

**On the Purdue University Distinguished Alumni Award to
Indian Social Psychologist Professor Ramadhar Singh**

Ritu Tripathi
Organizational Behaviour and Human Resources Management
Indian Institute of Management Bangalore,
Bannerghatta Road, Bangalore 560 076, India

27th May 2022

Author Note

This tribute is based on publications of Ramadhar Singh and the information given in his [Ahmedabad University website](#). However, the views expressed in the article are solely mine.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Ritu Tripathi, e-mail:

ritu.tripathi@iimb.ac.in

Abstract

Ramadhar Singh, PhD in social psychology from Purdue University (1973), received the Distinguished Alumnus Award on March 25th, 2022. How did a first-generation student hailing from a village in Nepal and educated in Bihar, India, come this far? In previous articles, the focus was on Singh's overall passion for and commitment to psychological science. In present article, the author focuses on Singh's academic and professional attainments at the Indian Institute of Management Bangalore (IIMB, 2010-2016), noting how, with IIMB's research support, Singh consolidated the research he had started at Purdue. This academic bio-sketch of an Indian social psychologist's outstanding contributions to research, teaching, and service argues for a healthy person-institution interaction if Indian institutions wish to be research-intensive.

**On the Purdue University Distinguished Alumni Award to Indian Social Psychologist
Professor Ramadhar Singh**

“सभी खिलाड़ी मन लगाकर खेलते हैं, सभी चाहते हैं कि हमारी जीत हो; लेकिन जीत एक ही होती है, तो क्या इससे हारनेवाले हिम्मत हार जाते हैं? वे फिर खेलते हैं; फिर हार जाते हैं, तो फिर खेलते हैं। कभी-न-कभी उनकी जीत होती ही है।”

मुंशी प्रेमचंद, (१९२५/२०१८), रंगभूमि, पेज ४४६

[English Translation: Players play with passion. All aspire to win. But only one does. Do other players then give up? No, they still compete. They lose again, they play again. Sooner or later, they do find their way to the top.

Munshi Premchand (1925, 2018) Rangabhumi, p.446]

Ramadhar Singh decided to pursue his career in psychology in his high school in Bihar but was cautioned against doing so by well-meaning elderly villagers in Balara of the District of Sarlahi in Nepal, where he was born. Nevertheless, driven by his overpowering interest and desire, he studied psychology at the University of Bihar, Muzaffarpur in India (1965 BA Hons., 1968 MA Gold Medalist) and at Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana, USA (1972 MS, 1973 PhD). On March 25, 2022, he received [Purdue University Distinguished Alumni Award in Psychological Sciences](#) for his outstanding achievements in social psychology and management. Only two American psychologists have received such an honour before him in the 153-year history of Purdue University. What Munshi Premchand wrote about players in 1925 has been the way of life for Singh since the 1950s. Congratulations to Professor Singh!

I had often heard of Singh as a widely respected social psychologist in my student years at the Department of Psychology, University of Allahabad. Ajit Kumar Dalal, Singh's first doctoral student from the Indian Institute of Technology (IIT) Kanpur (1975-78), taught me research methods and social psychology. By this lineage, I am one of Singh's academic grand children in India! Nevertheless, I first met Ramadhar Singh at the Indian Institute of

Management Bangalore (IIMB) in 2010. He had been appointed as the distinguished professor of management, I was a new assistant professor having just completed my Ph.D in Psychology from the University of Illinois at Chicago. Whereas he had superannuated from National University of Singapore (NUS), I was at the threshold of my faculty career. He had an enviable track-record of published research, I was dealing with initial ‘Revise and Resubmits’ in international journals. Awe and veneration of him naturally followed. So also, nervousness and fear. But thanks to his genuine interest and respect for scholarly activities of young researchers such as myself, I found in him a wonderful mentor and colleague at IIMB.

Our discussions ranged from the esoteric—the ‘moderators’ and ‘mediators’ in experimental social psychology to the literary—the quotes and examples from Munshi Premchand’s stories and novels; dotted with the more commonplace ones in between—the progress he was making as he was learning to drive in the campus! I have to say that in my interactions with Singh, I always found a unique combination of dedication, humour, intellect, knowledge, simplicity, and wit. Privileged and honoured as I feel to have had Singh as my colleague at IIMB, on the occasion of his Purdue University Distinguished Alumni Award, I want to pay a tribute to Singh by reviewing how IIMB was an important milestone in his professional journey. This note, therefore, is more academic than personal. In particular—as I describe in detail later in this note—I want to underscore how, with the help of research support available at IIMB, he was able to consolidate the various strands of his research that he had actually started at Purdue as a doctoral student.

Singh’s case also highlights an obvious but often overlooked point: how individuals and institutions reciprocally contribute to each other’s growth and success. Despite his PhD from Purdue in 1973 and passion for research—where his advisor Donn Byrne wrote in a [letter](#) dated,

July 3, 1973: “Your career here was truly outstanding in every respect... We’re glad that you came to Purdue, and we expect to follow your future career with pride,” Ramadhar Singh could not have sustained his research pipeline and scholarly impact with international publications were it not for his faculty appointment in the three institutions of national importance in India, namely, IIT Kanpur (1973-79), IIM Ahmedabad (1979-1988), and IIM Bangalore (2010-16); and the internationally famous National University of Singapore (1988-2010). His sabbaticals at the University of Rochester, University of Oxford, and Purdue University provided him with the opportunities for further advancement and build international collaborations. His current affiliation with Ahmedabad University lets him continue this scholarship which not only speaks of his commitment and dedication but also to the critical role that institutional support and affiliation play in an academic scholar’s career growth and renewal.

