

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

Undergraduate Honors Capstone Projects

Honors Program

4-21-1972

Chris Argyris and Organizational Behavior

Richard L. White
Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/honors>

 Part of the [Industrial and Organizational Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

White, Richard L., "Chris Argyris and Organizational Behavior" (1972). *Undergraduate Honors Capstone Projects*. 201.

<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/honors/201>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Honors Program at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Undergraduate Honors Capstone Projects by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usu.edu.



CHRIS ARGYRIS and ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR

By

Richard L. White

Senior Honors Thesis

April 21, 1972

Director, Honors Program

Utah State University

CHRIS ARGYRIS and ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR

Introduction

Organizational behavior is an academic discipline concerned with understanding and describing human behavior in an organizational environment. It seeks to shed light on the whole, complex human factor in organizations by identifying causes and effects of that behavior.¹

The preceding quotation is a definition of organizational behavior.

This paper is about organizational behavior and one man's research and ideas about this subject. That man is Chris Argyris.

Chris Argyris has been at Yale University for nearly two decades as a professor of Industrial Administration until recently moving to Harvard. During that period of time he has evolved from a beginning student of the behavioral sciences to a respected scholar and research authority in the field of organizational behavior. His own ideas have changed from a beginning theoretical framework² to more established and accepted commentaries on organizational behavior.

The purpose of this paper is to dissect and explain Argyris's ideas and theories about the broad field of human relations in organizations called organizational behavior. The paper could also serve as an introduction to organizational behavior for the uninitiated.

This author will not attempt to criticize nor condone the work done by Argyris. Such a task will be left for the more informed student of organizational behavior. The paper will make an effort to describe Argyris's viewpoints on the different aspects of organizational behavior from his early beginnings to his more recent works. The reader will witness that Argyris retains many of his early premises

throughout the span covered. As would be predicted Argyris also produced new ideas, theories, and techniques as he continued his research.

Five books, authored by Argyris, will serve as the sources. They are listed in order of publishing dates: Executive Leadership (1953), Personality and Organization (1957), Interpersonal Competence and Organizational Effectiveness (1962), Integrating the Individual and the Organization (1964), and Intervention Theory and Method (1970).

Executive Leadership was written when Argyris was a director of research projects at the Labor and Management Center at Yale University. The book proposes some of Argyris's early theories in understanding and interpreting individual and group behavior in the context of organizations.³ Intervention Theory and Method is not Argyris's most recent publication, but it indicates his latest thrust and the direction he has been moving. The other three books will serve to illustrate the evolution and introduction of Argyris's ideas over the intervening years.

Why Study Organizational Behavior?

Why study organizational behavior? What good does it do to know how and why people behave? Isn't leadership merely common sense and experience? How can such a study benefit me?

The preceding questions can be and often are asked of the scientist who attempts to study human behavior. People often tend to view the behavioral scientist as no scientist at all, but merely a person who is observing and proclaiming what one "knows to be true" anyway. If this is really true then why do we study human beings and their behavior as manifested in organizations or any other social setting?

Perhaps we can gain some insight by listening in on the following conversation:

"... If you want my opinion ... common sense is what we need-- good old-fashioned-down-to-earth-horse-sense."

"That's right." "If you ask me, experience is the best teacher," adds another executive.

"All right," I reply, "let's talk about common sense for a while. May I ask you, in your experience, do all people show equal amounts of common sense?"

"Hell no!"

"Have you ever experienced a situation in which Joe and Bob make the same error? Joe seems to learn from his fault while Bob does not."

"Happens all the time."

"Then are you saying that it is possible that two people can go through the same experience and learn differently?"

"I don't know what you are driving at, but so far all you've said is obvious."

"Sometimes science is characterized as trying to understand the obvious. If Joe and Bob experience the same error, and they come out differently, then it isn't experience that teaches Joe or Bob, it is what Joe or Bob do with (or how they view) their experiences that counts."

"O.K. so far; I'll go along."

"Then we can change your principle that 'experience is the best teacher' to read, 'experience is the best teacher when the individual is capable of learning positively from what he experiences.' This changes the emphasis. Experience is no longer the thing to focus on."⁴

If experience is no longer the thing to focus on, what is? Did Joe's and Bob's different personalities have anything to do with the difference in their behavior? Could their environment and attitude have anything to do with their differences? If Joe and Bob behaved differently, could it be that other people may behave in various ways depending upon their personalities and/or environment? If so why?

