CHAPTER -I

INTRODUCTION

The role of psychologists in an industrial organization to improve employee’s productive efficiency was realized in the very beginning of the 20th century with the work of Taylor. Later, Taylor’s work became instrumental in the development of an independent branch of psychology, namely, Industrial Psychology. The field of industrial psychology has a chequered history starting from management-oriented approach (Taylorism) to employee-oriented approach, passing through the various phases ranging from motivation, job/work satisfaction and job involvement to the concepts and studies. In the present modern age, the entire organizational approach is tending towards employee-centered system.

It is, indeed, true that employee centred managerial functioning had opened the ways for developing productive organizational efficiency through the system of humanizing the job and job conditions. As a result to such a focus on managerial strategy, job motivation and job satisfaction studies begin. Not only studies were conducted since the middle of 1930s but the theories
explaining motivation and satisfaction started coming in. The efforts of Hoppock (1935) for coining the term job satisfaction and conducting surveys and studies are commendable and immediately thereafter, job motivation / job satisfaction started pouring in, explaining human needs and other factors like processes involved in the determination of human motivation at work. In this regard, the theories propounded by Maslow (1943, 1954); Herzberg et al. (1959) and Vroom (1964) who explained and studied human motivation and satisfaction are work mentioning. The contribution of these great people generated a lot of interest amongst the psychologists, other behavioural scientists and managers who started using the theorists' views as strategy in dealing with the subordinates and gradually, industrial psychologists efforts to improve human productive efficiency with humanized mechanism continued travelling. Hence, such a zeal became instrumental in the development of the concepts and strategy of job enlargement, job enrichment and thereafter, the concept of quality of work life (QWL) emerged in the direction of the efforts for enhancing human motivation and the feeling of satisfaction at the workplace.
It is very pertinent to describe here that whatever the concept and strategies in industrial psychology / organizational behaviour have emerged are likely to appear, all are focusing on maximizing satisfaction in the quest of obtaining employees pro-organizational activities and behaviour. Therefore, in most of the affluent organizations there was a slogan as a matter of strategy that you make the people happy, they will be themselves motivated towards work.

Having given a brief description about industrial / organizational psychology, it is apparently clear that work satisfaction studies have always been important and will remain important because all human actions are directed to seek satisfaction. In view of the above contention the aim of the present endeavour is “A study of work satisfaction and absenteeism in relation to perceived fairness, work culture and locus of control”. Taking into consideration the problem of the study, all the variables in question will be discussed. Now, we will begin discussing by undertaking the variable of work satisfaction.

The phenomenon of work/job satisfaction is defined as a positive feeling that one gets after evaluating
one's job situation. There are degrees of satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Hence, the degree of dissatisfaction is defined in terms of negative feeling. The term 'job satisfaction' was brought to limelight by Hoppock (1935). He reviewed 32 studies on job satisfaction and observed that job satisfaction is a combination of psychological, physiological and environmental circumstances that cause a person truthfully to say, "I am satisfied with my job". Such kind of descriptions indicate a variety of variables that influence job satisfaction of the individuals but these do not provide clear picture about the nature of job satisfaction. Drever (1956) defines job satisfaction as "it is the end state of feeling". Here, the use of the word 'end' emphasizes that the feeling is experienced after a task is accomplished or an activity has taken place. The feeling could be positive or negative depending upon whether need is satisfied or remained unsatisfied and / or could be a function of the efforts of the individual on one hand and on the other the situational opportunities available to him.

Smith (1955) suggests that the job satisfaction is "the employees judgment of how well his job on the whole is satisfying his various needs".
The concept of Need Satisfaction as advocated by Maslow (1943) seems to be a good analytical tool. The theory of need hierarchy makes certain basic assumptions. There is cause and effect relations i.e. human behaviour is caused by the individual’s need structure. In other words need deficiency create a sort of dissonance or tension in an individual that becomes instrumental to take such appropriate action which might lead to need fulfillment. Thus, Maslow’s need hierarchy theory of motivations explains the jobs which are able to satisfy more of the needs of the individuals. Job would be the resultant in greater satisfaction on the part of the employees.

Herzberg, contrary to the Maslowian need hierarchy theory proposed a two-factor theory of work motivation and satisfaction. Herzberg, et. al (1957) concluded that job satisfiers are related to job content and that job dissatisfiers are allied to job context. Herzberg labelled the satisfiers as motivators and he called dissatisfiers as hygiene factors.

