CHAPTER III
THE PRESENT STUDY
3.1. THE PRESENT STUDY

A perusal of the existing studies indicates that the prime objective of organizational behaviour research has been study of industrial organizations and the people functioning in these organizations. The study of government organisations is generally viewed as the realm of public administration and so far as individuals in government institutions are concerned, very few empirical studies exist.

Since the real difference between one organisation and another is due to the people who man these institutions, this study examines some of the factors that affect people working in government organisations.

All ills in government institutions are attributed to the 'bureaucrats', but very few researchers have studied the kind of work situation or climate in which these individuals function, the conflicts and stresses they undergo, the type of persons who opt for government jobs and the job satisfaction, if any, these bureaucrats derive from their work. It is with a view to understand some of these factors that this study has been undertaken. This study is more in the nature of
an exploratory study, so as to determine some of the variables affecting the persons working in government organisations.

An organisation has been viewed as an open system. It is seen as an integrated system of interdependent structures and functions. A job in an organisation also is not an entity but a complex inter-relationship of tasks, roles, responsibilities, interactions, incentives and rewards. (Locke 1976).

In these interacting systems, the concept of role is of vital importance. Role can be understood as any position a person holds in a system, as defined by the expectations various significant persons, including himself, have from that position. Each individual occupies and plays several roles within a role space and a role set. A role set is the compliment of role relationship which persons have by virtue of occupying a particular social status, whereas role space is the dynamic inter-relationship both between the self and the various roles an individual occupies and amongst these roles (Pareek 1976).

Within this framework, behaviour in organizations can be viewed as in Figure 3-1.
Three embedding systems for behaviour on organisations.

SOURCE: Dunnette, M.D. Handbook of Industrial Organisations' Psychology.
(a) There is a physical and technological environment in which behaviour takes place;

(b) The social medium or patterns of interpersonal relations within which behaviour occurs;

(c) The person system or self of the person whose behaviour is to be considered;

The systems can be studied separately or can be studied at the intersection of any of the two systems or the resultant behaviour at the intersection of all the systems.

In the present study, the environment of the organisation is studied through the macro-climate and hierarchical structure; the social interpersonal environment through micro-climate as well as through the Role Stress Scale and the person system through the 16 PF and Locus of Control scales. The demographic variables like experience and education are also considered. These are the independent variables. The dependent variable is the job satisfaction or dissatisfaction as measured by the Herzberg Theory of motivational/hygiene satisfiers and dissatisfiers. To consider these, the following hypotheses were formulated:
3.2. HYPOTHESIS

1. There exists a significant positive relationship between motivational factors and climate.

2. There exists a significant negative relationship between motivational factors and stress.

3. Differences in the personality dimensions influence the motivational satisfactions/dissatisfactions.

4. Difference in the system of locus of control (internal-external) will significantly affect motivational/hygienic satisfaction, dissatisfactions.

5. Demographic factors like experience and education are significantly related to motivational factors.

6. There exists a significant difference in the perception of organizational climate at the same level and at different levels of hierarchy.

7. There exists significant differences in the perceived stress at different levels of hierarchy.
8. There exists a significant difference in the personality of the individuals at the same level and at different levels of hierarchy.

9. There exists a significant difference in the motivational/ hygienic satisfaction, dissatisfaction of individuals at the same level and at different levels of hierarchy.

10. There exists a significant difference in the locus of control among individuals at the same level and at different levels of hierarchy.

11. There exists significant differences regarding motivation between individuals with high performance and with low performance.

12. There exist significant differences regarding perception of stress between individuals with high performance and with low performance.

13. There exists a significant difference in personality between individuals with high performance and with low performance.

14. There exists a significant difference in the perception of climate by high performers and low
Thus, formulation of first five hypotheses is for understanding the significant variables that affect individuals functioning in a government organisation.

Another dimension that has been considered is whether hierarchy plays a vital role in the determination of differences at different levels. To consider this, hypotheses six to ten are formulated.

Finally, from the organisational viewpoint, to determine effective performance, hypothesis eleven to fourteen are formulated to understand the differences between high and low performers.

3.3. THE TOOLS USED IN THIS STUDY ARE -

(i) My World of Work
    (To study climate of the organisation) Padaki R (1983)

(ii) Work Experiences Padaki & V Dolke (1970)
    (based on Herzberg's 2-factor theory of motivation)
(iii) Organizational Role Stress Scale

Pareek U (1983)

(iv) Locus of Control


(v) 16 PF Scale

Cattel, R.B. (1956).
(As modified by Usha Seetharam)

3.3.1. My world of work - R. Padaki (1983)

The development of this questionnaire is based on 2 questionnaires -

(i) Organizational climate questionnaire by Litwin and Stringer (1968).

(ii) Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS) by Hackman and Oldham (1976).

It has been developed to measure the climate of the organisation, to understand the various features of organisation and work. The questionnaire is designed to measure the climate at two levels. The macro climate covering rules, regulations, policies, structure, and system of an organisation and micro
climate covering items of the immediate job like content, meaning and social alienation. After factor analyzing the scores, 6 factors emerged -

FACTOR - 1: Role Discretion

It consists of items related to (i) Responsibility (content, extent) (ii) Risk (encouraged, supported). This factor appears to be concerned with the supportive process essential for responsibility and discretion to be accepted and exercised.