Teaching and Mentoring at IIMB

Legend had it—and it was confirmed by Singh himself—that he had taken the tough decision to say goodbye to his quiet and comfortable life in Singapore, and determinedly responded to the invitation to be the first-ever distinguished professor of management at IIM Bangalore at a salary of Re 1 more than the director’s salary! The task entrusted to him by the then director Pankaj Chandra (2007-2013) was to enhance IIMB’s visibility as a research-focused business school and to provide guidance and training to research scholars at IIMB. Ramadhar Singh’s appointment required him to teach only one doctoral level course in a year. However, he taught two, namely, *Social Psychology* and *Research Methods in Organizational Behaviour* since 2010. I sat in a few of his research methods classes myself and wondered at his ability to explain complex statistical concepts in plain simple terms. He used common analogies and metaphors, so researchers do not get lost in the complexities of equations and formulas but

appreciate the crux of the analytic concepts and techniques. A self-confessed Maths drop-out in school but mentored by Ben James Winer in experimental designs at Purdue, Singh taught quantitative techniques such as analysis of variance, regression analysis, structural equation modelling and factor analysis with ease, comfort, and confidence that such topics require.

In 2014, he got an opportunity to design and teach a course on *Psychological Perspectives on Public Policy* for the Post-graduate Programme in Public Policy and Management (PGPPM). This group of students comprised of senior civil servants and government officials, who wanted to further their knowledge and skills of management. Singh uniquely designed and taught this course to show how psychological facts and principles can be applied to public policy in India. This course was equally popular among doctoral students of management. Civil servants were initially afraid of taking his course on public policy. On the completion of the course, however, they commented that they would “now recommend their children to study psychology as a career option.” Such evaluation of the course, and the chance to interact with civil servants was exhilarating to Singh who has been advancing psychology as science in Asia over the last 54 years!

Ramadhar Singh supervised master’s theses of three civil servants and served as member on the doctoral committees of two other civil servants, namely, Anjana Dube (currently Principal Economic Affairs Officer, United Nations Economic Commission for Africa) and Balamurgan K. (currently Commissioner, Customs, Bangalore). His impact as a teacher and mentor was not unprecedented. In 2009, NUS undergraduate students had also voted him as the Inspiring mentor. For example, Jennifer B. P. Teoh, an NUS alumna who had published two papers with Singh and nominated him for the Inspiring Mentor Award on July 27, 2009 (Balooni, 2017), wrote:

“Prof. Singh is very committed to developing his students’ interest in research, especially in social psychology, and he has inspired his students to take up psychology as a profession. Apart from teaching, Prof. Singh has been like a friend and mentor who is always there for his students in times of need. He is able to lend his support and provide sound advice to his students. He also treats his students like family members and sincerely cares for them. Even after our graduation, he continues to keep in touch with us to find out how we are doing.” (p. 139)

I could not agree more with Jennifer. Often, I learn of the whereabouts of PhD alumni and former research scholars from Singh. He keeps in touch with all his students and takes genuine interest in their career and research trajectory. At IIMB, even his research associates, with whom he also co-authored papers, namely, Bineet Mishra and Krithiga Sankaran, were subsequently admitted to graduate schools of management in America with full financial support. Another post-doctoral fellow Naureen Bhullar, who co-authored five papers with Singh, has been manager of the Behavioural Sciences Lab and Research Coordinator at IIM Bangalore since 2016. I also got the last opportunity to meet my revered ‘Dalal Sir’ (deceased: March 4, 2019) at Singh’s residence on IIMB campus in 2011, and that meeting is more memorable now than ever before. Not to say of the mentor-protégé bonding which I witnessed being as strong after decades as it being sublime.

Research and Publications

During his 6-year tenure at IIMB (2010-16), Ramadhar Singh, with the aid of generous research grants and research associates and/or fellows, pursued two lines of his experimental research. One was explaining the effects of similar attitudes on interpersonal attraction, a topic on which he had written his master’s thesis (Singh, 1973a) and dissertation (Singh, 1973b) at

Purdue University (Singh, 1974)—why and how do similar attitudes draw people together?

Another was the psychology of intuitive prosecution: Why do people desire and punish those who take the advantage of belonging to a group but shirk the responsibility that goes with the membership? He had earlier published on both the topics, but during his time at IIMB, he took a more nuanced approach and expanded the work conceptually with a fine-grained analysis.

Similarity-attraction Relation

It is well-known that *birds of a feather flock together*. To convert such adage into psychological phenomenon, and to understand what psychological processes may drive it, an experimental social psychologist usually manipulates similarity between attitudes of two persons (Independent variable: IV) and then measures the attraction between them (Dependent variable: DV). Note that the IV precedes the DV for any causal claim to be made. Before measuring the DV, the investigator also takes measures of variables that supposedly transmit the IV effects to the DV. Such intervening variables are popularly called mediating variables (MVs). Thus, a mediation model represents the relation between IV and DV via the MV(s). The investigation of such mediators is held in high regard in present psychological research (Rucker et al., 2011) because this helps in unpacking a seemingly straightforward phenomenon to its constituent elements. This unpacking is relevant to both to theory and practice. After all, if people with similar attitudes get attracted to one another, then it is consequential to all kinds of interpersonal and social behaviour such as political orientation, voting, organizational teamwork, marital and other family relationships, etc. As Munshi Premchand (1932/2019) had rightly observed, "जहाँ अपने विचारों का राज हो, वही अपना घर है जो अपने विचारों को मानते हैं, वही अपने सगे हैं" [मुंशी प्रेमचंद (१९३२/२०१९), *कर्मभूमि*, पेज २०२]. [English translation: "Our home is where our views prevail. Those who agree with us can be called our own." [Munshi Premchand (1932/2019), *Karmabhumi*, p.202].