Adams (1965) propounded Equity Theory of Motivation and satisfaction. This theory explains that the perception of fairness or equity have a major influence
on motivation / satisfaction of the person. It is greatly concerned with each person’s feelings of fairness about the rewards in the form of psychological, social and economic rewards being received during the course of organizational, functional and productive interactions. The theory states, that employees tend to determine fairness by considering their inputs and rewards on the job in comparison with those of other people. If the comparison is equal, the employee feels to be treated fairly, which leads to experience job/work satisfaction. If it is unequal, the employees feel inequality and is motivated to take corrective actions by the management, if not then such condition would lead to generate dissatisfaction among employees.

In Vroom’s (1964) theory of instrumentality, job/work satisfaction reflects valance of the job/work for its incumbent. Hence, it would follow that the strength of the force on a worker to remain on his job in an increasing function of the valance of his job. Thus, satisfaction should be negatively related to turn over and absenteeism, which the theory contends. Whether or not this valance should also lead to greater production while on the job is less clear, however, a point which
again seems to be upheld by the highly ambiguous existing data.

Sinha (1974) found job satisfaction as a “reintegration of effect produced by individual perception of fulfillment of his needs in relation to his work and the situations surrounding it”. He also revealed that job satisfaction is an individual feeling which could be caused by a variety of factors including group.

Having defined the very nature of job/work motivation and satisfaction, it is necessarily important to mention some of the factors of satisfaction which have come out of the empirical researches which follow:

Hoppock (1935) identified six factors that contributed to job satisfaction. These are as follow:

1. The way individual reacts to unpleasant situations.
2. The facility with which he adjusts himself to other persons.
3. His relative status in the social and economic group with which he identifies himself.
4. The nature of the work in relation to the abilities, interests and preparations of the worker.


Worthy (1950) enumerated six composite factors of job satisfaction viz. (a) company in general, (b) the local organization, (c) local management, (d) immediate supervision, (e) co-workers and (f) working conditions.

Grove and Kerr (1951) concluded on the basis of interrelation between these factors that wages and interpersonal relation at work appear to be major components of job satisfaction.

Blum (1956) asserts that satisfied employees are the greatest assets whereas, dissatisfied employees are the biggest liabilities. Satisfaction refers to the way one feels about events, people, and things. According to Blum job satisfaction or dissatisfaction is an attitude of the persons whom they hold toward the job related factors.

Blum (1956) & Blum and Naylor (1968) describe job/work satisfaction as a resultant of many attitudes possessed by a worker. It is general attitude which is the result of many specific attitudes in the three areas
viz. specific job factors, individual characteristics and group relationships outside the job.

In The job/work satisfaction an individual may be satisfied with a variety of factors like salary, co-workers, his own contributions etc.

Smith (1955) suggested that job/work satisfaction is "to employees" judgment of how well his job on the whole, is satisfying his various needs.

Guion (1958) believed that the extent to which an individual needs are satisfied and the extent to which the individual perceives the condition conducive at work refers to the feelings of satisfaction (global or general satisfaction). There are some situations when satisfaction appears only with some specific dimensions of the work environment (facets of satisfaction) and these facets also either appear individually or in conjunction thereof.

Smith and Kendall (1969) opined that "job/work satisfaction refers to the persistent feelings towards certain aspects of the job situation". These aspects refer to such factors as the work itself, pay promotional opportunities, the supervision, co-workers and the hours of work. Hulin (1969) has also proposed the same factors.
Job/work satisfaction expresses the amount of congruence between one’s expectations from the job and the rewards that the job provides (Steers & Porter, 1971).

Job/work satisfaction is probably the most widely studied area in the field of organizational psychology. Locke (1976) defined job/work satisfaction as a pleasurable or positive emotional State resulting from the appraisal of one’s job experience. The positive emotional State is highly contributive to an employee’s physical and mental well being. Job satisfaction literature indicates that it is related to both on the job and off the job variables.

Vande Ven and Ferry (1980) described job/work satisfaction as an effective reaction of feelings of employees with job supervision, co-worker, pay and his / her current and future career progress. The causes of employees satisfaction are not restricted to implant factors alone but they run the whole gamut of men’s needs and aspirations.

Ghosh and Ghorpade (1980) State that the “job satisfaction is a generalized attitude resulting from may
specific attitudes in three areas like specific job factors, individual adjustments and group relationships.