FACTOR - 2: Role Challenge

The items constituting this aspect of organizational climate connote job challenge and organizational traditions that promote achievement orientation.

FACTOR - 3: Role clarity

It consists of items describing (i) structure (ii) reward system (iii) identification and (iv) problem solving approach. The constituent items of the scale, their effective directions and their semantic connotations suggest that this aspect of organizational climate is concerned primarily with structure clarity.
The next three factors appear to be particularly concerned with the man-job interface, the meaning of job and the psychological identification with the job. Briefly stated, those consequences of work organisation commonly referred to within the framework of alienation.

FACTOR - 4: Alienation Content

The items under this factor consist of (i) Skill variety (identifiable contribution, control over whole items of work), autonomy (discretion, decisions on the job) and feed-back from others (task related). The constituents provide an assessment of job content and the extent to which they provide intrinsic satisfaction from the job.

FACTOR - 5: Alienation meaning -

Task significance (perceived importance) and feed-back from job (knowledge of results, monitoring facility).

This is related to the psychological importance of feed-back regarding the outcome of one's endeavours, the perceived significance of the effort.

FACTOR - 6: Alienation Social
This aspect of organizational climate concerns the opportunity provided on the job for social relations and fulfilment of social communicative needs.

According to R. Padaki, the environment is being assessed at two system levels with this instrument - the immediate (micro) environment of the job and the larger (macro) organizational environment. Thus, the work environment is viewed as fields, with fields of more specific and more general sources of influence for behavioural outcomes.

Higher scores refer to great extent of role clarity, role discretion and role challenge and lesser extent of alienation in social, content and meaning aspects.

The diagnostic value of this scale is at two levels. At the top organizational level, it provides a useful basis for planning and executing changes on structure, policies and role relationships.

At the micro level or departmental level, it can be said that it is the legitimate task of the manager to enrich the job, so that the crucial content and meaning factors on the job are enlarged and alienation is controlled.
The development of this scale began with a large item pool derived partly from organisation climate questionnaire by Litwin and Stringer and partly from Job diagnostic survey of Oldham and Hackman and partly from an item pool created by the researcher. All the items met the requirements of inclusion only after factor analysis. An interactive procedure of item analysis arrived at 72 items with 12 items each for the six factors identified and a standardised 7 point scale for all the items was developed for measurement. These six factors accounted for 63% to 93% of the total variation. Replacement and addition of items in the procedure was aided by a fresh factor analysis to ensure a minimum factor loading of 0.5 for each item. Thus, the validity of the instrument may be said to be factorially derived for all the six climate factors.

Reliability was established partly by the item-total item analysis and partly by retest exercise which yielded test-retest correlation of 0.81 for the first 3 factors of the climate scale and 0.64 for the next 3 factors of the scale.

Procedure, Instructions, Scoring of 'My World of Work':
The instructions for this questionnaire are as under:-
This is a questionnaire to understand the various features of your organisation and your work. The questionnaire contains statements describing situations and conditions that might prevail in any work/organisation.

Read each statement and decide to what extent it describes your present work/organisation.

A seven point scale is to be used to indicate the degree of accuracy of the statement as shown below:-

1------2------3-------4--------5--------6------7---
Very Untrue Slightly Uncertain Slightly True Very untrue Untrue true true

In the separate answer sheet write the number corresponding to the alternative chosen.

This questionnaire contains statements describing situations and conditions that prevail in any organisation, work place. The scoring is done on a seven point scale 1 to 7. 1 meaning very untrue to 4 which is uncertain to 7 which is very true. For each of the six variables, the score could be a minimum of 12 and maximum of 84. The higher the score, the better
the climate. There are a number of items for which there is negative scoring. For example, 'To rise in this organisation, chamchagiri is considered more important than good performance.' If a person marks this as very true then the scoring is not 7 but 1, and if he marks it as very untrue, it will be marked as 7.

3.3.2. Work Experiences


This questionnaire developed and standardised on Indian population at ATIRA, Ahmedabad is based on Herzberg's two factor theory of work motivation. The original basis for the Motivator - Hygiene (or 2 factor theory) was a study by Herzberg of some 200 engineers and accountants who were asked to describe a time when they felt especially satisfied/dissatisfied with their jobs. These "critical incidents" were then classified by grouping those together what "seemed to go together" and recording the frequency with which each category was mentioned.