To explain the anomaly in the similarity-attraction literature that a theorized variable of positive affect (Singh, 1974) acts as an MV only occasionally, Singh, Chen, and Wegener (2014) first showed that positive affect, inferred attraction of the stranger toward the participants themselves, and respect for the stranger do mediate the similarity-attraction relation when considered singly. More important, the MVs considered together operate as *serial* processes (i.e., one leading to another), not *parallel* ones as was previously investigated (Singh et al., 2007a).

Trust (i.e., a belief that the stranger would not take advantage of me) underlies most relationship development and appreciation of group members. However, trust was not previously considered as a driver of attitude similarity effects on attraction. Singh et al. (2015), therefore, proposed trust in the stranger as a new MV. In a series of four new experiments, they first demonstrated mediation of the similarity-attraction relation by trust and then documented solid evidence for the *multiple-MV sequential model* but against the popular multiple-MV *parallel model*. In any case, trust had survived as the key precursor of attraction.

In an article on this topic written at IIMB but published later from Ahmedabad University, Singh, Tay, and Sankaran (2016) further reported experimental evidence for *causation from trust to attraction*, but not vice versa. This demonstration was methodologically important because both trust and attraction were measured variables wherein the possibility of reversed causation always exists (Singh et al., 2007b). By experimentally manipulating the MVs of positive affect and inferred attraction of the stranger toward the participant at Time 1 and Time 2, respectively, Singh, Teng, Bhullar, and Sankaran (2018) further showed that affect precedes inferred attraction in building trust that fosters attraction. Most important, Singh et al. (2017) revisited the possibility of validation of one's views by the stranger (Byrne & Clore, 1967) as the primary response to attitude similarity, and then demonstrated that validatio—a

cognitive proces—precedes positive affect in the participants—an emotional proces—in promoting interpersonal attraction. Further, trust always remains an MV proximal to attraction.

Collectively, the above-mentioned findings from the articles cited converge in showing that there are multiple MVs of the similarity-attraction relation. Among them, moreover, validation is the first process (distal MV) and trust in the stranger is the last one (proximal MV) in the causal chain of MVs of the similarity-attraction relation.

The paradigmatic research enabled Singh to sort out many pending issues in the attraction paradigm initiated by his world-renowned mentor Donn Byrne at the University of Texas, Austin (Byrne 1961) and seemingly adjudged to be complete at Purdue University, West Lafayette (Byrne, 1971). However, subsequent contributions of Singh to the attraction paradigm suggest that all research is open to further exploration. A scientist can shift interests from one topic to another, for example, interpersonal attraction (Singh, 1973a, 1974) to information integration (Singh, 1975, 1983; Singh, Bohra, & Dalal, 1979a; Singh, Gupta, & Dalal, 1979b), but can easily revert to the old one with fresh insights on how (Singh & Ho, 2000; Singh & Tan, 1992) and why of (Singh et al. 2015, 2017) of an IV-DV link.

Intuitive Principled Theologians, Prudent Prosecutors, and Pragmatic Politicians

Ramadhar Singh has also been testing the *social-functionalist models* of people (Tetlock, 2002) since the last two decades. According to this framework, collectives function effectively through a set of *accountability procedures* (e.g., constitution, rules, traditions, norms, etc.). Further, humans belonging to a collective consider themselves as fair-minded persons; they want safety of their lives, liberties, and properties in society; and they try to be vigilant defenders of accountability procedures agreed upon.

In dealing with accountability procedures, humans can assume one of the three roles. They can (a) unquestionably defend accountability procedures, (b) demand accountability from others (e.g., subordinates, children, patients, etc.), or (c) respond themselves to the accountability demands by others (e.g., bosses, elders, doctors, etc.). Contingent upon the rule-role matrix, the same person can shift from one mindset to another to respond effectively to the adaptive challenge. Specifically, protecting accounting procedures turn people into principled theologians, placing accounting demands on others turn them into prudent prosecutors, and responding to accounting demands by others that entails making a positive self-presentation, turn people into pragmatic politicians (Tetlock, 2002).

From IIMB, Ramadhar Singh refined and extended the model of people as prudent prosecutors substantially. When people know of any rule-violation (IV), they make causal attribution (person *versus* situation), express outrage, and form attitudes (support *versus* oppose; retribution *versus* deterrence) which presumably transmit the IV effects on any punitive response (DV: fine, suspension, demotion, termination, or imprisonment) (Tetlock et al., 2007). In this original formulation, however, all the measured responses to the IV were initially found to have a unidimensional structure. That is, the MV and the DV responses loaded on a single factor. Such outcome made the model unfalsifiable. Worse, the mediation model became untestable. Consequently, Singh and his collaborators tested the model of prudent prosecutors in Asia as well as cross-culturally from three angles as described below.

Interest in Restoring Social Order

When people read or hear a headline news, they react to it more from the angle of its implications for their lives, liberties, and properties than from that of merely explaining it (Singh, Kaur, Junid, & Self, 2011). This demonstration was contrary to the prevailing cognitive view that

people are intuitive scientists interested in merely explaining the event (Kelley, 1973, Ross, 1977) but encouraging for the social-functionalist view that people are keen observers of the events in the society from a functional angle (Tetlock, 2002).

Second, public protest for any crime activates the pursuit of prosecutorial goal of retribution among Indians but not among Americans. This happens because social order is often perceived to be compromised more in India than in America (Singh et al., 2014). In other words, public protest triggers prosecutorial mind more when the threat to social order and severe crime are prevalent than uncommon in a country.

Third, evidence for developmental shift from overweighting consequence by children to overweighting intent by adults when determining punishment for a transgression (Piaget, 1965) is driven more by social (Singh et al., 2002) than cognitive development (Piaget, 1965). Stated simply, age-related changes in recommending punishment reflect more on forgiving an accidental harm than hounding the intentional one. Likewise, the decrease in importance of severity of harm effects on punishment over ages reflects a belief in a better social order among adults than among children. In sum, then, people are sensitive to any threat to social order, they interpret severe crime as threat to social order, and they desire to punish the norm- or law-violators to uphold the law-and-order.

