Indian Institute of Management Calcutta
Working Paper Series
WPS No. 878/ December 2022

Dharmic Manager: Meanings and Means

Prof. Rajiv Kumar*
Professor, Organization Behaviour Group,
IIM Calcutta, D. H. Road, Joka, Kolkata – 700104.
rajiv@iimcal.ac.in

Dr Nisigandha Bhuyan
Associate Professor, Business Ethics and Communication Group,
IIM Calcutta, D. H. Road, Joka, Kolkata – 700104.
nisigandha@iimcal.ac.in

* Corresponding author

Indian Institute of Management Calcutta, Joka, D.H. Road, Kolkata 700104

URL: https://www.iimcal.ac.in/faculty/publications/working-papers/

Dharmic Manager: Meanings and Means

ABSTRACT

Many Indians frequently attempt to adopt the construct of *Dharm* inherent in the ancient Indian tradition to evaluate their and others' actions amidst the perplexing complexities of daily life. However, the meanings of *Dharm* change according to space (*Desh*), time (*Kaal*), and Individual (*Patra*).

Given the increasingly pivotal role of businesses in society—particularly in the last few centuries—we support the integrative approach (Freeman, 1984) of business with society as opposed to the separatist view of Milton Friedman (Friedman, 1962, 2007). We contend that people managing businesses play a vital role in society by creating wealth and opportunities for work and perhaps shaping the culture and character of human civilization and its future. Their actions influence a multitude of people directly as well as indirectly. Hence, ensuring *Dharm* in their actions can have salutary and cascading effects on society.

The meanings of *Dharm* change as per texts and their interpretations, as well as with *Desh*, *Kaal,* and *Patra*. Sensing the ensuing complexity, we humbly attempt a formulation of the meaning of this construct for contemporary business managers. We draw insights from Shrimad Bhagwat Gita (SBG) and Mahabharat (MB)—among other texts from Indian tradition—for this purpose. We then aim to offer evidence-based ideas as means to move closer to *Dharm* thus specified.

INTRODUCTION

A person with managerial responsibilities in any contemporary organization is compelled to live a complex life. This person faces a multitude of dilemmas on a daily basis without much clear guidelines for their resolution. Formal rules and informal norms definitely exist for several situations, but there still remains a wide space for multiple interpretations of rules or norms and consequent choices. Moreover, the rules and norms can be contradictory at times, very flexible and open to varied interpretations at other times, and rigid, fixed, and authoritarian the rest of the time. For example, should a manager penalize an employee for coming late or should s/he first try to ascertain the reasons behind lateness? Suppose the reasons are genuine, and the manager chooses not to penalize. Would it set a bad

precedent for a number of other employees who probably only witnessed the forgiveness but not the underlying rationale? In case an employee is not putting in her or his best effort, should the manager try harder tactics—such as reprimand—or softer tactics—such as persuasion—to elicit the desired performance? One has to deliberate about all this at a time when the practice of work is evolving with new approaches like working from home and increasing diversity of the workforce and so forth.

Recognizing these uncertainties leads to a very important and eternal question: how does one ascertain whether one's actions are good or bad? As discussed above, just following rules and existing norms may not be sufficient for decision-making. Many luminaries before us have attempted to answer this eternal question. Our limited understanding of these answers makes us gravitate toward one particular viewpoint. We contend that a large number of managers in India may evaluate their involuntary or voluntary actions, conscious or subconscious choices, and quick or long-drawn decisions on the criteria of *Dharm.*[1] (Badrinath, 2019). They juxtapose the actions of their life with their notion of *Dharm*. However, we also assume that their notion or conception of *Dharm* may remain largely informed by ancient texts and the conditioning received from family, society, and organization. There could be a few problems with such a notion of *Dharm,* such as *Varnashrama Dharm*. Firstly, the recollections could be incomplete, imprecise and convenient (in order to avoid facing dilemmas). Next, the societal context has changed drastically in the last few centuries, which necessitates reinterpretation and contextualization of any notion associated with the construct of *Dharm*. Such notions may include duty, division of labor, common good, cooperation, competition and indifference. From an agrarian society with extended families, we have moved into a world of manufacturing or service organizations employing people and living with nuclear families. Such drastic changes in the way of life and technology around us cannot be ignored while deriving the traditional notions of *Dharm*.