In the questionnaire developed by ATIRA, twelve out of Herzberg's original sixteen factors were included. The four factors dropped because of their insignificant frequencies were personal life, working conditions,
status and interpersonal relations (peers). From the 300 interview protocols of the major study, a large number of statements were chosen to represent both high satisfaction and low satisfaction sequences concerning the 12 factors. In the ATIRA studies, it was emphasized that a significantly higher frequency of 'happy' response over the 'unhappy' was not by itself a sufficient condition for a factor to be deemed a satisfier (or vice-versa with reversed significance) as the total response volume to that factor might be insignificant compared to the total experience of happiness or unhappiness. Indeed, a more rigorous test of factor acceptance in the first instance led consistently over several studies to the conclusion that only 12 factors may be regarded as significant for satisfaction or dissatisfaction in Indian work organizations. Of the twelve factors, six factors represent motivators and six are hygienic factors. The questionnaire, thus, consists of two parts, one to identify factors that produced satisfaction, the other for dissatisfaction. 48 items in each part, with 4 items each for the 12 chosen factors. The items drawn from actual interview-based, work-related incidents/situations, seeking response of whether these actually occurred in the lives of the respondents, thus retaining the critical incident character of the enquiry, Padaki (1972) defended the critical incident
approach stating that the studies based on two factor theory suggest that neither the two factor proposition, nor the critical incident approach can be thrown overboard. Above all, by definition, a job attitude refers to a dynamic aspect of behaviour, an action potential and is conceptually quite different from opinion.

There is reason to believe that in seeking behavioural acts that one had indeed indulged in, one is closer to the pre-dispositions, than by seeking hypothetical behavioural acts that one may engage in, should the circumstances arise.

The psycho–metric properties of the questionnaire are as follows – (ATIRA, 1970; V Padaki & Dolke 1970).

1. The content validity of the questionnaire was established by the satisfier–dissatisfier profile through the original critical incident technique being reproduced by the questionnaire also.

2. The construct validity of the uni-directionality of job attitude was established only indirectly, through the agreement of the questionnaire profiles with the original interview profiles.
3. The retest reliability of the questionnaire (stability or response) was established by the satisfier - dissatisfier profile through the first administration being reproduced in the second administration also.

4. The retest reliability of the interview was already established with 83% repeatability in the satisfiers and 75% repeatability in the dissatisfiers.

5. The objectivity of the critical incident technique was established by inter-rater agreements which ranged from 98.5% to 99.6%.

The questionnaire was in two parts -

(a) The first part contained 48 incidents (4 x 12 factors) arranged at random, all dealing with high sequences (events when a person might have felt extremely happy) and the respondent was required to indicate which of them were very much like his/her own experience.

(b) The second part again has 48 statements and is similar to the first, but contains items dealing with low sequences (events when a person might have felt extremely unhappy).
Procedure, Instructions, Scoring: The instructions for this scale are -

On the following pages are lists of statements about events that might have occurred some time or the other in the working life of every one of us. Some of these statements may be very much like your own experience.

The first list contains events when a person might have felt extremely happy =

* Read each statement carefully

* Check ( ) in the brackets in front of the statement if it is very much like your own experience.

* Leave blank the bracket-space if it is not very much like your own experience.

Here are two examples

(1) I felt extremely happy when I solved a major problem in the department.

(2) I felt extremely happy when my ideas and suggestions were accepted.
The person who read the first item above felt that the statement was very much like his own experience. So, he checked ( ) the bracket-space next to the item. He felt that the second event, although familiar, did not make him feel extremely happy. So, he left the bracket-space blank.

Please remember that your answers should be in terms of what you felt when these things actually happened in the past and not in terms of what you will feel or what you should feel if these things happen in future.

There is no time limit. Work at your own speed.

The person who is extremely happy or unhappy on all the factors, could have a maximum score of 48. Conversely, the score could be 0 on both extreme happiness and unhappiness.

3.3.3. Organizational Role Stress Scale

This scale developed by Uday Pareek (1983) measures organizational stress within the framework of role system. From the individual view point, two role systems are important. The system of various roles an individual occupies and performs called as role space
and the system of various roles of which his role is a part and in which his role is defined by other significant roles known as roleset.

Five main role stresses or conflicts in the role space which are to be measured are as under —

a) Self Role Distance

This is the conflict between the self-concept and the expectations from the role as perceived by the role occupant.

b) Intra Role Conflict

As a result of his socialization and identification with others, an individual develops certain expectations and there may be incompatibility between two or more different expectations from his own role.

c) Role Stagnation

This includes role stress due to change in roles as an individual grows in an organisation or when progress slows or stops, specially at middle age.

d) Inter Role Distance
An individual occupies more than one role. There may be conflicts between two or more roles he occupies.

e) Role Boundedness

If an individual feels highly obligated to the expectations of significant role senders and sacrifices his own interests, preferences, values, comforts, etc., he may be said to be role bounded. He may experience the conflict between his tendency to live as a person and live as a role.

The role set stressors which are to be measured are as under -

a) Role Ambiguity

When an individual is not clear about the various expectations people have from his role, he faces a conflict which may be called role ambiguity. This exists when there is lack of clarity or information of work objectives, new roles and roles in expanding or contracting organizations.

b) Role Overload
When the role occupant feels that there are too many expectations from significant roles in his role set, he experiences 'role overload'. Marshall and Cooper (1979), distinguished between quantitative and qualitative overload.

c) Role Isolation

The role occupant may feel that some roles are psychologically at a distance. The main criterion of role - role distance is frequency and ease of interaction. French & Caplan (1970), came to the conclusion that mistrust of persons one worked with was positively related to high role ambiguity which led to inadequate communications between people and to psychological strain in the form of low job satisfaction.

d) Role Erosion

Stress is felt when some functions an individual would like to perform are being performed by some other role. It is a subjective feeling of an individual. This is likely to be experienced in organizations which are redefining their structures or creating new roles.

e) Role Inadequacy
Refers to two types of feeling -

(i) The role occupant does not have adequate resources to perform the role effectively (resource inadequacy).