The search for answers to these questions is the impetus for studying organizational behavior. Both administrators and scientists seek to understand why people behave the way they do. "Once they understand, it is an easy matter to predict and control behavior."⁵

We shall later come to see that "... it is impossible to understand

others unless we understand ourselves and we cannot understand ourselves unless we understand others."⁶

It is for these reasons that man has sought to understand the behavior of his species, for in so doing he will be better able to understand himself.

The Human Personality

The parts of the personality, no matter what they are, plus the way they are related to one another, constitute the "whole" that all personality theorists would call personality. Whenever we try to understand personality we must not only understand the parts, but also how these parts are related to each other Personality is something different from the sum of the parts; it is an organization of the parts.⁷

As man takes up the study of organizational behavior in order to understand himself better, he naturally must investigate the human personality as part of his study. An understanding of the human personality will add insight into the "whys" of human behavior.

Argyris states that the personality of man is not a single factor as the quotation above implies, but is instead an "organization" of its various parts. Some of those parts may be "good" and some may be "bad" depending upon the behavior exhibited and the value system of the person making the judgment. The one thing for sure is that they are all integrated parts of the "whole" personality.⁸

When the various parts of a man's personality are in balance or equilibrium with each other, he is said to be "adjusted." When the personality as a whole is balanced with the environment, the man is "adapted." The "integrated" personality is when one is both adjusted and adapted.⁹

From his birth man strives constantly toward this balanced, integrated state. When a change in one part occurs, since the various parts are inter-related, the change affects the whole and the personality is said to be in "disequilibrium."¹⁰ When unbalance occurs adjustments are usually made in an attempt to restore the "steady state" of equilibrium.

The human personality works hard not to change, but it is not a static affair. Changes often occur for various reasons, and since this happens, the personality must continually work hard in order to maintain itself in its present basic state.¹¹

This attempt by the human personality to maintain homeostasis is also seen in what Argyris calls "psychological energy." In describing psychological energy as one of the energy inputs of organizations, he states that "psychological energy is assumed to exist 'in' the needs of individuals."¹²

People behave. They love, hate, eat, cry, fight, work, strike, study, shop, go to the movies, play bridge, bring up children, go to church. The psychological energy to behave in all these ways comes from the need systems that exist in our personalities.¹³

Individuals live to fulfill their needs. Those needs may vary in nature as well as strength from time to time, however, man is constantly striving to keep his needs in balance. When that balance is affected and certain needs seek satisfaction they are said to be "in tension."¹⁴ Needs that are activated "... are always in tension in relation to some objective or goal in the environment. It is this tension that is supposed to motivate behavior. Human beings are seen as constantly striving to reduce the tension in the need by striving to achieve the goal to which the need is related."¹⁵

mechanisms to protect itself.²² Without describing in detail each of the following sixteen defense mechanisms listed by Argyris, one should be aware that the threatened self may use any single mechanism or combination of mechanisms for protection. The defense mechanisms include aggression, guilt, continuation, discriminatory decision, denial, repression, suppression, inhibition, conversion, overcompensation, rationalization, identification, projection, vacillation, ambivalence, and slips of the tongue.²³ Descriptions of each mechanism can be found in Argyris's Personality and Organization.

In Argyris's later writings he adds some additional insight to understanding the self. Argyris postulates that "... all human beings need to feel a sense of competence."²⁴ This he describes as the ability to solve problems without their recurrence, and doing so with minimum utilization of energy.

An essential requirement for this sense of competence is self-awareness. "If what he is experiencing 'out there' is consonant with his self-concept, then he will tend to 'see' it in an undistorted manner."²⁵ If it should be antagonistic to his self-concept, it is a threat. Such a threat may stimulate any of the previously mentioned defense mechanisms.