According to Reddy and Rajasekhar (1991) job/work satisfaction is a general attitude which is the result of many specific attitudes. The amount of satisfaction derived from his present job is an indication of one’s job satisfaction.

Salanki (1992) rightly pointed out that no single theory can fully explain the dynamics of job/work satisfaction because of dynamic, complex and varying sensitivity of the situation.

According to Super (1953) needs, aspirations, values and motives that we associate with our job if found conducive or fulfilled then these may lead to enhance satisfaction.

After giving a brief capsule description about the aspect of work satisfaction, it has become clear that the phenomenon of job/work satisfaction is a dynamic functional factor important for all sorts of pro-organizational activities. Hence, such studies have always been relevant inspite of the fact that it has already been widely described in literature. Now, the on-
going description will pertain to another variable—absenteeism. Its description follows.

Now-a-days, the phenomenon of absenteeism is very much existing while in the olden days absenteeism behaviour occurred very informally. In the modern era, work has become a major source of earning, it has made the entire work more formalized and under the conditions of increased formalized interpersonal relationship and as a result, men’s behaviour and activities have become more and more calculative, materialistic and egocentric in nature, hence accounted for absenteeism behaviour. In this modern age absenteeism is being considered very seriously as it is most likely to the influence adversely the industrial productive efficiency. It is pertinent to mention here that the phenomenon of absenteeism exists not only in Indian industries but it is a global problem.

The term ‘absence’ means staying away from work irrespective of it being either authorized or unauthorized or it is a voluntary or involuntary behaviour of the employees.

Vaid (1966) suggested the meaning of absenteeism as an unauthorized stay away from work. According to him unauthorized absence encompasses all cases related to
work. He contended that the worker knows about his absence but fails to report for duty and as a consequence the employer does not report him for work, hence, he considered this condition as absence. But in view of the present investigation employees may be classified as chronic absentees and non-chronic absentees. Chronic absentees are habitual of staying away from work irrespective of the conditions of authorized and unauthorized absence. Chronic absenteeism is a state of behaviour in which an employee is prone to remain absent from work, hence, chronic absentees need special kind of counselling and treatment.

According to Vaid (1967) chronic absentees have been found to be engaged in several social and cultural activities and for status, power, recognition, money etc. and they are generally passive and do not realize their responsibilities.

In the opinion of Chadwick Brown and Nicholson (1973) absenteeism raised two major problems from psychological point of view. One of the problem highlighted is that of a voluntary behaviour, where as, the other dimension of the problem is determined from the relationship between absenteeism and job satisfaction. It
is beyond doubt to say that absenteeism is one of the major problems of industries located in developing and under-developing countries. It is likely to have inverse relationship with inefficiency and indiscipline. However, absence behaviour cannot be completely eradicated but absence management mechanism can reduce such a behavioural tendency up to a manageable extent.

Absenteeism is one of the major human problems of Indian industries. It results in the dislocation of work, increase in labour cost, reduction in productivity and if unchecked, increase in indiscipline, although some amount of absence will always be inevitable, most of it should be avoided.

Labour Bureau and Annual Surveys of Industries define ‘absenteeism’ as the failure of the worker to report for work when he is “scheduled to work”. The labour Bureau does not regard absence from work due to authorized vacation privilege leave, strike out, lay off etc, while it considers ‘absence’ from work if it is due to unauthorized leave or undue absenteeism of the worker.

The labour deptt., Government of India defines absenteeism as “the total manstuffs lost because of absentees as a percentage of the total number of man
shifts scheduled (Sing & Singhal 1966). This definition does not include absence on account of authorized leave, layoff, strikes etc.

According to George (1989) the more positive feelings individuals report experiencing while at work, the lower their role of absenteeism, apparently, when being on the job is associated with positive feelings people act on this relationship by showing up for work regularly, when, in contrast they experience mainly negative feelings, they stay away and so avoid at least one source of such reactions Bassatt suggests that research studies have found only a limited relationship between satisfaction and work output and offer scant comfort of those seeking to confirm that a satisfied worker is a productive worker. Labour turnover and absenteeism are commonly associated with dissatisfaction but although there may be some correlation there are many other possible factors. There appears to be no universal general situations about worker’s dissatisfaction that offer easy management solutions to the problems of turnover and absenteeism. Bassett also suggested that it is primarily in this realm of job design that opportunity
for constructive improvement of worker satisfaction appears to be high.