Our goal in this paper, therefore, is twofold. Firstly, we offer a conceptualization of the construct of *Dharm* for a business manager, taking into consideration the contemporary context of existence. Secondly, we compile a list of actions—based on extant research—that promise results closer to *Dharm*.

---

[1] Badrinath views *Dharm* and religion as two distinct constructs, a view we agree with and borrow in this paper.

RECONCEPTUALIZING *DHARM*

The most prominent meaning of Dharm, as per *Bharat Ratna* Pandurang Vaman Kane (Kane, 1941), consisted of the privileges, duties and obligations of a person, including the standard of conduct as an Aryan, as a member of one's caste, and a person of a particular stage of life (*Varnashrama Dharm*). This definition may be accused of a rigid social division of caste hierarchy. Nevertheless, it contextualizes the duties and responsibilities of human beings in their position and stage of life, intending to maintain social order, stability, and the common good of that particular time. Hence, PV Kane advocated conceptualizing *Dharm* according to one's duties as a member of a community and one's stage of life. The modern-day relevance of this contextualization is that people are assigned specific responsibilities, and their *Dharm* must be in relation to their responsibility to the community/society/profession in a particular period of time.

The importance of context and time is also seen in the works of moral philosophers of the Western tradition, particularly in MacIntyre (2007), who asserts that "Morality which is no particular society's morality is to be found nowhere" (pp. 265-66). MacIntyre asserts that morality always existed for a particular era. In his germinal work *The Idea of Justice* (Sen, 2008), Amartya Sen advocates a comparative approach that focuses on the actual behavior of people over transcendental and/or ideal notions of right/good/just. Sen argues in favor of a realization-focused approach to deal with manifest injustice over the arrangement-focused notion of justice that emphasizes the transcendental identification of the ideal institutions for delivering justice. For Sen, ideal institutions are neither necessary nor sufficient for the actual manifestation of a just society. In contrast, the realization-focused champions of justice were often interested primarily in the removal of manifest injustice from the world that they saw. Similarly, a manager looking for a just and/or right decision in a particular situation exercises practical reason that involves an actual choice and demands a (*Dharmic*) framework for comparison of 'what is more right' with "what is less right' while choosing from among the feasible alternatives and not an identification of a possibly unavailable perfectly right.

The formulation of Chaturvedi Badrinath (Badrinath, 2007) refers to some other meanings of *Dharm* as per Taittiriya Upanishad, Bhagavad Gita, Manu- Smriti, Yajnavalkya Smriti, and Tantra Vartikka. These meanings manifest in certain specific varieties of *Dharm,* such as *Rastra Dharm*, *Kula Dharm*, *Yuga Dharm* and so forth. Chaturvedi Badrinath seems to contend that many of the above definitions/views of *Dharm* are ritualistic, narrow, and

sectarian (Badrinath, 2007, p. 80); hence there is a need for a secular and humanitarian understanding of the construct while keeping the important context of existence in view. Accordingly, he attempted a universal definition of *Dharm*.

Chaturvedi relied on Mahabharata and other schools of Indian Philosophy to derive a universalistic notion of Dharm. According to Nyaya- Vaaishesheka, *Dharm* is that which leads one to *abbhyudaya* (happiness) and to *nihshreyasa* (beatitude). As per Mahabharata, *Dharm* is the universal foundation of all relationships of the self with the self and of the self with the other. *Dharm* is the natural foundation of all social order (everywhere), and it includes every form of life. *Dharm* means the order in the universe (Badrinath, 2019). As per the learned Rishis, that which sustains is *Dharm - Dharayati eti Dhram*. As per Chaturvedi (p. 85), the characteristics of *Dharm* are nurturing, cherishing, providing more amply, enriching, increasing, enhancing all living beings and securing their *Prabha* (potential). It is supporting, sustaining, bringing together, and in their togetherness, upholding all living beings and securing their Dharana. Alternatively, whatever has the characteristic of depriving, starving, diminishing, separating, uprooting, hurting, doing violence, debasing, and degrading is the negation of *Dharm* (p.86).