In order to minimize the chances of feeling threatened one must possess a high degree of self-awareness and "self-esteem." Self-esteem is to value one's self. Self-esteem increases as:

1. He is able to define his own goals.
2. The goals are related to his central needs or values.
3. He is able to define the paths to these goals.
4. The achievement of these goals represents a realistic level of aspiration for the individual.²⁶

The mechanism for increasing self-esteem is called "psychological success." A person seeking psychological success will need a world where he can experience (1) self-responsibility and self-control; (2) commitment; (3) productiveness and work; and (4) utilization of his more important abilities.²⁷

Argyris mentions another important aspect of personality as being the confirmation of one's own self by others. Such confirmation tends to validate the individuals' self-esteem.²⁸

Social class is a determiner of aspirations and self-concepts that Argyris introduces in Integrating the Individual and the Organization. It is postulated that the lower class worker often shows signs of apathy, indifference, and fatalism believed to be partly attributable to his social standing.²⁹ Such information, if correct, should naturally be included as a related part to the development of personality.

In summary, the personality is an organization of its many parts in sundry possible arrangements. Each individual is constantly striving toward the psychological success discussed. Each individual achieves that success in varying degrees. One factor that contributes to whether or not an individual achieves psychological success and how often is the organizations he may be a part of. For that reason we will now turn our attention to a description of the typical formal organization.

The Formal Organization

It is my hypothesis that the present organizational strategies developed and used by administrators (be they industrial, educational, religious, governmental, or trade union) lead to human and organizational decay.³⁰

As seen from the above quotation, Argyris believes that today's organizations leave much to be desired in the area of total effectiveness. The incongruence between the organization and the human personality will be discussed a little later. Firstly, we shall examine the organization and its function.

Human organizations are a basic and integral part of our society. They exist in innumerable sizes, localities, and for varied purposes. Essentially, however, every organization is meant to (a) achieve its objectives (b) maintain itself internally and (c) adapt to its external environment. In fact, it is said that these are its "core activities."³¹

Most organizations today have been designed by architects of a school called "scientific management." These men have held some basic assumptions about the best way to create a logically ordered world. Their ideas for organizing men and the work they are to perform include the following basic principles:

Task specialization is used in many organizations because of three assumptions:

(1) That the human personality will behave more efficiently as the task it is to perform becomes specialized; (2) that there can be found one best way to define the job so that it is performed at greater speed; and (3) that any individual differences in the human personality may be ignored by transferring more skill and thought to machines.³¹

Chain of Command. The plurality of parts created by task specialization gives rise to a hierarchy of authority with a leader at the top. The leader's responsibility is to control, direct, and coordinate the work of the various parts. In order for the organization to function smoothly the leader is assigned the power to "... hire, discharge, reward and penalize the individuals in order that their behavior be molded toward the organization's objectives."³³

Unity of Direction. In order for task specialization to work efficiently, each individual unit or part must have its own objective or goal specified. The structure of the formal organization calls for the leader to be responsible for establishing the goals which the employees are to strive to achieve. The rationale is to insure a unity in the direction that the separate parts are headed.³⁴

Span of Control. This principle is the theory that one leader will be most efficient if his span of control is limited to no more than five or six subordinates whose work interlocks.³⁵

Underlying the preceding basic principles of the formal organization is the assumption of and emphasis upon rationality. The key components in organizations were developed from rational thought. They are designed to work in a rational world. It is expected, therefore, that the employees and management will behave rationally. This is verified by the fact that management and employees alike tend to discourage and suppress the expression of emotions on the job.³⁶ Irrationality is usually recognized but it is often assumed "... that people can be paid to behave rationally."³⁷

In summary, we can say that Argyris views the organization as being designed to employ individuals in jobs:

- a. Which would tend to permit them little control over their workaday world;
- b. Which would tend to place them in a situation where their passivity rather than initiative would frequently be expected;
- c. Which would tend to force them to occupy a subordinate position;
- d. Which would tend to permit them a minimum degree of fluidity and tend to emphasize the expression of one (or perhaps a few) of the agents' relatively minor abilities; and
- e. Which would tend to make them feel dependent on other agents (e.g., upon the boss.)³⁸

Conflicts and Individual and Group Adaptation

After discussing the characteristics of the human personality and the formal organization, it may be clear to the reader that conflicts could easily occur between the two. Argyris feels that this is the case.