Punishment for Mere Association and for Belonging to a Category

People are punished for not only committing a crime (i.e., commission) but also for being associated with an offender (Heider, 1958; Piaget, 1965). For example, the friends of an offender are punished collectively via dispositional attribution and blame because they had failed to prevent the crime (i.e., an error of omission). Such proclivity is stronger among Easterners than Westerners as if the social circle of responsibility were wider in the East than in the West (Singh

et al., 2011; Tetlock, Self, & Singh, 2010). Considered from this angle, what others of our social circle do is very much our responsibility. One cannot escape blame by merely saying that it was none of one's business (Singh et al., 2012).

When the category of the perpetrator (i.e., age, gender, race, religion, etc.) is known, people act as pragmatic politicians (i.e., using double standards) with in-group leaders but as fair-but-biased prosecutor with out-group leaders (Singh et al., 2018). Although intuitive prosecutors are basically interested in upholding normative order, they do succumb to the information about social category of the perpetrators. Specifically, people try to favour the in-group but also to appear fair to out-groups (Singh, Choo, & Poh, 1998).

Mediators of Deviance Effects on Punishment

Severe, compared to mild, consequence of the perpetrator's act results in harsher punishment (Walster, 1966). One may account for such phenomenon by dispositional attribution as Walster did (i.e., the greater the severity, the greater the personal responsibility) or by pursuit of the backward-looking goal of retribution (Carlsmith, Darley, & Robinson, 2002). However, Singh and Lin (2011) showed that the severity effect signals the desire to send a loud and clear deterrence message to others that such deviance cannot be tolerated.

Also, the iVs of circumstance leading to the crime (intention *versus* accident), culture (West *versus* East), and severity of consequence (high *versus* low) are most likely triggers of proximal dispositional attribution, blame, and punishment responses, respectively. In addition, effects arising from the preceding dispositional attribution and blame responses influence the succeeding responses including punishment. In short, different iVs of the DV of punishment are more potent trigger of one intervening response than other responses but the responses themselves are serially dependent, not independent of one another.

In the original articulation of the prosecutorial model (Tetlock et al., 2007, Figure 1, p. 196), attribution, outrage, and punishment goals were proposed as MVs which were conceptualized to build upon on each other in such a way that they might not be always empirically distinguishable. Given that the MV and punishment responses to offenders loaded on a single factor, Tetlock et al. (2007) had used the single composite measure of attributional punitiveness in testing the model with North Americans. However, subsequent studies of Asians found evidence for a multi-dimensional structure of the prosecutorial mind (Singh & Lin, 2011; Singh et al., 2012, Singh et al., 2016) which broadened the scope for specifying the causal relation among the MVs themselves. Surprisingly, however, dispositional attribution had lost out to other MVs when they were considered as multiple parallel processes. Such outcome was at odds with legal systems in which dispositional attribution is the prime reason for recommending any punishment (e.g., Hart & Honore, 1959).

Singh and Rai (2021) resolved the foregoing ambiguity in the literature by performing two experiments. In Experiment 1, the accused leader had *resigned* (i.e., already punished) or *hadn't resigned from* the position (i.e., remained unpunished). In Experiment 2, the leader had also *cooperated with* (i.e., an appropriate response) or *threatened* the accusers and the investigators (i.e., an inappropriate response). Results yielded more convincing evidence for the multidimensional structure of the prosecutorial mind than ever before. Moreover, participants were harsher with the national leader who had gone unpunished for the wrongdoing than with the leader who was previously unpunished.

Most interestingly, the relation between an inappropriate response by the leader and the desired punishment for him/her was represented best only when the MVs were specified serially as dispositional attribution leading to outrage which leading to attitude toward the leader.

Evidence for such multiple-MV sequential model reaffirmed the importance of causal attribution in punishment and refined the model in a way never done before.

The prosecutorial model is promising from both the conceptual and practical perspectives. Explaining an event by the person (e.g., personality, motive, value, or any other internal attribute) when it can equally well be explained by the circumstances was previously conceptualized as a *fundamental attribution error* (Ross, 1977) or *correspondence bias* (Jones & Harris, 1967) of intuitive scientists. In the prosecutorial model, such overweighting of personal over external causation is not error or bias but a tightening of accountability procedures to reduce Type 2 error of acquitting the guilty (Tetlock, 2002).

At the practical level, awareness of any wrongdoing does evoke gossips and feelings of distress among common people. And they do wish that the wrongdoers be somehow punished by others, government bodies, or even Gods. These responses are seemingly *none-of-their-businesses*. According to the prosecutorial model, however, gossips, attributions, emotions, and punitive responses are extremely functional responses toward upholding social order. The prosecutorial mindset activated by wrongdoing is switched-off only when the wrongdoer is adequately punished and the law-and-order appears to have been restored (Singh & Rai, 2021).

Overall Portrait of Humans from Two Different Research Paradigms

The preceding findings of the research programs by Ramadhar Singh and his collaborators portray humans as being cognitively affluent and dynamic (Singh 2011a, 2011b), not miserly as they were believed to be in the 1980s (Fiske & Taylor, 1984). Decision makers go much beyond the information given to them (Singh, 1991, 2011a). They actively process multiple pieces of information (Singh & Singh, 1994) and relate activated processes with each other serially in producing an overt response (Singh et al., 2015, 2017). Theoretically, therefore, *cognition*

(validation of attitudes by others, causal attribution to the perpetrator) precedes *emotion* (positive affect, outrage) regardless of whether it is interpersonal attraction from similar attitudes (Singh et al., 2017) or intuitive prosecution from a wrongdoing (Singh & Rai, 2021).