(ii) He is not fully equipped to perform the role effectively (personal inadequacy).

With regard to the reliability and validity of this measure, the test retest reliability coefficients were calculated for a group of about 500 employees from 3 banks. Retest reliability checked after eight weeks gave coefficients which were significant at .001 level except for one which was significant at .003 level.

Validity was measured by both item and factor analysis. In item analysis, each item was correlated with the total score on the instrument for about 500 respondents. All but two correlations were significant at .001 level; one at .002 and another at .008 levels. The results show high internal consistency of the scale.

Construct validity of the instrument was tested by factor analysis of the instrument. All factors having...
a loading of three were taken. Thus, there were eight factors. However, in the light of factor analysis, two role stresses were split into four. Role ambiguity was split into Role Ambiguity and Role Expectation Conflict and Role Inadequacy into personal inadequacy and resource inadequacy.

Procedure, instructions, scoring:

The instructions for answering this questionnaire were:

People have different feelings about their roles. Please read each statement given below and check how often you have the feeling expressed in the statement.

The answer is given in a graded format.

0 If the person never or rarely feels this way
1 If the person feels this way occasionally (a few times)
2 If the person sometimes feels this way
3 If the person frequently feels this way
4 If the person very frequently or always feels this way

There are 50 questions measuring 10 stress variables. Thus, each variable/factor can have a minimum score of
0 or a maximum score of 20.

3.3.4. Internal-External Locus of Control


This scale was developed by Dr Valecha and others (1986 at IIM, Bangalore.) It is intended to measure an important belief system, viz, the extent to which an individual believes that he is self-motivated, directed or controlled (internal frame of reference) or to the extent to which he believes that the environment (luck, fate, chance, powerful other people) plays a dominant role in influencing his behaviour and the rewards and punishments which he obtains.

The main scale consists of 45 items including 11 Filler items. But another scale was developed for work relevant variables. This scale was developed with an industrial sample which predominantly consisted of males (N.300). These were individuals working in (i) supervisory (ii) junior management and (iii) middle management positions in banks and commercial concerns, both in the private and public sectors.

For the American population, Rotter had developed the widely used instrument to measure I/E beliefs.
However, since environment and culture play a significant role in the development of beliefs and attitudes, Dr. Valecha considered it appropriate to develop a scale specifically for Indian population.

For the development of the scale to begin with, the researchers had a pool of 76 items consisting of -

(i) 23 scorable items of Rotter
(ii) 6 filler items of Rotter
(iii) 42 new scorable items
(iv) 5 new filler items.

The fillers in the test are meant for reducing the element of guessing the purpose of the test, as well as to reduce the bias of selecting socially desirable responses on the part of respondents; thus, the purpose of the filler items is to minimise faking. A Lie Scale of 15 items was also added as part II of the test in order to check the tendency of faking and giving more socially desirable responses.

Of the 76 items, 12 were dropped as they were repetitive or ambiguous and 64 items were accepted for pilot study. After the pilot study, 54 items were retained, 43 scorable and 11 fillers and after the main study, the final version had 45 items - 34 scorable and
11 fillers and the shorter version (especially suited for industrial use) consisted of 20 items - 16 scoreable and 4 fillers.

For the present study, the work related Internal/External Locus of Control Scale with 20 items is used. Item analysis: The items were analyzed by using the FLANNAGAN’s chart. The middle 45% scores were discarded and the two extreme groups of 27.5% high scores and 27.5% low scores were used for double cross validation purposes. The omega value of W.15 and above was used as a cut off point for discrimination validity of the test, i.e., item discrimination was done at .05 probability value. The scale can be regarded to be quite high on general acceptable level of discriminative value.

The instructions for this scale are:

This is a questionnaire to find out the way in which certain important events in our society affect different people. Each item consists of a pair of alternatives lettered (a) (b). Please select one statement of each pair (and only one) which you most strongly believe to be the case as far as you are concerned. Be sure to select the one you actually believe to be more true rather than the one you think
you should choose or the one you would like to be true. This is a measure of personal beliefs; obviously, there are no right or wrong answers.

Please answer these items carefully but do not spend too much time on any one item. Be sure to answer every choice; find the number of the item on the answer-sheet and mark your answer by marking a cross like this (x) under the letter (a) or (b) which you choose as the statement more true.

In some instances you may discover that you believe both statements or neither one. In such cases, be sure to select the one you more strongly believe to be the case as far as you are concerned. Also, try to respond to each item independently when making your choice; do not be influenced by your previous choice.

3.3.5. 16 Personality Factors Scale

The Sixteen PF 'C' Form (Cattel, R.B., 1956) has been modified by Usha Seetharam and the language has been made much simpler than in the original form to suit Indian conditions. No major alterations have been made. The 16PF form provides the measurement of the personality of an individual. It is based on the trait theory of personality, that is, an individual has
certain stable personality traits and this test gives the maximum number of identifiable source traits of personality. These source traits are not arbitrarily decided upon, but are the result of many laborious factor analyses.