DHARM AND HUMAN CONTEXT

Chaturvedi notes that *Dharm* secures for all beings' freedom from violence and freedom from fear. In ordinary parlance relationship of the self with the self is incoherent, and with others, it is problematic (p. 100), leading to situations of envy, fear, greed, anxiety, violence and so on. Sri Sri Paramahansa Yogananda, in his work *God Talks with Arjuna* (2007), which is a compilation of SBG writes, "From the moment of conception to the surrender of the last breath, man has to fight in each incarnation innumerable battles - biological, hereditary, bacteriological, physiological, climatic, social, ethical, political, sociological, psychological, metaphysical - so many varieties of inner and outer conflicts. Competing for victory in every encounter are the forces of good and evil. The whole intent of the SBG is to align man's efforts to the side of *Dharm*, or righteousness." (p.7). *Dharm* is the natural laws governing the universe and man – inherent in which are prescribed duties applicable to given circumstances. Man's *Dharm* is to adhere to that natural righteousness that will save him from suffering and lead him to a state of freedom (p. 158).

The universe exists because it is held together by the immutable cosmic principles of creation, usually referred to as *Rta* in the Vedic literature. The highest *Dharm* or duty of every human being is to find out (by realization) that she is sustained by cosmic principles. *Dharm* is the cosmic law that runs the mechanism of the universe – obeying natural laws of living and existence, which are applicable to all things and beings. This is a teleological view as it relies on there being a final goal and purpose of existence, and human flourishing is dependent on striving towards that goal. In many respects, this view is also closer to the views of the celebrated Greek philosopher Aristotle. Human *Dharm* is to realize one's true nature and to perform one's natural duty selflessly and fearlessly for the welfare of all beings, a view expressed in SBG (Yogananda, 2007).

CONSTRUCT SPECIFICATION OF *DHARM* ADOPTED

We find the monumental work of PV Kane inspiring as well as apt to begin the journey to arrive at the meaning of *Dharm* for a contemporary manager. His comprehensive analyses and careful syntheses of the original texts made him believe, as Chaturvedi Badrinath did decades later, that *Dharm* actually meant a code of conduct, a way of life. He inferred, and we concur with him, that the English word religion reflects an imprecise translation of *Dharm*, a point repeatedly occurring in the works of Chaturvedi Badrinath. Being *Dharmic* most probably means a comprehensive and careful adherence to certain codes in every walk of life (Badrinath, 2019; Kane, 1941) as well as gradually developing the capability to transcend such codes (W. K. Pirsig, 2022) as we attempt to state below.

Kane (1941) documented many manifestations of *Dharm* in the ancient texts. But the culmination of his interpretations of these texts is seen in his adoption of *Varnashram Dharm* as the central meaning of *Dharm.* Kane (p. 11) described the meaning of *Varnashram Dharm* for a person as performing "right acts in everyday life…according to his station in society." On the face of it, this meaning looks static and frozen in time. Specifically, it seems an onerous task to determine one's station in society, and even if one does end up identifying this station, the dynamic forces of human life (Rogers, 1959) are quite likely to make that person sooner or later rebel against such an immovable position (W. K. Pirsig, 2022). Needless to say, therefore, this conceptualization of *Dharm* germinates reasons for rejection even before one can make a serious attempt to understand and practice it. But as we argue

later, Kane's specification of *Varnashram Dharm* may have a very useful purpose. This purpose has to be excavated, perhaps, by getting into the original meanings—etymology—of words like *Dharm* and other words in its neighborhood.