Akhtar (1992) had pointed out that psycho-personal dimensions are important determiners of absenteeism. She also had expressed her opinion regarding the nature of absence and in this regard she clearly indicated that absence is absence, either it is legitimate or illegitimate.

The above description reveals that absenteeism behaviour is not pro-organizational behaviour as absence behaviour is most likely an avoidance action in which individual undertakes as a consequence to his / her experience of dissatisfaction.

Perceived fairness is one another variable to be discussed here. The aspect of perceived fairness refers to management, fair and unbiased treatment with employees, specially pertaining to salary, administration and promotion in general which seems very much positively related to work satisfaction and inversely related to absenteeism.

Number of psychologists have conducted scores of researches on perceived fairness. They relate it with equity theory. According to equity theory, people are
motivated to reduce feelings of inequity when they occur, just as they are motivated to reduce dissonance. Indeed, equity theory was originally derived from dissonance theory, and the two are closely related in several respects (Adams, 1965).

Individuals make their judgment through the comparison of their outcomes and inputs. We perceive what we get from a job situation (outcomes) in relation to what we put into it (inputs) and then we compare our input ratio with the outcome input ratio of relevant ones. We perceive our ratio to the equal to that of the relevant others with whom we compare ourselves, a state of equity is said to exist. We perceive our situation as fair that justice prevails. When we see the ratio as unequal we experience equity tension. J. Stancy Adams has proposed that this negative tension state provides the motivation to do something to correct it.

The desire for equity and for equality of treatment are aspirations to be taken into account in dealing with employees throughout all levels of the Scalar Chain.

Equity theory focuses on people's feeling of how fairly they have been treated in comparison with the treatment received by others. It is based on exchange
theory. People evaluate their social relationships in the same way as buying or selling an item. People expect certain outcomes in exchange for certain contributions or inputs.

Evidences indicate that the referent chosen is an important variable in equity theory. There are four referent comparisons an employee can use:

1. Self inside
2. Self outside
3. Other inside
4. Other outside

When employees perceive inequity based on equity theory, they have six chances which are as follows:

1. Change their inputs
2. Change their outcomes
3. Distort perception of self
4. Distort perception of others
5. Choose a different referent
6. Leave the field

When people perceive an imbalance in their outcome input ratio relative to others, tension is created.

Greenberg (1988) reasoned that employees who found themselves in smaller offices than they had before would
experience feeling of inequity. As a result, they would work less hard in order to reduce their contributions. Thus, their output would fall and people who found themselves in larger offices then they’d before would feel overpaid, with the result that they would increase their efforts on the job and change their output.

Treat people fairly but according to merit ensure justice in treatment, equitable systems of motivation and rewards, clear personnel policies and procedures, avoidance of discrimination and full observance of all laws and codes of conduct relating to employment. People expect certain outcomes in exchange for certain contributions or inputs. A feeling of inequality causes tension and motivate the persons to indulge in certain forms of behaviour in order to remove or to reduce the perceived inequity.

The theory establishes four propositions relating to inequitable pay.

1. Given payment by time, over rewarded employees produce more than equitably paid employees.

2. Given payment by quantity of production, over rewarded employees produce fewer, but higher quality, units than equitably paid employees.
3. Given payment by time, under rewarded employees produce less or poorer quality of output.

4. Given payment by quantity of production under rewarded employees produce a large number of low quality units in comparison with equitably paid employees.

One of the major variables of satisfaction in the Porter Lawler expectancy model is perceived equitable rewards. This leads to consideration of another process of motivation equity theory. Applied to the work situation, equity theory is usually associated with the work of Adams.

When individuals conclude that they are being treated unfairly in some manner, they can take a number of steps to reduce such reactions. Firstly they can alter their contributions (inputs). Thus, if they feel under compensated, they can reduce their efforts or outputs. Similarly if they feel over compensated, they can work harder and produce more or can expand the scope of their work activities to one outside their job description (Brockner, Davy and Carter, 1986, Organ, 1988).

Secondly, they can attempt to alter their outcomes. If individuals feel that they are being treated unfairly
than they deserve they get less, they can go on strike or other things and if they want more they can seek other job where they get more. Research findings indicate that individuals are much less sensitive to over compensation than to under compensation and seldom feel much pressure to reduce their own outcomes (Greenberg, 1989). As far as they are simply getting what they deserve.