The personality factors have been established as unitary, psychologically meaningful entities in many researches and enter into psychological theory.

These 16 dimensions or scales are independent, that is to say, the correlation between one and another are usually negligible. Having a certain position on one does not prevent the person having any position whatever on another. Thus, each of the sixteen scales brings an entirely new piece of information about the person, a condition not found in many alleged multi-dimensional scales. In a general way, it can be pointed out here that this psychological reality enables more far-sighted predictions to be made from them. For example, it is known that intelligence (B, general ability factor) follows a certain curve of development into adolescence, that "enthusiasm" (F factor) declines rapidly between twenty and thirty years of age, that schizothymia is largely hereditarily determined and fixed; whereas sensitivity (I factor) and tenseness (Q4 or somatic anxiety) are
largely environmental and may be expected to alter according to further emotional conditions. Such knowledge, as well as the predictions now obtainable from the factors on various clinical, social, industrial and educational criteria, place the use of factored personality measures on a total different scientific level from that which had existed for a single case or separate composite questionnaires, not demonstrated to correspond to truly independent traits or to psychological realities.

The 16 PF 'C' Form was standardised by Cattell due to the great demand for the shortened version of the test. This version aims at using simple vocabulary and also includes an index to guard against attempts of distortion of self picture.

It is a shortened version of 'A' and 'B' Forms which contain 185 items each. This is a short test, 40 minutes in length, in a more elementary vocabulary than A and B Forms, but capable of yielding measures on 16 factors as in the lengthy versions, being an exact parallel to forms A & B (Cattel 1956). It was aimed at giving maximum reliability and validity of measurements possible with only six items per factor. The results showed good validity and also, that the same factors are being measured as in A & B forms. In this form,
eight items have been added to B and a motivational distortion scale (MD) consisting of seven items has also been added to the 98 items. Thus, the 16PF 'C' form consists of 105 questions, each provided with 3 alternatives for answer, except for Factor B, where only two alternatives are possible.

The 16 PF as described by Cattel are given below –

1. FACTOR A - Cyclothymia /vs/ Schizothymia (reserved /vs/outgoing)

2. FACTOR B - General intelligence (Spearman's G in its personality manifestation /vs/ mental defect.)

3. FACTOR C - Emotionality stable character /vs/ demoralized general personality.

4. FACTOR E - Dominance /vs/ submission

5. FACTOR F - Surgency /vs/ desurgency

6. FACTOR G - Positive character integration /vs/ immature dependent character.

7. FACTOR H - Parmia-charitable, adventurous /vs/
Threctia-shy & timid.

8. FACTOR I – Premsia-sensitive, effeminate /vs/
Harria-tough & realistic.

9. FACTOR L – Protensia-suspecting, jealous /vs/
Alaxia-relaxed, trusting.

10. FACTOR M – Autia-unconcernedness Bohemian /vs/
Prexernia-Conventional, practical.

11. FACTOR N – Audia-Sophistication /vs/ rough simplicity

12. FACTOR O – Free anxiety /vs/ confident adequacy.

13. FACTOR Q1– Radicalism /vs/ conservatism

14. FACTOR Q2– Self-sufficiency /vs/ group dependency

15. FACTOR Q3– High self-sentiment /vs/ poor self-
sentiment.

16. FACTOR Q4– High energetic tension, excitable /vs/
low energetic tension, composed.

The sixteen Personality Factors:-
FACTOR 'A'

Low Scoring: 1, 2, 3, 4

High Scoring: 7, 8, 9, 10

Aloof (Schizothymia) /vs/ Warm-outgoing (Cyclothymia)

Aloof: Low scoring

The person who scores low (standard score 1 or 2) on Factor A, tends to be stiff, cool, aloof. He likes things rather than people; working alone, and avoidance of clash of view points. He is apt to be precise and rigid in his way of doing things and in personal standards and in many occupations these are desirable traits. He may tend, at times, to be critical, obstructive or hard.

Warm, outgoing: High scoring

The person who scores high on Factor A, tends to be good-natured, easy-going, ready to cooperate, attentive to people, soft-hearted, kindly, trustful, adaptable. He readily forms active groups. He is generous in personal relations, less afraid of criticism, better able to remember names of people, but he is often less dependable in precision work and in obligations.
FACTOR 'B’

Low scoring: Low general ability /vs/ Bright (intelligence) (high score)

Low general ability (dull)

The person scoring low on Factor B tends to be slow to learn and grasp, dull, sluggish. He tends to have little taste or capacity for higher forms of knowledge and to be somewhat boorish and rude.

Bright (intelligence)

The person who scores high on Factor B tends to be quick to grasp ideas, a fast learner, intelligent. He is usually persevering, conscientious, cultured, a man with a character.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stanine</th>
<th>Sten</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low scores</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High scores</td>
<td>7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FACTOR 'C’
Emotional (general instability) vs. Mature (Ego strength)

Low scoring: Emotional

The person who scores low on Factor C tends to be emotionally immature, lacking in frustration tolerance, changeable, evasive, neurotically fatigued, prone to worry, easily annoyed with things and people, generally dissatisfied, having various neurotic symptoms (phobias, sleep disturbances) psychosomatic complaints, etc.