Many scholars (Kane, 1941; R. M. Pirsig, 1992) believe that *Rta* is the germ of *Dharma*. This term appears in *RgVed*, and scholars understand it to mean the cosmic order of things in general. The key point to keep in mind is that *Rta* meant *order*, a kind of *orderliness* that one was dutybound to realize and maintain. How else will this order manifest itself if not in a stable and balanced understanding of one's position in the larger scheme of things? This is where Kane's meaning of *Varnashram Dharm* makes sense. Probably it is fruitful to stabilize certain boundaries in one's quest and practice dwelling within them before transcending them. For instance, a disciplined stay within the boundaries of student life most probably enables one to enter fruitfully into marriage and family life.

At the same time, people are also ever-evolving individually and, therefore, collectively. The station of life in which a young adult craves autonomy and agency gradually evolves into late adulthood, wherein the same person benignly wishes to contribute and give rather than gain for oneself (Erikson, 1950). Hence, most likely, an individual has to seek the peace and stability of order and orderliness while also being simultaneously aware that this stability has to eventually give way to new stability both individually as well as societally. This gradual but certain evolution of the human condition probably renders a precise meaning of such terms beyond any verbal formulation. What seems illuminating here is the familiarity with the root of the word *Dharm*. The word *Dharm* itself is derived from the root word *dhr*, meaning to support, to uphold, and to sustain. Hence this entire scheme of stability and change, static and dynamic patterns of *Dharm* (W. K. Pirsig, 2022), need to be practiced in a way that supports, sustains and enhances everything, all life.

Pirsig (1992; W. K. Pirsig, 2022) not only acknowledges the logically vague specification of *Dharm,* but he also claims that perhaps *Dharm* is beyond proof or reason. Going further, Pirsig (2022) states that *Dharm* should guide reason but not the other way around. The realization of *Dharm*, according to Pirsig (2022), also entails the dissolution of self or ego, which typically results from a logical division between oneself and others. Pirsig's formulation of *Dharm* distinguishes between static and dynamic aspects of it. This classification of *Dharm* is seen in Kane (1941) as well as in the work of Polanyi (1966). The static *Dharma* of Pirsig (1992; W. K. Pirsig, 2022) is seen in the explicit formulations or

knowledge (Polanyi, 1966) and rituals (Kane, 1941). The dynamic aspects of *Dharm* described in Pirsig (1992; W. K. Pirsig, 2022) resemble the tacit knowledge (Polanyi, 1966) and the *Smarta* tradition (Kane, 1941).

This multifarious and perhaps ambiguous specification of *Dharm* becomes more crystallized in the work of Chaturvedi Badrinath. He distilled it in the following definition: relation of self with self and with others. This gels with the idea of the subject and object—a duality seen in philosophical texts. Every self is a manifestation of the *Rta* and contains the true essence (W. K. Pirsig, 2022) within. If that is true, then what else is left there to relate to? And there lies the seed of *Vasudhaiv Kutumbakam*; if one can *relate* to one's self and also to others, such relating leaves no space for contemplating anything *Adharmic*. Accordingly, we adopt this specification of *Dharm* for this paper.

WHO IS A *DHARMIC* MANAGER?

The Western Parallel

In today's neoliberal capitalist economic system, a good manager is almost always associated with someone who is efficient and who ultimately adds to the maximization of the bottom line. Neoliberalism coupled with rational choice theory predominates the Western notions of a good manager where the values that matter the most are: narrow self-interest, utility, efficiency *or profit (swartha* and *artha)*. What is missed and problematic in this western capitalist paradigm of an efficient manager is a holistic approach to all stakeholders, including the environment and being inclusive and taking a moral stand over and above a utilitarian and libertarian stand. Self-interest and rational choice are attributed to Adam Smith and the discipline of neo-classical economics, whereas efficiency as a parameter of the distribution of resources is attributed to John Locke and, more recently, to Milton Friedman. With the focus on efficiency and self-interest, the consideration given to the means of achieving this set goal of wealth or profit maximization is almost always privileged unless and until there hits a crisis that disrupts the very aim of profiteering like in the cases of Volkswagen, Wells Fargo, Enron, Satyam and so on. Post Milton Friedman's declaration of the sole aim of business as profit maximization, this practice of accepting the Lockean notion of efficiency as the only measure of a good manager is accepted as normal and even ethical in the neo-liberal context. However, it has been challenged as narrow and sectarian from many quarters now.