Thirdly, it is not in the hands of the individuals that they are fairly perceived by others. If the persons feel inequity they can engage in several psychological strategies. It does not change the situation but the mind of an individual may change. If the person gets lesser than others, he may convince himself that other’s inputs are actually greater than he initially believed. Thus he may reduce his feelings of inequity.

Most exchanges involve a number of inputs and outcomes. According to equity theory, people place a weightage on these various inputs and outcomes according to how they perceive their importance when the ratio of a person’s total outcomes to total inputs equals the perceived ratio of other people’s total outcomes to total inputs there is equity.
When there is an unequal comparison of ratios the persons experience a sense of equity. The feeling of inequity might arise when an individual’s ratio of outcomes to inputs is either less than or greater than that of other people, for example, Adams suggested that workers prefer equitable pay to overpayment workers on piece rate incentive payment schemes who feel they are overpaid will reduce their level of productivity in order to restore equity.

Fairness is a basis value in many cultures, and it is more people who want to see to be put into practice where they work, they want to be evaluated and then rewarded fairly and if they are not done so, then their morale and motivation may suffer greatly (Greenberg, 1989), with serious consequences for their organizations.

A feeling of inequity causes tension which is an unpleasant experience. The presence of inequity therefore motivates the person to remove the level of tension and the perceived inequity. The magnitude of perceived inequity determines the level of tension. The level of tension created, determines the strength of motivation. Adam identifies six broad types of possible behaviour as consequences of inequity.
1. Changes to inputs, person may increase or decrease the level of his or her inputs.

2. Changes to outcome, change their outcomes like pay, working conditions status and recognition, without changes to inputs.

3. Cognitive distortion of inputs and outcomes. In contrast to actual changes, people may distort, cognitivity, their inputs or outcomes to achieve the same results.

4. Leaving the field, find a new situation with a more favourable balance (by absenteeism, transfer, resign).

5. Acting on others, a person may attempt to bring about changes in others (to lower their inputs or accept greater outcomes).

6. Changing the object of comparison, this involves changing the reference group with whom comparison is made.

This does not imply that all persons with whom an individual compares herself / himself must receive the same outcomes or offer the same contributions, rather, what is crucial is that the ratios of these factors be roughly equal.
Additional support for equity theory is provided by the test of Pritchard, Dunnette and Jorgenson (1972) which held set a simulated company and actually hired more employees to perform clerical tasks for a two week period.

It is also important to note that while most researches on equity theory have focused on pay, employees seem to look for equity in the distribution of other organizational rewards.

Finally, recent researches have been directed at expanding what is meant by equity or fairness. Historically equity theory focussed on distributive justices or the perceived fairness of the amount and allocation of rewards among individuals. But equity should also consider procedural justice - the perceived fairness of the process used to determine the distribution of rewards. The evidence indicates that distributive justice has a greater influence on employees satisfaction than procedural justice where as procedure justice tends to affect an employees organizational commitment, trust in his or her boss, and intention to quit.
By increasing the perception of procedural fairness, employees are likely to view their bosses and the organization as positive even if they are dissatisfied with pay, promotions, and other personal outcomes.

In view of the above fact, it is significantly important to mention that fairness in organization has always been derived as it is most likely instrumental in enhancing employees satisfaction and as a consequence to it reducing the rate of absenteeism from the work place.

Modern organizations are prone to give greater emphasis to work culture as free and democratic culture is found to be highly conducive for organizational productive efficiency and organizational growth as well. Work culture in simple terms is considered to be the "personality or feel" of the organization, when people influenced by the culture how do they act within organization. How people perform, view the job, work with Colleagues and looks at the future is largely determined by cultural norms, values and beliefs, as these things are affected by culture.

Work culture is an important aspect through which we can understand individual's behaviour within the organization with some limitations; like it is not the
only way to view organization and like so many concepts
work culture is not defined in the same way by any two
researches.

Culture is defined in so many ways like :

1) Symbols, language, ideologies, rituals and myths.

2) Organizational scripts derived from the personal
scripts of the organisation’s founders or dominated
leaders.

3) It is a product, it is historical and is based upon
symbols, and is an abstraction from behaviour and
the products of behaviour.

4) A pattern of basic assumptions invented by a group
as it learns to cope with its problems of external
adoption and internal integration that has worked
well enough to be considered valid and therefore to
be taught to new members as the correct way to
perceive, think and feel in relation to those
problems (Schein, 1990).