As a cross-cultural psychologist, I often find the quest of turning personal observations and anecdotal data into rigorous empirical research (Tripathi, 2016; Tripathi & Cervone, 2008; Tripathi, Cervone & Savani, 2018) both fascinating and challenging. Hence, I admire the sharp acuity with which Singh has taken common sense notions and popular ideas from literature, mythology, and/or philosophy to guide his research (Singh, 2022). Disciplines differ more with respect to their methodological than thematic stance. Similarly, “Science and literature are not two things, but two sides of one thing” (Thomas Huxley, n.d). In psychological sciences, ideas from common sense, literature, philosophy, and/or mythology get transformed into *reproducible* and *replicable* phenomena (Nosek et al., 2021) empirically and, more often, experimentally. The experimental ingenuity that Singh had displayed is noteworthy (see, e.g., Jia & Singh, 2009; Singh, 1975, 1983, 1991, 1996; Singh & Bhargava, 1985, 1986; Singh et al., 1979a, 1979b; Singh & Ho, 2000; Singh & Rai, 2021; Singh, Sidana, & Saluja, 1978; Singh & Singh, 1994; Singh & Tan, 1992, Srivastava & Singh, 1988). The findings have been statistically *reproducible* from his original data and *replicable* by the new data collected by others using different methods of research and participant populations. Ramadhar Singh indeed stands out as an original thinker and an ingenious experimentalist from India.

This assessment of scholarly contributions of Ramadhar Singh converges with that of Balooni (2017) who had interviewed him on his five-decades of scholarship for the [IIMB Management Review](#). To him, Singh’s writings were so impactful that they were cited widely in (1) **textbooks** of *industrial and organizational psychology, management, organizational*

behavior, psychology, and social psychology; (2) **journals** of *animal husbandry, biology, communication, economics, finance, law, marketing, physics, physiology, political science, psychology, sociology, and social work*; (3) **books** of *political science, communication, marketing, law, public policy, organizational behavior, and human resource management*; and (4) **handbooks** of *industrial and organizational psychology, leadership, and social psychology*. Balooni's prediction, "[Singh's] multidisciplinary influence is likely to grow even more over the coming years" (p. 143) indeed came true. Singh received the [Lifetime Achievement Award for Excellence in Research](#) from IIM Indore (2021) and the more recent [Purdue University Distinguished Alumni Award in Psychological Sciences](#) (2022). Further, in 2022, the Department of Humanities and Social Sciences at IIT Kanpur established the annual [Distinguished Lecture in Psychology](#) named after Ramadhar Singh and his wife Prabha Singh, a development psychologist, to honour their contributions to advancement of psychology and management in Asia

Another notable incident in Singh's tenure was in 2014, when he represented IIMB to the 2nd Pan-IIM World Conference at IIM Kozhikode to conduct an invited *Workshop on International Publications*. While preparing for the workshop, he came to know that Biresh Sahoo, a professor at the Xavier Institute of Management Bhubaneswar, had compiled data on research productivity in management schools of India since 1968. Singh used the data in the workshop and encouraged Sahoo to write a paper for publication in an international journal. With the help of two research associates and Singh's guidance, Sahoo came up with a manuscript that was published in *Omega: The International Journal of Management Science* (2017).

According to the findings reported in [this paper](#), Singh ranks highest among the top 10 organizational behaviour researchers and No. 4 among the top 5% of 40 management researchers in

India. More important, Singh with his co-authors provided five suggestions for accelerating research productivity in India. These included: “(1) quality of the doctoral programs, (2) self-renewals of the faculty members, (3) research programs by the stars identified, (4) appointing academic leaders with experience and focus on research, and (5) retaining the star researchers.” (Sahoo, Singh, Mishra, and Sankaran, 2017, p.131). These recommendations in the article, worded in a very compelling—and provocative manner—provide a fine blueprint for the institutes of higher education to follow, and I also urge policy makers and higher education authorities to consider those for the sake of nation’s progress and prominence in social science research.

Ramadhar Singh volunteered his services to the *IIMB Management Review* as well. He served or has been serving as an *associate editor* with four successive editors-in-chief (V. Ravi Anshuman: 2007-2011, Nagasimha Balakrishna Kanagal: 2011-18, Ashok Thampy: 2018-2021, and Jishnu Hazra: 2021-present). I had seen him spend considerable time and effort toward improving the quality of manuscripts submitted to and/or accepted for publication in the journal. It would have been utterly satisfying and fulfilling for the editorial team to see the cite score (equivalent to impact factor of a journal) of the *IIMB Management Review* improve from 0.18 in 2011 to 2.10 in 2020.

Professional Service and Impact

A scholar attracts visibility to the institution not only through one’s teaching but also through the impact and recognition of one’s research in the scholarly community of peers, professional associations, and among the practitioners and society. Singh represented IIMB as a consulting editor in three international journals: *Advances in Applied Sociology* (Scientific Research), *Asian Journal of Social Psychology* (Asian Association of Social Psychology: AASP), and *Review of General Psychology* (American Psychological Association). He was included among 50 most prominent social psychologists who have had at least [one important but](#)

[unloved piece of research](#) (Singh, 2011a). The 2011a chapter and its earlier detailed version (Singh, 1991) also made him join the coveted [Faces and Minds of Psychological Science](#)—a website of influential psychologists worldwide developed and maintained by the Association for Psychological Science (APS— in 2013. As of today, he alone represents India on this site. The Sir J. C. Bose Memorial Award (2014) and his featuring among the Legends of HRD in the Business Manager: HR Magazine (2015) showed that his work is relevant to both basic and applied management science.