One wonders if there is any school of thought/thinker that emphasizes values other than efficiency and utility. Do any theory or system account for justice, sustainability and the common good? The ancient Greek philosopher Aristotle comes to mind in the context of the common good. In *Nichomachean Ethics*, Aristotle depicts the concept *of Eudaimonia*; the goal of human existence is the attainment of the highest good for Aristotle. The highest good is synonymous with flourishing, the good-in-itself for which all other goals are pursued. Flourishing, however, cannot be attained unless individuals are virtuous, and virtue is conceived by Aristotle as being exercised only when each entity acts as per its 'ergon' or 'characteristic activity'. As the characteristic activity of a flutist is to become a virtuoso at flute-playing, likewise, the characteristic activity of a human being is the exercise of the 'capacity of reason'.

Aristotle focuses on the possibility of bringing consistency in human character to achieve the highest good by the use of their capacity of reason and developing the virtues of excellence through habituation. In other words, character consists of virtues, vices, feelings, emotions, and actions and is, therefore, necessary for the coherence of personal identity. Happiness stems from coherence, coherence of activities to desires, amongst desires, and desires to values. The virtue of character entails 'hitting the mean' between deficiency and excess in a given situation. Crucially for Aristotle, the virtue of character, or the ability to attain the mean, entails the use of reason but also requires habituation into the practice of the virtues. He cites the instance of the successful athletes at the Olympic Games to argue that the winners are not the ones who possess the greatest strength but the ones who compete and, thereby, participate in the activity.

In conceiving character as comprising of virtues and vices, desires and values; and then, in defining virtue of character as the ability to 'hit the mean' between extremes in a situation; and in insisting on the importance of habituation in the inculcation of the virtue of the mean, Aristotle points out that virtue is not a state, but a capacity which can be developed through habituation and reason. Aristotle observes: "So virtues arise in us neither by nature nor contrary to nature, but nature gives us the capacity to acquire them, and completion comes through habituation" (Crisp, 2014). Aristotle argues in Book II of the Nicomachean Ethics that no set of rules or principles can enable the moral agent to grasp the morally salient features of a situation; this entails the use of phronesis or practical wisdom, which can be acquired only through habituation and is guided by reason.

Aristotle was very particular about individuals' being members of a larger community that he called the *Polis*. What is important in that notion of individuals being part of the *Polis* is that our virtues are also defined by the larger community. Crucial to Aristotle's argument is that there was no antagonism between the self-interest of individuals and the larger public good. This argument of Aristotle is further developed by contemporary communitarian philosophers like Amartya Sen and Michael Sandel. In *Politics*, Aristotle divides economic activities into two broad types. While he approved of *oeconomicus* or household trading but did not approve of *chrematisike* commerce or trade for profit and labelled the latter as an unethical approach. Contemporary virtue ethicists, especially MacIntyre (MacIntyre, 2007), have gone to the extent of denouncing business as a practice and argue that business managers are clouded by their normative bias towards the fixed goal of economic benefit, and therefore business cannot be a practice, and hence it lacks the ability to develop internal goods of virtues of excellence.

Indian View of a *Dharmic* Manager

The distinctness of Indian philosophy is the aim of unity of individuals with the universe. It is reflected in proclamations such as *vasudhaiva kutumbakam* (the entire world is a family), seen in many renditions of ancient Indian texts and thoughts (Hatcher, 1994). It elucidates the global outlook that individuals are capable of. This is similar to the concept of the 'point of view of the universe' of Henry Sidgwick (de Lazari-Radek & Singer, 2014). Hence the emphasis on character building over vocational/professional education in ancient India is something very integral to the Indian system of existence and good living. The ancient institutions of education—Gurukulas—were meant to develop the overall character of the individuals and not just the training in specific skill sets or vocational skills. Another significant distinction of Indian philosophy is that it did not condemn or divide the economic activities into profitable and required rather that we embrace concepts like *Subha Labh,* auspicious or righteous profits.