High Scoring: Mature (Ego strength)

The person who scores high on Factor C tends to be emotionally mature, stable, calm, phlegmatic, realistic about life, placid, possessing ego strength, having an integrated philosophy of life, better able to maintain high group morale.

FACTOR 'E'

Submissive (submission) vs. Dominance (dominant)

Low scoring: The person who scores low on Factor E tends to be dependent, a follower, to lean on others in
making decisions and taking action, to go along with the group. He is often soft hearted, expressive and tends to be easily upset.

High scoring: Dominant: The person who scores high on Factor E tends to be ascendant, self-assured, assertive, independent-minded, bold and courageous in his approach to situations. He may, at times, be hard, stern, solemn, unconventional, tough-minded.

FACTOR 'F'

Glum, silent (desurgency) /vs/ Enthusiastic (surgency)

Low scoring: Glum, silent: The person who scores low on Factor F tends to be taciturn, reticent, introspective. He is sometimes incommunicative, melancholic, anxious, depressed, smug, languid, slow.

High scoring: Enthusiastic: The person who scores high on this trait, tends to be cheerful, talkative, frank, expressive, quick, alert, unperturbable. He is frequently chosen as an elected leader.

FACTOR 'G'

Casual (weakness of character) /vs/ Conscientious
Low scoring: Casual: The person who scores low on Factor G tends to be fickle, irresolute, unsteady, undependable, quitting. He is sometimes demanding, impatient, indolent, obstructing, lacking in internal standards.

High scoring: Conscientious: The person who scores high on Factor G, tends to be strong in character, responsible, determined, persevering, consistent, energetic, cautious, well-organized. He is usually conscientious, attentive to others, emotionally mature. He has a high regard for moral standards and prefers efficient people to other companions.

FACTOR ‘H’

Timid (withdrawn schizothymia) /vs/ Adventurous (cyclothymia)

Low scoring: Timid: The person who scores low on this trait tends to be shy, withdrawn, cautious, retiring, cool, aloof. He usually has feelings of inferiority. He tends to be slow in speech and in expressing himself, dislikes occupations with personal contacts, prefers one or two friends to large groups.
and is not able to keep in contact with all that is going on around him.

High-scoring: Adventurous: The person who scores high on this factor tends to be sociable, participating, ready to try new things, spontaneous, abundant in emotional response. He is able to face wear and tear in dealing with people and grueling emotional situations without fatigue. However, he can be careless of details, ignore danger signals, consume much time talking. He may be artistic, poetic or sentimental, and have active interest in the opposite sex.

FACTOR 'I'

Tough (toughness) /vs/ Sensitive (sensitivity)

Low scoring: Tough: The person who scores low on factor I, tends to be practical, realistic, masculine, independent, responsible. He is sometimes phlegmatic, hard, cynical, smug. He tends to keep a group operating on a practical and realistic basis.

High Scoring: Sensitive: The person who scores high on factor I tends to be tender-minded, imaginative, introspective, artistic, fastidious, excitable. He is
sometimes demanding, impatient, dependent, impractical. He dislikes crude people and rough occupations. He tends to slow up group performance, to upset group morale by negative remarks.

FACTOR 'L'

Trustful (lack of paranoid tendency) /vs/ Suspecting (Paranoid tendency)

Low scoring: Trustful: The person who scores low on factor L, tends to be free of jealous tendencies, adaptable, cheerful, composed, concerned about other people, a good team worker.

High Scoring: Suspecting: The person who scores high on factor L, tends to be mistrusting and doubtful. He is often involved with his own ego, is self-opinionated and interested in internal mental life. He is usually deliberate in his actions, unconcerned about other people, a poor team member.

FACTOR 'M'

Conventional (Practical concernedness) /vs/ Eccentric (Bohemian unconcern)
Low scoring: Conventional: The person who scores low on factor M, tends to be conscientious, anxious to do the right thing, practical. He is easily concerned and expressive and able to keep his head in emergencies. He is often rather narrowly correct.

High Scoring: Eccentric: The person who scores high on factor M, tends to be unconventional, unconcerned, bohemian, egocentric, sensitive, imaginative. He sometimes makes emotional scenes, is somewhat undependable, irresponsible, impractical. He is often rejected in group situations.

FACTOR 'N'

Simple (native simplicity) /vs/ Sophisticated (sophistication)

Low scoring: Simple: The person who scores low on factor N tends to be unsophisticated and simple. He is easily pleased and somewhat crude and awkward.

High scoring: Sophisticated: He tends to be polished, experienced, worldly. He is sometimes aloof, fastidious, hard-headed, analytical. He has intellectual, unsentimental approach to situations.
FACTOR 'O'

Confident (freedom from anxiety) /vs/ Insecure (anxious insecurity)

Low scoring: Confident: He tends to be placid, calm, with unshakable nerve. He has a mature, unanxious confidence in himself and in his capacity to deal with things.