These definitions do suggest that work culture
consists of a number of elements such as assumptions,
beliefs, values, rituals, myths, scripts and languages.
Edger Schein (1985) have captured these elements in his
work. He said that culture has three layers.
1. It includes artifacts and creations which are visible but often not interpretable.

2. It includes values or the things that are important to people.

3. It is the basic assumption that people make which guide their behaviour.

Work culture has emerged as one of the crucial and important concepts in the field of organizational behaviour and human resource management in recent past.

Pettigrew (1990) on the basis of research evidence indicates that variations in cultural values might have a significant impact on employees turnover and employees job satisfaction. Further Hofstede et. al. (1990) have observed that nationality, industry and task policy determine the work culture.

According to Herkowitz (1955), culture is a man-made part of the environment. Organizational functions within the cultural system of the society in which it is located (Longenecker & Pringle, 1981). The way in which organization function is affected not only by the powers of managers but also by underlying culture of forces. The culture regulates the way in which organizational member's perform their work and even the way in which
managers build relations and exercise powers. Work culture is a product of leadership styles, organizational policies, practices, systems, traditions, conventions etc. Over a period of time, those aspects become a way of life in an organization. The sum total of all these components constitute work culture (Bate, 1984).

Robbins (1994) describes the term primary characteristics that in a nutshell, capture the essence of an work culture. These are as follows: member identity, group emphasis, people focus, unit integration, control risk, tolerance, reward criteria, conflict tolerance, means end orientation and open systems. Robbins derived these characteristics from the work of Hofstede et. al. (1990) and O’Reilly 111 (1991).

Luthans (1995) has also highlighted the important characteristics of work culture. These are behavioural observed regularities, norms, dominant values, philosophy, rules. Work culture is a pattern of basic assumptions that are taught to new incumbents or employees as the way to perceive, think and act in the situation they are confronted with.

According to Martin (1992) work culture includes organizations, norms, stories people tell about what goes
on, the organization formal rules and procedures, it’s former codes of behaviours, rituals tasks, pay systems, jokes only with insiders and so on. She further added that when cultural members interpret the meanings of the above manifestations, their perceptions, memories, beliefs, experiences and values usually vary. So interpretations of culture will vary depending upon the situations and the perception of employees towards these conditions and situations.

Culture helps in reducing complexity and uncertainty. It provides a consistency in outlook and values and develop effectiveness in the processes of decision making co-ordination and control.

Morey and Luthans (1987) stated that “the culture has been a mainstay in the field of anthropology from it’s beginning and was given attention in the early development of organizational behaviour”.

Culture is clearly an important ingredient of effective organizational performance. Work culture as a perspective to understand behaviour within organization has it’s own limitations like it is not the only way to view organizations and like so many concepts, work
culture is not defined in the same way by any two popular researchers.

Brown suggests that work culture can be a powerful tool for improving performance and the key to effective leadership and organizational development.

In a simple way culture is defined as how things are done around here. Atpinson explains organisational culture as reflecting the underlying assumptions about the way work is performed, what is acceptable and not acceptable, and what behaviours and actions are encouraged and discouraged.

The wide diversity of interpretations relating to Organizational Development (OD) gives rise to a large number of definitions. But still there is sometimes confusion over the difference between work culture and organizational climate.

Culture is reinforced through the system of rites and rituals, patterns of communication, the informal organization, expected patterns of behaviour and perceptions of the psychological contract culture can be defined as the cumulative belief, values and assumptions underlying transaction with nature and important phenomenon.
Culture is reflected in the artifact, rituals, design of space, furniture and ways of dealing with various phenomenons. Distribution and concentration of power may be one basis of classifying culture. From this angle, work culture can be of four types: feudal, bureaucratic, technocratic and entrepreneurial or organic. The way human resources issues are handled in the beginning sets the tone for culture (The Times of India 'Ascent': 16th June 1999)

Harrison, Handy Classified organization culture into four main types.

a) Power culture  b) Role culture
c) Task culture    d) Person culture

a) Power culture depends on power source which influence from the central figure throughout the organization.

b) Role culture is often stereotyped as a bureaucracy and works by logic and rationality, it rests on strength of strong organization pillars.

c) Task culture is work or job oriented; the task culture can be likened to a net some strands of which are stronger and are influential.
d) Person culture is where the individual is the central focus and any structure exists to serve the individuals within it. When a group of people decide that it is in their own interest to bond together to do their own thing and share office space, equipment or clerical assistance then the resulting organization would have a person culture.