We said earlier that the basic principles of the formal organization included task specialization, chain of command, unity of direction, and span of control. We also said that the underlying principle was rationality in behavior. Let us now analyze what kind of effect these principles have upon the human personality.

Task Specialization. The human personality is constantly "... attempting to actualize its unique organization of parts resulting from a continuous, emotionally laden, ego-involving process of growth."³⁹ It seeks to be different from others and recognized for that difference. Task specialization tends to ignore those differences.

Another problem is that only a few of a man's abilities are used in task specialization. Those few that are used are often less complex motor abilities, "... which research suggests is of lesser psychological importance to the individual."⁴⁰ With task specialization "what you can do" becomes more important than "who you are."⁴¹

Chain of Command. As the hierarchy of authority is established those on the lower levels tend to become more "... dependent upon, passive toward, and subordinate to their leader."⁴² In addition their time perspective is shortened because they often have little control over the information necessary to predict their future.

Unity of Direction. When the leader is totally responsible for the assigning of goals, the individual employee is denied that essential activity for attaining psychological success, i.e., defining one's own goals.

Span of Control. One criticism of this principle is that it increases the "administrative distance" between individuals. This results in more red tape, problems in communications, and decreased control and time perspective for the individuals who are at the bottom of the ladder.⁴³

Another criticism is that minimized numbers of subordinates creates closer supervision. This in turn leads to greater dependence, passivity, and submissiveness on the part of the subordinates.

Argyris asserts that when the preceding conflicts occur, growth toward healthy personalities and effective organizations is stymied. He further hypothesizes that these incongruencies will continue to increase as:

(1) the employees are of increasing maturity, (2) as the formal structure ... is made more clear-cut and logically tight for maximum formal organizational effectiveness, (3) as one goes down the line of command, and (4) as the jobs become more and more mechanized (i.e., take on assembly line characteristics).⁴⁴

In light of the foregoing discussion of what happens to employees when they come in contact with formal organizations, Argyris advances three propositions to summarize the occurrence:

Proposition I. There is a lack of congruency between the needs of individuals aspiring for psychological success and the demands of the (initial) formal organization.

Proposition II. The resultants of this disturbance are frustration, failure, short-time perspective, and conflict.

Proposition III. Under certain conditions the degree of frustration, failure, short-time perspective, and conflict will tend to increase.⁴⁵

As conflict and frustration develop within and between the individual and the organization, the individual may attempt to deal with the conflict in any number of the following ways: (1) Using any of the defense mechanisms listed under human personality in order to defend his self concept. (2) Regressing, i.e., becoming less mature and less efficient. (3) Giving up and leaving the organization. This confronts him with the problem of where to go. Most other companies are organized the same way. (4) Becoming aggressive, hostile, and attacking what is frustrating him while developing a tendency to blame others. (5) Remaining frustrated by doing nothing. This choice will lead to still more tension. (6) Working hard to climb the ladder in order to arrive at a position where he will no longer face the conflicts. The problem with this lies in the limited opportunities for advancement. (7) Becoming apathetic and resigning oneself to the situation. By becoming passive and unconcerned the hurt of the conflict may not be quite so bad.⁴⁶

In addition to the methods used by the individual to adapt to his personal frustrations, the "group" also has ways of adapting as illustrated below:

Quota Restriction, Goldbricking, and Slowdown on the Group Level.

Such action is sometimes used to "get even" with management. The attitude of "Why should I go all out?" is a representative attitude. Dislike and resentment is shown toward the employee who exceeds either the clearly defined upper or lower limits of work:

You should not turn out too much work. If you do, you are a 'rate-buster.'

You should not turn out too little work. If you do, you are a 'chiseler.'