In this paper, we take the help of the text - The Mahabharata and interpret the characters and their contexts to be able to identify what is the Dharmic thing to do (the morally right thing to do?) for anyone in view of their life circumstances and its potential in achieving the common good and human flourishing. A *Dharmic* manager is one who achieves control over oneself. Control over oneself is basically controlling, regulating, and transforming one's negative psychic emotions into a positive, calm, peaceful state. Negative

emotions like envy, anxiety, anger, fear, revenge and so on, if fed on a continuous basis, have the potential to damage, dilute and deteriorate one's relationship with oneself first and then one's relationship with others and society at large. These emotions are found universally, and each of these emotions is potent to destroy the human character and the character of the civilization and nation as portrayed in the Mahabharata. The envy of Duryodhana, the anxiety of Karna, the revenge of Ashwatthama, and the fear of Dhritarashtra led to the situation of war. A person who is a *Dharmic* person should be able to experience and outgrow these experiences and cultivate positive attributes and attitudes. Messages of Swami Vivekanand imply that if a person's relation to his colleagues and workers is devoid of love and respect, the person is shrinking (Letters of Swami Vivekananda, 2019). It is hard to see how such a manager can contribute to and to others' wellbeing. The same positive emotions that one needs to develop for setting one's relationship with oneself right are also required for building one's relationship with the others around. Without these qualities, a manager would create a lot of damage to everything and everyone.

DERIVING THE MEANS OF BEING DHARMIC

Cultivating virtuous habits and maintaining a narrative unity of life with the constancy of character is important for being just, right, and good. One needs to cultivate virtues such as courage, generosity, temperance, justice, honesty, truthfulness and so forth. That apart, one needs to be practically wise, bereft of purely selfish desires and consider work as her share of offering to the human society and universe. A good manager also should be a better listener and be able to relate to the person and situation better.

Pirsig (2022) mentions that the way to become *Dharmic* is to practice *Dhyan* or Zen. The word practice here seems important. Most probably, disciplined adherence to certain codes can, over time, open the paths and vistas of *Dharm* for a manager. The essence of earlier conceptions can be seen in both the adherence—static—and opening of new vistas—dynamic—aspects of *Dharm*. In the section below, a potentially useful collection of such practices is made available for readers.

Avoiding Attribution Error

A manager faces several situations when an employee appears to have made a mistake. A central question in such a situation is to decide if the employee is responsible for that mistake or what circumstances led to that mistake. Many managers may hold the

employee responsible (Ross, 2018). However, such a mental habit could be more erroneous than accurate. Published research suggests a way out. It offers a framework to examine if the manager is reaching the right decision in such cases. This framework consists of three considerations termed consistency, distinctiveness, and consensus (CDC) (Kelley, 1973). Consistency refers to the uniformity—or its absence—in the past behaviors of the employee. For example, if a manager notices lateness on a particular day, s/he would come to a more accurate decision by considering if the employee has shown lateness in the past. If such an examination yields consistency in lateness, holding employees responsible becomes a more accurate decision. The second consideration—distinctiveness—can be implemented by asking if the behavior under examination stands out as separate from other behaviors of the employee. For instance, if the employee coming late on a given day has also missed several deadlines in the past or has made many errors, one can more reasonably conclude that the lateness occurred due to the employee and not due to uncontrollable circumstances. Lastly, considering consensus means looking at the behaviors of many other employees that day. If many people came late that day, the behaviors of many employees would match with the employee in question. Such a data point can safely indicate that lateness occurred due to circumstances beyond the control of any single individual.

We posit that practicing the CDC principle—habituating oneself—can lead to better relations of self with self and better relations of self with others. Thus, it serves the conception of Dharm.