The realization that work culture is important cause of organization's effectiveness is widespread in management practice. Work culture—the system of shared values, beliefs and norms, is the product of the interaction among the selection process, the managerial functions, the organization exists and the removal process. Work culture encompasses both the managerial functions and organizational characteristics. Management is both a cause of and a part of work culture. The existing culture of any organization reflects past and present managerial planning, organizing, leading and controlling activities.

Deal and Kennedy categorise corporate cultures according to two determining factors in the market place.
(1) The degree of risk associated with the organization’s activities.

(2) The speed at which organization and their employees receive feedback on the success of decisions or strategies

These two factors give rise to four generic types of culture:

1- Tough guy, macho culture: An organization of individualists where individuals frequently take high risks and receive quick feedback or the right or wrong of their actions.

2- Work hard / play hard culture: Where employees take few risks, all with quick feedback. There is a high level of relatively low risk activity. It is characterized by fun and action.

3- Bet your company culture: There are large stake decisions with a high risk but slow feedback so that it may be years before employees know if decisions were successful.

4- Process culture: A low risk slow feedback culture where employees find difficulty in measuring what they do.
From a study of garden festival walls Mendalls and Gadd found that success in creating a culture occurred as a direct result of their recruitment and training initiatives. However, it is not only culture but climate that is important for organizational effectiveness.

There are so many factors which influence the development of culture, like History means that in which manner the organization has originally formed its age, philosophy, values of its owners and first senior managers were affected by culture. The other factor is primary function and technology has an important influence on its culture. Goals and objectives also play an important role, organization may pursue profitability, this is not by itself very clear criterion for its effective management. Size (the other factor) of the organization have more formalized structures and cultures because size also influences the development of work culture. The other thing is location, so geographical location and the physical characteristics can have a major influence on culture. After location, Management and staffing influence the culture that top executives can have considerable influence on the nature of corporate culture. And last but not the least is the
environment. Effective organization must be responsive to external environmental influences.

Johnson presents a cultural web in order to understand culture of an organization which brings together different aspects of the analysis of organizational culture. It includes so many things like routines, rituals, stories, symbols, powers, structures, control systems and organizational structures.

Another variable which is linked to the present investigation is the phenomenon of ‘locus of control’. It is believed and empirically found that behaviour of an individual is controlled to a large extent by the consequences where locus of control was observed to be a dominating factor in determining the person’s behaviour. It has been one of the most pervasively employed concepts in psychological researches. Locus of control refers to the disposition to the perceive one’s own behaviour or as due to extrinsic or external factors. Those who believe that they can exercise some control over their destinies are considered to be internally controlled. Externals believe that their reinforcements are controlled by Luck or Chance (Rotter, 1966).
Locus of control is viewed to be the tendency in the individual to attribute the outcome in the life irrespective of success or failure, the external factors on to those which are within his control.

Some attempts have been made by the Indian researches in using locus of control as moderator variable (Pestonjee and Singh, 1981; & Pestonjee, 1992).

In locus of control the individuals determine the degree to which they believe their behaviour influence what happens to them. Some people believe that they are autonomous and are the masters of their own fate and bear personal responsibility for what happens to them. They see the control of their lives as coming from inside themselves. Rotter calls these people internalizers.

Rotter (1966) also holds that many people view themselves as helpless pawns of fate, controlled by the outside forces of which they have little, if any, influence. Such people believe that the locus of control is external rather than internal. Rotter calls them externalizers.

The concept of locus of control denotes whether people believe that they are in control of events or events control them. Those who have an internal locus of
control (internals) believe that they control and shape the course of events in their lives, while those who have an external locus of control (externals) tend to believe that events occur purely by chance or because of factors beyond their own control. Internals, as compared to externals, seek more job related informations, try to influence others more at work, more actively seek opportunities for advancement, and rely more on their own abilities and judgement at work (Phares, 1973; Szilagyi and Sims, 1975).

People who have studied the distribution of perceived control in organizations have arrived at two solid conclusions. The first is that the total amount of perceived control varies from organization to organization i.e. in some organizations all levels of the organization management and workers see themselves as having greater control than do people in other organizations. In other words, the fact that laboratory management shares decision making with technical professionals does not itself mean that laboratory management will be perceived as having less control.