You should not tell a supervisor anything that will react to the detriment of an associate. If you do, you are a 'squealer.'⁴⁷

Formalizing Small Groups. Trade unions are often brought in under the assumption that it will be able to represent the employees to management and minimize their problems. Unfortunately, unions themselves tend to organize according to the principles of formal organizations, thus compounding the employees' frustrations.⁴⁸

Emphasis on Monetary and Other Material Rewards. Upon finding little satisfaction or progress toward attaining psychological success, emphasis is often redirected toward increasing the material benefits. Money then becomes a factor "... used by many to rationalize their lack of self-satisfaction on the job."⁴⁹ The problem is that no matter how many material benefits are granted, none of them alleviate the fundamental problems but simply attempt to compensate for them.⁵⁰

Develop Youth to Be Apathetic in, and Not Expect Happiness From, Their Work. It is shown that parents quickly teach their children either by example or exhortation not to expect happiness from their work. The children, as a result, come to expect little chance for self-actualization in their work and settle for "passive conformity."⁵¹

To summarize, when the individual and the organization come together, conflict and frustration result. The individual may attempt innumerable activities to adapt to the organization or to minimize the frustration. These adaptive activities may occur on the individual level or by the large group of employees.

Now we should investigate what type of impact the employees' adaptive activities have upon management and what their reaction often is.

Management's Reaction and Its Impact Upon the Employees

As management witnesses the activity of the employees, which we have interpreted to be adapting to frustration, they tend to regard it in a different light. Argyris states that as they observe their employees at work, they come to the conclusions that: "(1) The employees are lazy. (2) The employees are uninterested and apathetic. (3) The employees are money crazy. (4) The employees create errors and waste."⁵²

The problem, as management sees it, is "in" the employees. The employees are the ones who must be changed if any changes are to occur. The assumption is then made by management that it is human nature to "... want to work as little as possible, to be unconcerned over errors and waste, to ask always for more wages and benefits, to resist change, and to show decreasing loyalty toward the company"⁵³

Being committed to the formal organization, management assumes that: (1) The organization charts and manuals define the only important relations between people. (2) People in organizations behave logically. (3) Logical incentives and clear communications are necessary for direction. (4) The administrator knows best. (5) The way to get things done is through the leader. (6) The employees would behave differently if they understood the economic problems of the business.⁵⁴

These assumptions give rise to three fundamental policy decisions:

The first is the importance of strong, "dynamic," loyal leadership. Second, is the importance of a logical and systematic control over the employees' behavior. Finally, is the importance of communicating to the employees management's thinking related to their organization and its economic problems.⁵⁵

We shall now look at each of these three policy decisions more closely and discuss their ramification:

"Dynamic" Leadership. Good leaders, according to most management policy, are those who (1) are able to "needle," "push," or "drive" employees to do their jobs effectively; (2) are able to get the facts and make effective decisions; (3) know management's goals, policies and practices; (4) communicate this information to the employees; and (5) effectively evaluate the performance of the employees.⁵⁶

The above description illustrates management's preference for pressure-oriented, authoritarian leadership. As management places greater emphasis upon such autocratic, directive leadership, the subordinates tend to increase in their adaptive behavior. Management then reacts by increasing their defensiveness and directive leadership and thus "compounds the felony."⁵⁷

Tighten Management Controls. Under the traditional structure of the formal organization and especially as the organization increases in size and becomes more decentralized, management sees the need for direct control as being very important. This control includes management determining the over-all plan and then controlling and determining what actually takes place.

What impact will such controls tend to have upon the employees? First, the principle takes away from the workers the planning for the work (and all its aspects) and leaves them primarily with the responsibility to perform. ... Moreover, taking away the planning deprives the employees of an opportunity to participate in important decisions affecting their working life. ... Finally, the lack of participation in defining the goals will tend to cause the employee to feel psychological failure.⁵⁸

As employees renew their reactive and adaptive activities as a result of management's controls, management will sometimes turn to

time and motion studies. Still thinking that the problem is "in" the employees, management attempts to bring in the "experts" to solve the problem. This action also arouses negative feelings on the part of the employees.⁵⁹

Human Relations Fads. When problems are not easily solved by directive leadership and tighter controls, management sometimes attempts the human relations approach. Communications programs, suggestion programs, and "pseudo-participation" efforts are tried in various ways and combinations. The results are usually equally disappointing as employees soon learn that little if anything changes in spite of the "programs" that are intended to do so.⁶⁰

To review, we see that management views the problems that occur as being "in" the employees. As they then attempt to alleviate the problems with stronger, dynamic leadership, management controls, and "human relations," the employees experience increased frustrations and continue their adaptive activities. Management in turn interprets the employees actions as the need to concentrate even more on the values of the organization and the accepted ways of leadership. Thus we see a self-fulfilling cycle develop as each part confirms its expectations of the other and, therefore, continues in its own way of adapting to the situation.