From IIMB, Ramadhar Singh delivered invited colloquia and/or conducted workshops at IIMs (i.e., Indore, Kozhikode, and Lucknow), IITs (i.e., Bombay, Guwahati, and Kanpur), Defense Institute of Psychological Research Delhi, and the other Central, State, and Private Universities across the country. Moreover, IIT Kharagpur and IIM Lucknow took his services as an expert on the committees for faculty recruitment. The *National Academy of Psychology (India)* (nAoP) sought his services as the chair of its *Fellowship Committee* (2011-13). In 2016, he was a resource person in the workshop for vice chancellor of the central universities of Northeast India held at the University of Guwahati, Assam, India.

Singh's role in AASP from IIMB remained as active and involved as it was before. He served as the chair of Education and Training Committee (2010-14), principal of the 3rd AASP Summer School at Kunming, China (2011), associate editor of the *Asian Journal of Social Psychology* (2016-18), and member on the Kwok Leung Scholarship (2015-18). By conducting a workshop on research methods for students and faculty of management and psychology at the Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Johor Bahru, Malaysia in 2014, he drew attention of Southeast Asian researchers to Indian mentors.

Concluding Comments

Norman H. Anderson, professor of psychology and the information integration theorist of the University of California at San Diego, USA, had adjudged Singh's (1991) chapter based on eight experiments conducted over 15 years as "... a tour de force in cognitive psychology" and "... a fine illustration of Singh's persistence and dedication to psychological science" (p. 142). Singh surpassed that evaluation and undoubtedly achieved a lot more in social psychology and management since 1991 as illustrated by his fellow status in six professional associations of psychology (APA, APS, British Psychological Society, nAoP, Singapore Psychological Society (SPS), and Society of Personality and Social Psychology (SPSP) since 1992 and invitations to speak at colloquia at different academic institutions and professional conferences held across the globe. The Purdue Award reiterates the same exceptional dedication to and accomplishments in behavioural sciences from Asian institutions. Thanks to Jeffrey Karpicke, James V. Bradley chair professor and head of the Department of Psychological Sciences for nominating Ramadhar Singh as a distinguished alumnus and Marion K. Underwood, distinguished professor and dean of the College of Health and Human Sciences for accepting that nomination. I am sure Donn Byrne is following his star student's career— "with pride"— from up above!

In his IIM Ahmedabad recent [post](#) on Ramadhar Singh, Vishal Gupta had rightly noted, "I hope that other universities in our country will regularly follow the careers of their respective alumni who distinguish in their chosen fields with equal pride and delight." I agree with Gupta. Singh's example and recognition by Purdue must inspire our higher education institutes to recognize their alumni academic scholars, because many have been unsung heroes in the home-country, despite getting recognition abroad.

I whole-heartedly agree with Ramadhar Singh who has been saying,

“One’s intrinsic motivation for research and persistence on the task undertaken in academia can bear the much sought-after fruits of money, position, and recognition. The two attitudes can also convert the non-believers and critics at home, school, and the workplace into believers and enthusiasts. Therefore, what is vital for life satisfaction is the “sheer joy” of whatever one undertakes!”

Congratulations again to you, Sir, on receiving the Purdue University Distinguished Alumni Award in Psychological Sciences! I feel honoured to have had you as my colleague at IIMB.

References

- Anderson, N. H. (1981). *Foundations of information integration theory*. New York: Academic Press.
- Balooni, K. (2017). Sustaining impactful multidisciplinary contributions over five decades: An interview with Ramadhar Singh. *IIMB Management Review*, 2017, 29, 136-151.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iimb.2017.03.009>
- Byrne, D. (1961). Interpersonal attraction and attitude similarity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 62, 713–715. [DOI: 10.1037/h0044721](https://doi.org/10.1037/h0044721)
- Byrne, D. (1971). *The attraction paradigm*. New York: Academic Press.
- Byrne, D., & Clore, G. L. (1967). Effectance arousal and attraction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 6 (4, Whole No. 638), 1–18. [DOI: 10.1037/h0024829](https://doi.org/10.1037/h0024829)
- Carlsmith, K. M., Darley, J. M., & Robinson, P. H. (2002). Why do we punish? Deterrence and Just deserts as motives for punishment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(2), 284–299. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.83.2.284>
- Fiske, S. T., & Taylor, S. E. (1984). *Social cognition*. Boston, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Hart, H. L. A., & Honore, A. M. (1959). *Causation in the law*. Oxford, UK: The Clarendon Press.
- Heider, F. (1958). *The psychology of interpersonal relations*. New York: Wiley.
- Jia, L., & Singh, R. (2009). Asymmetrical attention allocation to dissimilar and similar attitudes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45, 1259-1265.
<http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2009.07.012>
- Jones, E. E., & Harris, V. A. (1967). The attribution of attitudes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 3(1), 1-24.
- Kelley, H. H. (1973). The processes of causal attribution. *American Psychologist*, 28, 107–

128. <http://doi.org/10.1037/h0034225>

Nosek, B. A., Hardwicke, T. E., Moshontz, H., Allard, A., Corker, K. S., Dreber, A., ... Vazire, S. (2021, February 9). Replicability, robustness, and reproducibility in psychological Science. *Annual Review of Psychology* (in press). DOI: [10.31234/osf.io/ksfvq](https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/ksfvq)

Premchand, M. (2018). *Rangabhumi*. Allahabad: Hansa Prakashan (Original work published 1925)

Premachand, M. (2019). *Karmabhumi*. Allahabad: Hansa Prakashan. (Original work published 1932)

Piaget, J. (1965). *The moral judgment of the child*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Rosenbaum, M. E. (1986). The repulsion hypothesis: On the nondevelopment of relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *51*, 1156–1166.