The second conclusion is that the shape of the characteristic “control curve” differs among
organizations those charts of pot’s showed examples. Some of these characteristics control curves peak at top management levels; others are “humped”, peaking somewhere at lower levels of management. Also, the slopes of the curves differ, some being steeper than others. The location of this peak in the characteristic control curve is what we mean by locus of control.

Some important effects are associated with these factors. Higher employee satisfaction seems to result where total control is greater rather than smaller; and where the locus of control is shifted towards lower levels of management. We have over simplified, but that is the essence of it. However, our interest here is in using the locus of control idea to describe an organizational situation than to establish a point of organizational design.

The best theoretical statement introducing the expectancy of control construct was given by Rotter (1966) in his review of researches on locus of control. According to Rotter a reinforcement, acts to strengthen an expectancy that particular behaviour or event will be followed by the reinforcement in the future once an expectancy for such a behaviour reinforcement the
sequence is built up. The failure of the reinforcement in the future once an expectancy for such a behaviour reinforcement sequence is built up. The failure of the reinforcement to occur will reduce or extinguish the expectancy. It follows as a general hypothesis that when the reinforcement is seen as not contingent upon the subject's own behaviour, its occurrence will not increase an expectancy as much as when it is seen as contingent, conversely, its non-occurrence will not reduce any expectancy so much as when it is seen as contingent. It seems likely that, depending upon the individual's history of reinforcement, individual would differ in the degree to which they attribute reinforcement to their own actions.

The locus of control construct is an integral part of social learning theory (1954 Rotter, Chance and Phares, 1972). In social learning terminology, locus of control is a generalized expectancy pertaining to the connections between personal characteristics and or actions an experience outcomes. This develops out as an obstruction from a number of specific encounters where the person perceives the control as a causal sequence occurring in their lives. For some individuals many
outcomes are experienced as dependent upon the effort experienced in their pursuits. Such people may come to believe that the outcomes are generally contingent upon the work put into them. So, they are supposed to act themselves when engaged in an important task; on the other hand, the individuals who were less responsive may fail to perceive the connection between efforts and the outcomes. As pointed out by Rotter (1954), in social learning theory that the degree to which individual’s perceive the events in their lives as being a consequence of their own actions and thereby controllable (Internal Control) or as the uncontrollable on their own behaviour and therefore beyond personal control (external control).

In general, the locus of control has been reported as a tendency of an individual predictability and control over his environment. It assumes individual differences in terms of degree to which a person feels reinforcing events in the environment as subject to his personal control, perceiving the events in life as being a consequence of his own action and thereby controllable as being unrelated to his own behaviour, therefore beyond personal control (externally controlled). Empirical researches have shown that there are some people who
developed unshapable belief that valued reinforcement occur only by chance and that man is not the master of his fate. In contrast to it some others believe the human beings get their due desserts because man is responsible for his fate. When these two concepts are put together, they constitute a major construct in psychological inquiry known as locus of control.

In the literature of psychology when we make use of the abbreviated terms, such as of I-E (Internal-External) for the experience in expression, these two terms (I-E) refer to the description of one’s belief or expectancy. A systematic description of I-E control dimensions was given by Rotter in 1966. The analysis differentiates between I-E on the basis of the degree to which each accepts the personal responsibility for what happens to them. Another description to belief characterizes I-E was given by Lef Court (1966). Internal control refers to the perception of positive and negative as a consequence of one’s actions and thus under personal control. The external control refers to the perception of positive or negative events as being unrelated one’s behaviour in certain situations and therefore beyond personal control.
The I-E control has been described by De Charms (1972) in terms of origins and Paun variables whose work focuses on personal causation which is somewhat different construct than locus of control. He defined personal causation as the initiation by an individual’s behaviour intended to produce a change in his environment.

Behavioural aspect of locus of control seems to be highly important determiner in generating the sense and intensity of job satisfaction – dissatisfaction experiences. Such aspect is because of the fact that mastering over one’s external-internal controls itself is reinforcing and satisfying, hence, locus of control is significantly important for job/work satisfaction.

In the light of the above descriptions pertaining to the numerous variables which have been a part of the present investigation, it is imperative to point out that the present investigation is very relevant so far as identification of the factors for enhancing job/work satisfaction and reducing the frequency of absenteeism are concerned. With these lines the other details of the thesis and particularly the review of literature has been given in the next chapter.