Are organizations destined to remain in this rut leading toward human and organizational decay that Argyris referred to earlier? Argyris thinks that this destruction need not continue to occur if certain principles and practices would be experimented with and used where applicable in the organizations. Let us now turn to those recommendations for closer scrutiny.

Recommendations for Improving the System

The task of the leader is somewhat similar to that faced by automotive engineers. Their task is to create a maximum fusion process where the amount of gas and the amount of spark that ignites the gas is "just right" to permit the car to move forward with the greatest possible push while, at the same time, the gas is not burned excessively or the points on the spark plug are not burnt out too quickly.⁶¹

Argyris wrote the above quotation in 1953 describing his early impressions of what the improved organization would be like. Since that time he has done a good deal of thinking and experimenting with various ideas and has proposed some possible improvements to the formal organization. The following discussion considers his recommendations.

Organizational effectiveness can be defined quite broadly according to the open systems theory. That definition is that an organization "... increases in effectiveness as it obtains:

- (a) increasing outputs with constant or decreasing inputs, or
- (b) constant outputs with decreasing inputs, and (c) is able to accomplish this in such a way that it can continue to do so."⁶²

This says that the effective organization will be able to accomplish its three core activities (achieve its objectives, maintain itself internally, and adapt to its external environment) without increasing its energy inputs, such as human psychological energy.

Argyris recommends what he calls the "Mix" Model as a discussion point for possible improvements. The "mix" model is composed of six dimensions with each being on a continuum from left to right. The dimensions are outlined below.

1. "From a situation in which a part (or subset of parts) directs the organizational 'core activities' ... to the point where these core activities are influenced through interrelationships of parts."⁶³

2. "From awareness of the organization as a (random) plurality of parts to awareness of the organization as a pattern of parts."⁶⁴

3. "From a state in which the objectives being achieved are related to the parts to a state in which the objectives being achieved are related to the whole."⁶⁵

4. "From a state in which the organization is unable to influence its internally oriented activities (achieving its objectives, maintaining the internal system) to a state in which it can influence these activities as the organization desires."⁶⁶

5. "From a state in which the organization is unable to influence its externally oriented activities to a state in which it can influence these activities as the organization desires."⁶⁷

6. "From a state in which the nature of the core activities (achieving the objectives, maintaining the internal system, and adapting to the environment) is largely determined by the present to a state in which the present core activities are continually influenced by considerations including the past history, the present and the anticipated future of the organization."⁶⁸

According to Argyris, the traditional formal organization approximates mostly the left ends of the continua. Integration of the individual and the organization and the minimization of conflicts between the two has a greater possibility as the organization approximates more closely the right ends of the continua of the "mix" model.⁶⁹

In order for this integration to occur by decreasing defensiveness and inputs while increasing psychological success and human energy, Argyris proposes some new organizational structures for the system:

Structure I: The Pyramidal Structure.

Structure II: The Modified Formal Organizational Structure.

Structure III: Power According to Functional Contribution.

Structure IV: Power According to Inevitable Organizational Responsibilities.⁷⁰

The difference between the structures is basically the degree of involvement required in making decisions. Structure I is furthest to the left on the continua while Structure IV is furthest to the right. Essentially then Structure I involves very few in the decision making while Structure IV calls for each individual to have equal power.

The point that Argyris makes is that no one of these structures should be used all the time. Instead the "... organizations (of the future) will tend to vary the structures that they use according to the kinds of decisions that must be made."⁷¹

Argyris hypothesizes that "decision rules" will need to be established to determine which structure should be used under given sets of conditions.⁷² At the same time, different patterns of leadership may be determined to be used on different occasions. Argyris proposes four stages in this organizational leadership which will decrease gradually the degree of dependence among the subordinates while increasing the chances for psychological success:

Stage I: Reality-Centered Leadership. This first stage calls for the leader to select the pattern of leadership which best suits the occasion.

Stage II: Subordinates and the Leader Control the Decision Rules for the Appropriate Leadership. In this stage the subordinates participate with the leader in defining the decision rules that will guide his selection of the various leadership patterns.