Ensuring Various Norms of Justice

A manager needs to follow three important norms of justice. The first norm to be kept in mind is distributive justice. This form of justice demands from a manager that rewards and punishments be distributed to employees in proportion to their good or bad outcomes. The next form of justice—procedural justice—poses two demands on managers. Firstly, managers should devise transparent procedures to determine rewards and punishments. And next, employees should have an effective mechanism to appeal if they perceive a lack of distributive justice. The last form of justice—interactional justice—requires a manager to treat employees with respect and dignity irrespective of the conditions under which manager-employee interactions take place (Colquitt et al., 2001).

Evidence strongly shows that ensuring these forms of justice results in several positive employee attitudes and behaviors (Colquitt et al., 2001). Again, we posit that

practicing these forms of justice ensures less pain to others and less pain to people in the interdependent entity of the business. Hence, these practices can help the attainment of *Dharma* (Badrinath, 2019).

Expanding Leader-Member Exchange

According to the theory of exchanges between a manager and an employee, the manager should aim to display certain specific behaviors in order to establish a positive relationship between the two. For instance, a manager should let an employee know the level of satisfaction the manager experiences owing to the employee's output. Besides assessing the output of an employee—and sharing this assessment—a manager should also assess the potential of that employee. A manager should also endeavor to experience the difficulties and problems an employee faces while at work. A manager should try to use her/his authority to enable the work of an employee. Quite frequently, one witnesses a passive possession of authority by a manager, which s/he seldom uses to help the employees. Such an attitude proves dysfunctional, according to evidence. Moreover, certain occasions require a manager to protect an innocent employee who might have unknowingly made a mistake. A *Dharmik* manager should do that, as the evidence (e.g., Dulebohn et al., 2012) suggests a positive work atmosphere resulting from such managerial actions. Employees actively reciprocate the combined impact of these behaviors by endorsing the manager even when in her/his absence (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995).

Evidence (e.g., Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995) also suggests that managers typically engage in these behaviors for a smaller set of employees close to them. The challenge, therefore, is to *expand* this circle and engage in such behaviors with an ever-increasing number of employees. This idea is assumed further importance given that managers may not include the output of employees while engaging in these behaviors (Martin et al., 2016).

Providing Perceived Organizational Support (POS)

Employees experience positive attitudes and display several useful behaviors when they feel supported. In particular, they reciprocate well when they perceive that managers value the contributions they make. Furthermore, employees also expect their managers to care for their interests, not to take advantage of employees' vulnerabilities, and to ensure their overall wellbeing at the workplace (Eisenberger et al., 1986). Evidence also suggests that employees personify their organizations in their managers and find the role of their managers

crucial while formulating their perceptions about these kinds of support (Eisenberger et al., 2002; Shanock & Eisenberger, 2006).

Working to ensure POS demands the practice of valuing people's work objectively, shedding biases or prejudices, and relating with compassion in order to let employees grow. Evidence suggests that these actions and their consequences have positive outcomes for employees and organizations (Riggle et al., 2009; Rockstuhl et al., 2020). It seems that such practices can ensure better relations between self and others and probably also between self and self. In other words, these practices seem capable of ensuring *Dharm*.

Overall, it seems that avoiding attribution error through the practice of the CDC framework, ensuring the different forms of justice, better LMX, and POS can obviously lead to better relations between self and others. We posit that these practices can also ensure peace within and hence ensure a better relationship of the self with self. These, therefore, can be considered *Dharmic* practices as per the conceptualization of Badrinath(Badrinath, 2007, 2019).

CONCLUSION

Probably, the ultimate goal of a manager, as a human being, should be to peacefully surrender to the Wishes of The Almighty. This could be experienced as a non-resistant and childlike response to what the manager witnesses within and without. However, the proponents of action, internal locus of control, and capitalism would be upset with such a prospect. They need to see goals, and goal-directed actions, course corrections in case goals are not met, and so forth. Perhaps it is better left to each manager to choose between peaceful surrender—lest it is misunderstood, we are not advocating inaction—and determined action. In case the manager does choose the latter, the paper humbly offers some evidence-based suggestions for better prospects of results.

References

Badrinath, C. (2007). *The Mahabharata: An inquiry in the human condition*. Orient Longman Hyderabad.

Badrinath, C. (2019). *Dharma: Hinduism and Religions in India*. Penguin Random House India Private Limited.

Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*(3), 425–445. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.425

Crisp, R. (Ed.). (2014). *Aristotle: Nicomachean Ethics*. Cambridge University Press.

de Lazari-Radek, K., & Singer, P. (2014). *The point of view of the universe: Sidgwick and contemporary ethics*. Oxford University Press.

Dulebohn, J. H., Bommer, W. H., Liden, R. C., Brouer, R. L., & Ferris, G. R. (2012). A meta-analysis of antecedents and consequences of leader-member exchange: Integrating the past with an eye toward the future. *Journal of Management*, *38*(6), 1715–1759.

Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *71*(3), 500–507.

Eisenberger, R., Stinglhamber, F., Vandenberghe, C., Sucharski, I. L., & Rhoades, L. (2002). Perceived supervisor support: Contributions to perceived organizational support and employee retention. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*(3), 565–573. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.3.565

Erikson, E. H. (1950). *Childhood and society*. WW Norton & Company.

Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Cambridge University Press.

Friedman, M. (1962). *Capitalism and Freedom*. University of Chicago Press.

Friedman, M. (2007). The Social Responsibility of Business Is to Increase Its Profits. In W. C. Zimmerli, M. Holzinger, & K. Richter (Eds.), *Corporate Ethics and Corporate Governance* (pp. 173–178). Springer Berlin Heidelberg. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-70818-6_14

Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *6*(2), 219–247. https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(95)90036-5

Hatcher, B. A. (1994). The Cosmos is One Family'(Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam): Problematic Mantra of Hindu Humanism. *Contributions to Indian Sociology*, *28*(1), 149–162.

Kane, P. V. (1941). *History of dharmaśāstra* (Vol. 2). Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute Poona.

Kelley, H. H. (1973). The processes of causal attribution. *American Psychologist*, *28*(2), 107–128. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0034225

Letters of Swami Vivekananda. (2019). *Letters of Swami Vivekananda*. Advaita Ashram.

MacIntyre, A. (2007). *After virtue: A study in moral theory* (3rd ed.). University of Notre Dame Press.

Martin, R., Guillaume, Y., Thomas, G., Lee, A., & Epitropaki, O. (2016). Leader–member exchange (LMX) and performance: A meta-analytic review. *Personnel Psychology*, *69*(1), 67–121.

Pirsig, R. M. (1992). *Lila: An inquiry into morals*. Bantam Books.

Pirsig, W. K. (Ed.). (2022). *On Quality: An Inquiry into Excellence*. Mariner Books.

Polanyi, M. (1966). *The Tacit Dimension*. Doubleday and Company Inc.

Riggle, R. J., Edmondson, D. R., & Hansen, J. D. (2009). A meta-analysis of the relationship between perceived organizational support and job outcomes: 20 years of research. *Journal of Business Research*, *62*(10), 1027–1030. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2008.05.003

Rockstuhl, T., Eisenberger, R., Shore, L. M., Kurtessis, J. N., Ford, M. T., Buffardi, L. C., & Mesdaghinia, S. (2020). Perceived organizational support (POS) across 54 nations: A cross-cultural meta-analysis of POS effects. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *51*(6), 933–962. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41267-020-00311-3

Rogers, C. R. (1959). A theory of therapy, personality, and interpersonal relationships, as developed in the client-centered framework. In S. Koch (Ed.), *Psychology: A Study of a Science* (Vol. 3, pp. 184–256). McGraw-Hill.

Ross, L. (2018). From the Fundamental Attribution Error to the Truly Fundamental Attribution Error and Beyond: My Research Journey. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *13*(6), 750–769. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691618769855

Sen, A. (2008). The idea of justice. *Journal of Human Development*, *9*(3), 331–342.

Shanock, L. R., & Eisenberger, R. (2006). When supervisors feel supported: Relationships with subordinates' perceived supervisor support, perceived organizational support, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*(3), 689–695. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.3.689

Yogananda, P. (2007). *God talks with arjuna*. Diamond Pocket Books (P) Ltd.