High scoring: Insecure: He tends to be depressed, moody, a worrier, suspicious, brooding, avoiding people, perturbed by his mood changes. He has a childlike tendency to be anxious in difficulties. He does not feel accepted in groups or free to participate.

FACTOR 'Q.1'

Conservative (conservatism) /vs/ Experimenting (radicalism)

Low scoring: Conservatism: He tends to be overly cautious and moderate. He is opposed to any change.

High scoring: Experimenting: He tends to be interested in intellectual matters and fundamental
issues. He frequently takes issues with ideas, either old or new. He tends to be more well informed and more inclined to experiment in life generally, more tolerant of inconveniences.

FACTOR "Q.2"

Dependence (group dependence) /vs/ Self-sufficient (self-sufficiency)

Low scoring: Dependence: He prefers to work and make decisions with other people, likes social approval and admiration. He tends to be conventional and may be lacking in resolution.

High Scoring: Self-sufficient: He tends to be independent, resolute, accustomed to going his own way, making decisions and taking decisions on his own. He is, however, not necessarily dominant in his relationship with others.

FACTOR "Q.3"

Lax (lack of stability) /vs/ Controlled (will control)

Low scoring: Lax: He lacks will, control and
character stability; he is not too considerate, careful, or conscientious. High scoring: Controlled; he tends to have strong control of his emotions and general behaviour, is inclined to be considerate, careful and conscientious. However, sometimes he tends to be obstinate. Effective leaders tend to be high on Q.3.

FACTOR 'Q.4'

Stable' (relaxation) /vs/ Tense (somatic anxiety)

Low scoring: Stable: He tends to have good emotional stability and freedom from various nervous and instability symptoms.

High scoring: Tense: He tends to be tense, excitable, restless, fretful, impatient. He is often over-fatigued but unable to remain inactive. He takes a poor view of group unity, orderliness and leadership.

Reliability and Validity

Reliability has been worked out as a test - retest correlation with one week interval in between. The values obtained on a population of 200 students are -
Reliability for the modified 'C' Form, English version by Usha Seetharam are -

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For validity, the mean correlation of all the items with factors they represent is 0.37 and the mean correlation of a factor with a group of 6 items by which it is represented is about 0.71 which is decidedly high for so brief a test.
Procedure, Instructions, Scoring: The procedure and instructions for answering this questionnaire are -

Here are some questions which give you a chance to say what sort of a person you are and to state your interests and attitudes. Since each person is different, there are no right or wrong answers, except what is true for you.

After each question are given three possible answers. Try to decide which of the answers represents your usual way of acting or feeling and put a tick mark against one of the three alternatives.

Try to avoid middle answers as much as possible.

In answering these questions, try to remember the following -

1. Answer the questions as frankly and truthfully as possible, since there is no advantage in giving the wrong impression. Never give an untrue answer about yourself.

2. Although this is an untimed test, we would still like you to answer the questions as rapidly as you can.
It is important that you put down your first reaction. So, do not spend time thinking over the questions.

3. Use the middle answers only when it is absolutely impossible to lean toward one or the other of the answer choices. In other words, the YES (or 'a') or the NO (or 'b') should be used for most cases.

4. Do not skip any questions. If an occasional question does not seem to apply to your interests, mark the "In between" answers.

Scoring: Each item in the questionnaire has three alternative answers, each item has a score of 0, 1 and 2 points (except factor B, intelligence items which score 0 or 1). Each item score contributed to one factor, i.e., there are no cases of item score being added to different factors. The raw scores obtained are changed to Stanine Standard Score. MD scale could be used to compute a best allowance for Factor H and G.2. If the score on MD exceeded 12 points, one point was taken away from Factor H and one point was added to Factor Q.2. (For it is on these factors that distortion effects are most likely to affect the score.)

3.4. SAMPLE
The study was conducted in one of the government administrative organisations. It is an all India Central Service. The recruitment to this service is primarily at two levels - direct recruitment at the staff level (Class-III) and direct recruitment at the executive level (Class-I).

Recruitment to Class-III is through the Staff Selection Commission. They select staff known as lower division clerks, upper division clerks, inspectors and stenographers. A functionary at the lowest level, that is of Class-IV (peon) can also get promotion to Class-III. The lower division clerk and others get promoted to the next level after passing necessary examinations. This also depends on the number of vacancies in the next cadre.

In Class-III, the highest level is that of inspector. From this level, he gets promoted to Class-II, which is an officers level. Periodically, there was direct recruitment to Class-II also. But from 1969 onwards, for the past twenty years, Class-II persons are promoted from Class-III only.

At Class-I level of this service, 50% of the persons are promoted from the Class-II and 50% are directly recruited through the Union Public Service
Commission. This is through the common examination held by the UPSC for recruitment to the various administrative services in India. After appointment, the officers normally get three to four further promotions in their career.

The organisation is one of the revenue collecting agencies of the country. The work involved is both technical as well as administrative.

There are a set of rules and regulations for the guidance of their work. The performance of the organisation is annually audited by the Comptroller and Auditor General of India.

Till the mid-eighties, there was no distinction between the functions performed by Class-II and the Class-I officers till they got promotion to the junior administrative grade. Recently, the redeployment of officers has taken place with job classification for different levels of hierarchy.