Stage III: The Subordinates and the Leader Control the Use of Rewards and Penalties. During the third stage, the subordinates and the leader share equally the control over salaries, promotions, and bonuses.

Stage IV: The Subordinates and the Leader Control the Rules for Membership in the Group and the Make-up of the Group. In this final change in leadership both the leader and the subordinates control the membership and the make-up of the group.⁷³

Argyris also proposes a number of additional changes designed to enhance the opportunity for psychological success and organizational effectiveness:

The Staffing of Organizations. Rather than the traditional overstaffing or "optimum" staffing of organizations, Argyris suggests that "... a 'proper' understaffing could lead to positive results for the individual and the organization."⁷⁴

The Redesign of Jobs. "Job enlargement is the expansion of job content to include a wider variety of tasks and to increase the worker's freedom of pace, responsibility for checking quality, and discretion of method."⁷⁵

Managerial Controls. Employees will tend to behave more responsibly if permitted to have more control over their own behavior. This includes granting more control over the determining and administration of budgets.⁷⁶

Reward and Penalty Systems. Under this category Argyris recommends that rewards and penalties be:

... geared to reinforce those human activities that (1) increase the individual's (group's) awareness and responsibility for as much of the total organization as possible, (2) enlarge the experience of interdependence with others and with the whole, and (3) increase the control that the whole has over its own destiny.⁷⁷

Incentive Systems. Emphasis should be increased in the area of an employee's "level of willingness" to work rather than recognition being given for production alone.

Evaluation Activities. Instead of causing employees to be in competition with one another to earn the praise of management via the standardized merit-rating programs, emphasis should be geared toward self-competition. This can be accomplished by having the peer group define self-development (including the criteria for growth) and make it applicable to all. Individual responsibility and self-stimulation would be encouraged.

Hiring New Employees. New employees would be asked to consider their new jobs as a new culture "... with as compelling a set of norms and values as any other culture."⁷⁸ The employee would be expected to make a commitment to strive toward individual-organizational health. The fellow employees would be involved in the hiring in as much as they would all be a part of the same culture.

Termination of Employees. Such an action would usually be relative to the employee's capacity to meet the standards that he accepted upon entrance. Anyone who was to be terminated would have the right to be involved in discussions about his termination.

A Summarization

Over the last few pages we have been considering some of Chris Argyris's views of the conflicts that occur between the human personality and formal organizations and some possible ways to redesign organizations to minimize the incongruence that occurs. Argyris himself is quick to declare that these ideas for reorganization are still in the testing stage. He has been actively involved in various research projects to test the validity of such recommendations. The whole field of researching behavior in organizations is one we have not and will not discuss in this paper. It could, however, easily tie in to our discussion of Argyris and his work. This subject relates to the methods of research used, the observation sessions, diagnostic experiences, T-groups, role playing, and more. Argyris's latest work in this area is discussed in his book Intervention Theory and Method. In the book he recommends to consultants his ideas for aiding organizations in their quest for greater effectiveness.

The study of organizational behavior can be a ponderous task. With limitless persons and organizations to study, man may be seeking insight into his own behavior by studying others for a long time to come. This paper has been about one man's study of that subject and his ideas on the matter. Evolving from unsubstantiated hypotheses to bold declarations of ineffectiveness and proposed methods for improvement, Argyris's research and theories about organizations have been refined and focused over the last two decades. Perhaps

this brief discussion of his work will interest others to join
Mr. Argyris in the search for the "ideal organization."

NOTES

¹Keith Davis, Human Behavior At Work (4th ed. rev.; New York: McGraw-Hill Inc., 1972), p. 5.

²Chris Argyris, Executive Leadership---An Appraisal of a Manager in Action (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953), p. 128.

³Ibid.

⁴Chris Argyris, Personality and Organization---The Conflict Between System and the Individual (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957), p. 13-14.

⁵Ibid., p. 5.

⁶Ibid., p. 6.

⁷Ibid., p. 21.

⁸Ibid., p. 21.

⁹Ibid., p. 22.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 23.

¹¹Ibid., p. 23.

¹²Chris Argyris, Integrating the Individual and the Organization (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964), p. 22.