DOI: [10.1037/0022-3514.51.6.1156](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.51.6.1156)

Ross, L. (1977). The intuitive psychologist and his shortcomings: Distortions in the attribution process. In *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 10, pp. 173-220). Academic Press.

Rucker, D. D., Preacher, K. J., Tormala, Z. L., & Petty, R. E. (2011). Mediation analysis in social psychology: Current practices and new recommendations. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *5*(6), 359-371.

Sahoo, B., Singh, R., Mishra, B., & Sankaran, K. (2017). Research productivity in management schools of India during 1968-2015: A directional benefit-of-doubt model analysis. *Omega*, *66*, 118–139. Doi: [10.1016/j.omega.2016.02.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.omega.2016.02.004)

Singh, R. (1973a). *Affective implications of the weighting coefficient in attraction research*. [Master's Thesis, Purdue University] ProQuest Dissertations Publishing 7328141

- Singh, R. (1973b). Attraction as a function of similarity in attitudes and personality characteristics. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 91, 87–95. <http://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.1973.9922650>
- Singh, R. (1974). Reinforcement and attraction: Specifying the effects of affective states. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 8, 294–305. <http://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.1974.9923198>
- Singh, R. (1975). Information integration theory applied to expected job attractiveness and satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60, 621–623. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.60.5.621>
- Singh, R. (1983). Leadership style and reward allocation: Does least preferred co-worker scale measure task and relation orientation? *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 32, 178–197. [http://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073\(83\)90146-0](http://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(83)90146-0)
- Singh, R. (1991). Two problems in cognitive algebra: Imputations and averaging—versus—multiplying. In N. H. Anderson (Ed.), *Contributions to information integration theory* (Vol. II, Social, pp. 143–180). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Singh, R. (1996) Subtractive versus ratio model of "fair" allocation: Can group level analyses be misleading? *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 68, 123-144. <http://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.1996.0094>
- Singh, R. (2011a). Imputing values to missing information in social judgment. In R. M. Arkin (Ed.), *Most underappreciated: 50 prominent social psychologists describe their most unloved work* (pp. 159-164). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Singh, R. (2011b). Information integration as a basic cognitive process. In G. Mishra (Ed.), *Handbook of psychology in India* (pp.73-98). New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Singh, R. (2022). On the complexity of a “seemingly simple relation” between attitude similarity

- and attraction. In P. Singh & G. Misra (Eds.). *Social psychology in the globalizing era: Emerging challenges and potentials*. [New Delhi: Publisher to be decided]
- Singh, R., Bell, P. A., Sinha, R. B. N., Singh, S., & Sankaran, K. (2014). Crime against woman And punishment goals: Social order and country moderate the public protest effect. *IIMB Management Review*, 26, 82-90. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.iimb.2013.12.005>
- Singh, R., Bohra, K. A., & Dalal, A. K. (1979). Favourableness of leadership situations studied with information integration theory. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 9, 253–264. <http://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2420090304>
- Singh, R., Chen, F., & Wegener, D. T. (2014). The similarity-attraction link: Sequential versus parallel multiple-mediator models involving inferred attraction, respect, and positive affect. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 36, 281–298. [DOI: 10.1080/01973533.2014.912583](https://doi.org/10.1080/01973533.2014.912583)
- Singh, R., Choo, W. M., & Poh, L. L. (1998). In-group bias and fair-mindedness as strategies of self-presentation in intergroup perception. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 24, 147-162. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0146167298242004>
- Singh, R., Goh, A., Sankaran, K., & Bhullar, N. (2016). Similarity and liking effects on interpersonal attraction: A test of the two-dimensional trust-respect model. *Psychologia*, 59, 1-18. <http://doi.org/10.2117/psysoc.2016.1>
- Singh, R., Gupta, M., & Dalal, A. K. (1979). Cultural difference in attribution of performance: An integration–theoretical analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 1342–1351. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.37.8.1342>
- Singh, R., Ho, L. J., Tan, H. L., & Bell, P. A. (2007b). Attitudes, personal evaluations,

cognitive evaluation, and interpersonal attraction: On the direct, indirect, and reverse-causal effects. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 46, 19-42.

<http://doi.org/10.1348/014466606X104417>

Singh, R., & Ho, S. Y. (2000). Attitudes and attraction: A new test of the attraction, repulsion, and similarity-dissimilarity asymmetry hypotheses. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 39, 197–211. DOI: [10.1348/014466600164426](https://doi.org/10.1348/014466600164426)

Singh, R., Kaur, S., Junid, Z. B., & Self, W. T. (2011). Reacting to headline news: Circumstances leading to causal explanations versus implicational concerns. *International Journal of Psychology*, 46, 63-70.

<http://doi.org/10.1080/00207594.2010.516829>

Singh, R., Lim, H. K., Sankaran, K., & Bhullar, N. (2018). Punishing an ‘unfair’ leader: People as pragmatic politicians with in-group but fair-but-biased prosecutors with out-group. *IIMB Management Review*, 30, 77-90. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.iimb.2018.01.002>

Singh, R., & Lin, X. (2011). The severity effect on the compensation and imprisonment recommendations: Deterrence as a mediator in Singapore. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 14, 36-49. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-839X.2010.01324>

Singh, R., & Rai, H. (2021). Desiring to punish leaders: A new test of the model of people as intuitive prosecutors. *Journal of Theoretical Social Psychology*, 5(4), 377-390. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jts5>.

