc)?
- How organization celebrates success or reacts on failures of any project/campaign? To whom organization say responsible for it?
- Do you believe that manager's thinking and interpretation of events happening around organization helps organization to find the answers of success or failure of organization.
- What steps are necessary to achieve optimum benefits from a project/campaign?
- Which organization is better: that organization who accepts well planned strategies as true or organization that revisits and manipulates strategies frequently?
- External environment (government, economic, social, technological and political conditions) is very dynamic, for what purposes you scan this environment?
- In your organization which is large in size in terms of number of employees, will you prefer flexible structure or rigidly define structure?
- In spite of existence of organizational structure, do you in favor of formation of informal interdepartmental social networks of employees?
- Do you believe in close supervision or encourage self management?
- Do you think that by developing proper structure, the role of manager/supervisor for coordination has reduced?
- You have devised SOPs to achieve targets or to hold control.
- What are the reasons for customer's satisfaction went downhill in spite of collective efforts of organizations/employees, high payrolls of top management and quality products?
- Major workforce of your organization are either permanent or contract.
- Do explicitly written HR philosophy communicated to employees as well as departments?
- What parameter your organization keep in mind during selection?

- What types of special facilities are provided or rewards for employees (e.g day care, flexible hours etc.)
- Firing policy (some organizations do not fire in any case, they have the policy to retain in every case, e.g. a company in recession converted its employees from production department to sales department as “no firing of employee serving 3 years”)
- Is there any policy to promote from within?
- Do believe in Profit sharing policy of gain sharing?
- Do you provide Training or learning opportunity or development opportunities
- Is there any policy for “open book management” i.e. sharing all information with employees especially financial conditions
- Autonomy in working processes?
- Challenging tasks are assigned or just routine tasks?
- Are they provided task and deadlines to accomplish tasks or they are strictly supervised?
- How often in you use ritual to signal responsibility, produce symbols and negotiate meanings in your organization?
- Are rituals used to confirm values and create opportunities for bonding in your organization?
- Do you think an image of accountability and responsiveness to negotiate new social order is maintained in your organization?
- How often occasions have been used to play roles in shared drama for evaluation purposes in your organization?
- How often you develop shared values and use conflict to negotiate meaning in your organization?
- Do you think while setting goal developing symbols and shared values are given due consideration in your organization?
- Telling stories of the past have been a successful means of communication in your organization.
- Meeting are considered sacred occasions to celebrate and transform the culture in your organization.

- Symbols and celebrations are considered Highly significant for motivation in your organization.
- The management often evokes images of oppressor and rigid bureaucrats in your organization.
- The management often rethinks the relationship of structure, strategy, and environment in your organization.
- The management focuses on implementation mainly by putting their design in place in your organization.
- The management first experiments, then evaluate, and finally adapt the strategy in your organization.
- The management believes in people and communicates their belief in your organization.
- The management is visible and accessible to every one who is working in your organization.
- The management empowers others in your organization?
- The management clarifies what they want and what they can in your organization.
- The management assesses the distribution of power and interests in your organization?
- The management builds linkages to key stakeholders in your organization.
- The management persuades first, negotiate second, and coerce only in necessary in your organization.
- The management always leads by an example in your organization.
- They always use symbols to capture the attention in your organization.
- The management offers plausible interpretation of experience in situation of uncertainty and ambiguity in your organization.
- The management communicates a vision to every individual in your organization.
- Are individual commitment and motivation essential to success?
- Is the technical quality of the decision important in your organization?
- Is there a high level of ambiguity and uncertainty in your organization?
- Are conflict and scarce resources significant in your organization?
- Are you working from the bottom up in your organization?