For the purpose of this study, persons functioning at three levels of the hierarchy, i.e., the staff, Class-II and Class-I were selected randomly. Most of the sample consists of individuals functioning primarily at Bangalore. But some individuals functioning at Bombay,
Madras, Cochin and Hyderabad were also contacted and their responses noted down.

Group-I consists of staff – N = 60
Group-II consists of officers in Class-II – N = 60
Group-III consists of officers in Class-I – N = 60
(only direct recruits.)

People upto mid-management have been studied. The top management has not been considered in this study.

Two of the demographic variables that were considered in the present study were experience in the organisation and educational qualifications. Years of service are given in Table 3.1.

The average experience in group 2 is the highest. This is due to the fact that the majority of these persons are the ones who have been promoted from staff. Hence, they would have inevitably spent more years in service than the other 2 groups.

The details of educational qualifications are given in Tables 3.2 and 3.3. Group 3 has the highest mean on educational qualifications. If the percentage of people who are graduates and post-graduates is compared, it is again seen that 81.66% of direct
### TABLE 3.1.

YEARS OF SERVICE IN THE ORGANISATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GROUP-I</th>
<th>GROUP-II</th>
<th>GROUP-III</th>
<th>Complete Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>12.61</td>
<td>26.61</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RANGE (2-32)</td>
<td>10.51</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>11.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3.2.

EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GROUP-I N=60</th>
<th>GROUP-II N=60</th>
<th>GROUP-III N=60</th>
<th>Complete Group 180</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEAN RANGE (0-3)</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 - Undergraduate
1 - Graduate
2 - Post-graduate
3 - Professionally qualified/Doctorate/M.Phil, etc.
   (Doctor/Engineer)
## TABLE 3.3.

PERCENTAGE OF EDUCATION IN DIFFERENT GROUPS

(Of the 60 in each group % relating to undergraduates, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP-I (60)</th>
<th>GROUP-II (60)</th>
<th>GROUP-III (60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.66%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>61.66%</td>
<td>58.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>23.33%</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 - Undergraduate  
1 - Graduate (B.A./B.Com./B.Sc.)  
2 - Post Graduate (M.A./M.Sc./M.Com.)  
3 - Professionally qualified/Doctorate/ M.Phil., etc. (Doctor/Engineer)
recruits are post-graduates and 8.33 are either doctors, engineers or doctorates. Similarly, for the staff it is seen that 3.33% (2 persons) had done post-graduate studies. This is a reflection of the lack of job opportunities and how even highly qualified persons opt for jobs in government departments, even if they are clerical jobs.

Both groups-I and II have under-graduates. This is because a person need not be a graduate for recruitment at the level of lower division clerk.

3.5. PROCEDURE

The persons to be studied in the organisation were divided into 3 groups: The staff, the officers of Class II and the direct recruits of Class-I.

A pilot study was conducted initially. The questionnaires were given to 30 individuals at different levels of hierarchy. As none of the questionnaires had a time limit, the individuals were asked to answer at leisure, but they were also told not to dwell too much on any question. As the questionnaires are in simple English, none of the participants expressed any difficulty in understanding the questionnaire. Though the time taken for answering
the questionnaires was approximately two hours, the participants did not complain of too much time taken for answering them. As the response of the sample group was positive, the study proper was conducted.

The questionnaire was given individually to 200 persons functioning at different levels of the hierarchy. Different sections of the questionnaire, though self-explanatory, were again explained and the participants were asked to seek clarifications, if any doubts arose.

One of the frequent queries raised was regarding the anonymity of the responses. They were repeatedly assured that giving their name was optional and further, the information collected will be treated as strictly confidential.

Another difficulty expressed by them was regarding the choice in locus of control questionnaire. A large number of respondents said that both the statements are true. For example, (a) Being a success is a matter of hard work, luck has little or nothing to do with it; (b) Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time; they felt that both could be true at some time or the other. They were informed that they were to give the response which was more predominant.
Out of the 200 questionnaires given to the individuals, only 191 returned them. Despite repeated reminders, 9 of the individuals did not return the answer sheets. In some of the returned questionnaires also, it was found that all the questions had not been replied to. Hence, these questionnaires had to be discarded. Thus, a further 14 answer sheets were not taken into account. As the numbers in the 3 different groups were almost the same, questionnaires were further given to a few more individuals, so that each group would have 60 persons in it. Thus, the final replies were obtained from 180 respondents.

At the initial stages of the study, it was planned that the performance of the individuals through objective criteria will be assessed. However, as a large number of respondents were sceptical about whether anonymity would be really maintained, they were given an option not to mention their names. Hence, the nexus between the actual performance of the individual and other factors could not be established. Subsequently, after all the response sheets had been received, wherever the details of name and place of work were given, further data was collected for these individuals. From this, a group of eight high performers and eight low performers was drawn. The basis of performance was superior's
rating as well as the actual quantitative and qualitative outputs of the individuals in the previous year. These, incidentally, are not the only individuals who have performed well or poorly, but as mentioned earlier, due to the constraint of anonymity, these are the only individuals who could be identified on the basis of their performance. After the collection of data, the results were statistically analyzed.