¹³Argyris, Personality and Organization, p. 27.

¹⁴Argyris, Integrating the Individual-Organization, p. 22

¹⁵Ibid.

¹⁶Argyris, Personality and Organization, p. 31.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 32.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 33.

- ¹⁹ Ibid., p. 34.
- ²⁰ Ibid., p. 35.
- ²¹ Ibid., p. 36.
- ²² Ibid., p. 37-41.
- ²³ Ibid., p. 41-47.
- ²⁴ Argyris, Integrating the Individual-Organization, p. 24.
- ²⁵ Ibid., p. 25.
- ²⁶ Ibid., p. 26.
- ²⁷ Ibid., p. 27.
- ²⁸ Ibid., p. 28-29.
- ²⁹ Ibid., p. 78-86.
- ³⁰ Chris Argyris, Interpersonal Competence and Organization Effectiveness (Irwin-Dorsey Series in Behavioral Science in Business; Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, Inc. & Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1962), p. 1.
- ³¹ Argyris, Integrating the Individual-Organization, p. 120.
- ³² Argyris, Personality and Organization, p. 59.
- ³³ Ibid., p. 60.
- ³⁴ Ibid., p. 63.
- ³⁵ Ibid., p. 64.
- ³⁶ Argyris, Interpersonal Competence, p. 40.
- ³⁷ Ibid., p. 31.
- ³⁸ Argyris, Executive Leadership, p. 129-130.
- ³⁹ Argyris, Personality and Organization, p. 59.
- ⁴⁰ Ibid.

- ⁴¹ Ibid., p. 60.
- ⁴² Ibid., p. 60.
- ⁴³ Ibid., p. 65.
- ⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 66.
- ⁴⁵ Argyris, Integrating the Individual-Organization, p. 40.
- ⁴⁶ Argyris, Personality and Organization, p. 78-95.
- ⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 102.
- ⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 103-107.
- ⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 108.
- ⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 110.
- ⁵¹ Ibid., p. 112-116.
- ⁵² Ibid., p. 123.
- ⁵³ Ibid., p. 124.
- ⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 125.
- ⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 125.
- ⁵⁶ Ibid., p. 125.
- ⁵⁷ Ibid., p. 130.
- ⁵⁸ Ibid., p. 132.
- ⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 135-136.
- ⁶⁰ Ibid., p. 139-162.
- ⁶¹ Argyris, Executive Leadership, p. 130.
- ⁶² Argyris, Integrating the Individual, p. 123.
- ⁶³ Ibid., p. 151.

- ⁶⁴ Ibid., p. 152.
- ⁶⁵ Ibid., p. 153.
- ⁶⁶ Ibid., p. 153.
- ⁶⁷ Ibid., p. 153.
- ⁶⁸ Ibid., p. 154.
- ⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 162.
- ⁷⁰ Ibid., p. 197-211.
- ⁷¹ Ibid., p. 211.
- ⁷² Ibid., p. 212.
- ⁷³ Ibid., p. 214-220.
- ⁷⁴ Ibid., p. 221.
- ⁷⁵ Ibid., p. 230.
- ⁷⁶ Ibid., p. 241-249.
- ⁷⁷ Ibid., p. 249.
- ⁷⁸ Ibid., p. 268.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Argyris, Chris. Executive Leadership---An Appraisal of a Manager in Action. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953.
- Argyris, Chris. Integrating the Individual and the Organization. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1964.
- Argyris, Chris. Interpersonal Competence and Organizational Effectiveness. Irwin Dorsey Series in Behavioral Science in Business. Homewood, Illinois: They Dorsey Press, Inc. and Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1962.
- Argyris, Chris. Intervention Theory and Method---A Behavioral Science View. Edited by Warren G. Bennis. Reading, Massachusetts; Melo Park, California; London; Don Mills, Ontario: Addison-wesley Publishing Company, 1970.
- Argyris, Chris. Personality and Organization---The Conflict Between System and the Individual. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957.
- Davis, Keith. Human Behavior At work. 4th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Inc., 1972. (Formerly published under the title of "Human Relations at Work: The Dynamics of Organizational Behavior," New York: McGraw-Hill Inc., 1957, 1962, 1967.)