Singh, R., Ramasamy, M. A., Self, W. T., Simons, J. J. P., & Lin, P. K. F. (2013). Age-moderated effects of consequence and intent information on punishment: An intuitive prosecutorial interpretation. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 174, 1-24. <http://doi.org/10.1080/00221325.2011.635913>

- Singh, R., Sidana, U. R., & Saluja, S. K. (1978). Playgroup attractiveness studied with information integration theory. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 25, 429–436.
[http://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0965\(78\)90066-8](http://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0965(78)90066-8)
- Singh, R., & Simons, J. J. P. (2010). Attitudes and attraction: Optimism and weight as explanations for the similarity-dissimilarity asymmetry. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 4, 1206-1219. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2010.00328.x>
- Singh, R., Simons, J. J. P., Self, W. T., Tetlock, P. E., Bell, P. A., Ong, P., & Kaur, S. (2011). Cultural and developmental differences in norm and meta-norm enforcement: Does collective blame compensate for individual blame? In P. Singh, P. Bain, C. H. Leong, G. Misra, & Y. Ohtsubo (Eds.), *Psychological, group, and cultural processes in changing societies: The Progress in Asian social psychology series* (Vol. 8, pp. 109-122). New Delhi: MacMillan.
- Singh, R., Simons, J.J P., Self, W. T. Tetlock, P. E., Bell, P. A., May J., Crisp, R. J., Kaur, S., Benfield, J. A., & Sziemko, W. J. (2012b). From wrongdoing to imprisonment: Test of a causal-moral model. *IIMB Management Review*, 24, 73-78.
<http://doi.org/10.1016/j.iimb.2012.02.001>
- Singh, R., Simons, J. J. P., Self, W. T., Tetlock, P. E., Zemba, Y., Yamaguchi, S., Osborn, C. Y., Fisher, J. D., May, J., & Kaur, S. (2012a). Association, culture, and collective imprisonment: Tests of a causal-moral model. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 34, 269-277. <http://doi.org/10.1080/01973533.2012.674763>
- Singh, R., & Singh, P. (1994). Prediction of performance using motivation and ability information: New light on integrational capacity and weighing strategies. *Cognitive Development*, 9, 455–496. [http://doi.org/10.1016/0885-2014\(94\)90015-9](http://doi.org/10.1016/0885-2014(94)90015-9)

- Singh, R., & Tan, L. S. C. (1992). Attitudes and attraction: A test of the similarity–attraction and dissimilarity–repulsion hypotheses. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *31*, 227–238. [DOI: 10.1111/j.2044-8309.1992.tb00967.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.1992.tb00967.x)
- Singh, R., Tay, Y. Y., & Sankaran, K. (2016). Causal role of trust in interpersonal attraction from attitude similarity. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *34*, 717–731. [DOI: 10.1177/026540751665682](https://doi.org/10.1177/026540751665682)
- Singh, R., Teng, J. S. Q., Bhullar, N., & Sankaran, K. (2018). Positive affect as a moderator of liking effects on trust and attraction. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, *21*, 13–21. [DOI: 10.1111/ajsp.12192](https://doi.org/10.1111/ajsp.12192)
- Singh, R., Wegener, D. T., Sankaran, K., Bhullar, N., Ang, K. Q. P., Chia, P. J. L., Cheong, X., & Chen, F. (2017). Attitude similarity and attraction: Validation, positive affect, and trust as sequential mediators. *Personal Relationships*, *24*, 203–222. [DOI: 10.1111/per.1278](https://doi.org/10.1111/per.1278).
- Singh, R., Wegener, D. T., Singh, S., Sankaran, K., Lin, P. K. F., Seow, M. X., Teng, J. S. Q., & Shuli, S. (2015). On the importance of trust in interpersonal attraction from attitude similarity. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *32*, 829–850. [DOI: 10.1177/0265407515576993](https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407515576993)
- Singh, R., Yeo, S. E., Lin, P. K. F. & Tan, L. (2007a). Multiple mediators of the attitude similarity-attraction relationship: Dominance of inferred attraction and subtlety of affect. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, *29*, 61–74. [DOI: 10.1080/01973530701331007](https://doi.org/10.1080/01973530701331007)
- Srivastava, P., & Singh, R. (1988). Age and task differences in prediction of performance from motivation and ability information. *Child Development*, *59*, 769–781. <http://doi.org/10.2307/1130575>

- Tan, D. T. Y., & Singh, R. (1995). Attitudes and attraction: A developmental study of the similarity–attraction and dissimilarity–repulsion hypotheses. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *21*, 975–986. [DOI: 10.1177/014616729521901](https://doi.org/10.1177/014616729521901)
- Tetlock, P. E. (2002). Social functionalist frameworks for judgment and choice: Intuitive politicians, theologians, and prosecutors. *Psychological Review*, *109*(3), 451-471. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.109.3.451>
- Tetlock, P. E., Self, W. T., & Singh, R. (2010). The punitiveness paradox: When is external pressure exculpatory- and when a signal just to spread blame? *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *46*, 388-395. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2009.11.013>
- Tetlock, P. E., Visser, P., Singh, R., Polifroni, M., Scott, A., Elson, B., & Mazzocco, P. (2007). People as intuitive prosecutors: The impact of social-control goals on punitiveness and attributions of responsibility. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *43*, 195-209. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2006.02.009>
- Tripathi, R. (2016). Motivation and values. In R.C.Tripathi and R. Dwivedi (Eds.), *Organisational Studies In India* (pp.37-60). New Delhi: Orient Blackswan.
- Tripathi, R., & Cervone, D. (2008) Cultural variations in achievement motivation despite equivalent motivational strength: Motivational concerns among Indian and American corporate professionals. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *42*, 456–464. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2007.06.001>
- Tripathi, R., Cervone, D, & Savani, K. (2018) Are the Motivational Effects of Autonomy-Supportive Conditions Universal? Contrasting Results among Indians and Americans. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *44* (9), 1287-1301. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167218764663>

Walster, E. (1966). Assignment of responsibility for an accident. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 3(1), 73–79. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0022733>