CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A review of past studies is useful to define concepts, to show the theoretical basis and to formulate the methodology objectively. Therefore, an attempt is made in this chapter to prevent a review of the previous studies and the concepts used.

Organisational Climate – Theoretical Frame Work

In the daily interactions and confrontation with structures and process of the organization, behaviour attitudes and emotions develop that make up the climate. The shared perceptions that organizational members have about the policies, practices and procedures which are supported and expected in the organization determine the specific climate. The members of the organization and their personalities have a central influence on climate. Each organizational member notices it and can explain it in light of his or her own perceptions. Interpretation is dependent on the individual abilities and motives. Different motives lead to different perception and thus to behaviours. But even if each member has his or her own unique interpretations, climate is a real existing phenomenon in the organization independent of how it is perceived by the individual members.

Knowing about the specific organizational climate and the way in which people with individual personalities, value systems, needs and motives respond to different climate could be a help to understand and explain behaviour in organization. Climate itself does not cause any effects, but it strengths or lessens the outcomes of the ongoing variables. ‘Climate’ refers to the general attitude of members of a group to life and work in that group. Climate on the
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other hand is dynamic and affected by everything that occurs within the organization. Thus this kind of study is useful for long range results.

Schneider and Raichery published an influential theory about how climate arises. In their opinion three sources are essential viz (a) the common exposure of organizational members to the same objective structural characteristics, (b) selection of organizational members so that a homogeneous staff be developed and (c) social interaction leading to shared understanding of meaning. According to Schneider, organization chooses those individuals as members who are compatible with the working environment and fit to the organization’s personality. Mismatches will lead to resignation and dismissal and thus, in the end homogeneity in the staff exists. Since all the members have similar personalities, perceptions and assumptions and give similar meanings to organizational events, a shared climate develops. Through social interactions and specific introduction process for newcomers this collective organizational climate is supported and held up.

Anderson and Wets support this approach and state that a shared climate arises when an individual interacts common good exists and tasks are interdependent. The behaviour patterns can be predicted and controlled by efficiently managing the organizational climate. (Luthans) Hence the management of organizational behaviour requires the application of knowledge about how people act within organization.

Organizations are faced with demand for change, mainly stemming from competition, to changing economy and the progressive internationalization of business transactions. To improve the healthy effectiveness of an organization and to enhance its strength to cope with changing environment, it is essential to foster a climate. Since the perceptions and attitude of individuals and small
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groups vary from time to time, it becomes imperative to monitor the climate of employee at the desired level periodically and take necessary action for preservation. The climate builds up and affects employee’s satisfaction and productivity. The climate of an organization encourages some behaviour more than others. To nurture the growth and development of individuals and to ensure job satisfaction, a favourable climate is essential. It is not sufficient just to have highly qualified and experienced personnel in the organization, their motivational level should also be high.

Organizational climate refers to the quality of the working environment. If people feel that they are valued and respected within the organization, they are more likely to contribute positively to the achievement of business outcomes. Therefore, organizational climate is a mechanism for developing organizational improvement initiatives. Employee's satisfaction is influenced by the overall atmosphere of the organizational climate which is the atmosphere that employee perceive.

High job satisfaction means higher career satisfaction, satisfaction with life in general, strong commitment to the organization and low intention to leave their organization. Further, technical competence and managerial competence showed negative relationship with turnover intentions. At the time of structuring, merger, outsourcing (may result in job loss hence loss of confidence, fear of failure), events are easier to manage if the organization climate is good prior to change. The Organizational climate has such an important impact on the relationship between leadership styles and influences strategies, that organizations should be changed in such a way that they provide a favourable environment for the use of effective and rational influence

Every other resource such as technology, money or equipment becomes the most productive if the human will is there. It is people who can make thing happen. At the heart of organization, success is the development climate. The performance climate is the biggest single factor influence organizational effectiveness. Climate that does emerge within the organization represents a major determinant of employee behaviour.

Organization climate influences the motivation and behaviour of the members of the organization. The functional climate viz. achievement, expert influence and extension leads to reduction of stress experienced while performing in an organizational role and hence it promotes physical and mental health of the employee.

Relationship between organizational climate and employee health (physical or mental) is therefore logical to understand. Competition is driving employees to work harder and thereby they are facing tremendous pressure. Maintenance of physical and mental health is essential for consistently delivering higher order performance in the work place. Human Resources departments are therefore required to provide and fixture conducive organizational climate. Organizational climate is conceptually integrated synthesis of organizational characteristics. It describes the personality of the organization which influences the motivation and behaviour of the members of the organization. Organizational climate is the result of interaction among an organization’s structure, systems, culture, behaviour of leader and employees’ psychological needs. It depends on the perception of the individuals in the
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organization about organizational working and problem there in.\textsuperscript{21} Support and helpful co-operation among the members of the managerial work group is generally believed to be linked with favourable task performance. Climate and behaviour are inseparable and also in one-way the relationship between behaviour and climate is reciprocal in nature. Applying this cognitive theory it is predicted that individuals behave supportively if they experience a supportive climate in which relationships are interpreted as helpful and co-operative. Reciprocally co-operative behaviour also leads to the perception of supportive climate.\textsuperscript{22} Employee feedback is the best source to find how management style impacts the team’s performance. Team members may be reluctant to give a honest feedback for fear of reprisal. Instead, organization creates a favourable climate where in team members can voice their concerns and listen more, understand them and thereby better equipped to positively impact their work performance and engagement levels.

When team members fail to do some task as per expectations, guide them to better performance through words of encouragement. Since criticism adversely affects enthusiasm to work, advice and guidance help them to do a better job. The more genuine and approachable a leader, the greater will be ability to lead the people.

Employees are the most important resources of an organization. Employees are the knowledge base of an organization. Their skills and suggestions are indispensable for the success of an organization. Along with the skill required to perform the duties of their rules, employees have hidden potential pertaining to several other areas. The hidden potentials are an ability to think logically or under pressure, convincing people, social skills, negotiation skills, organization skills, mentoring skills, psychological skills, counseling skill and other abilities which are demonstrated only when there is a

need for them. The employees can possess these abilities irrespective of their rank and roles in the organization. Organizations identify, handle and utilize these abilities.

Employee’s abilities and participation are the two factors for their empowerment. Employees empowerment means giving them power and authority to make decision on their own. They do not interfere in the work of their subordinates, of course there are restrictions. Empowerment reinforces self-confidence. It makes them feel trusted and valued by fair organization. They feel more responsible and loyalty and commitment also increases. It improves interaction between the employees, their work relations and team spirit. Participation is possible only with the transparent style of management. The vision, goals and expectation of the organization must be clearly communicated to employees. This allows employees to get insight into the values and priorities of the organization. This will have influence on the decisions they make and finally employee must be duly rewarded for their initiatives and achievements to maintain the climate.

Values represents a state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence. They contain a moral flavour in that they carry an individual’s ideas as to what is right. Desirable value systems represent prioritizing of individual values in relation to their relative importance. In other words, all have a set of values that form a value system. This system is identified by the relative importance assigned to such values - freedom, pleasure, self-respect, honesty, obedience and equality. We all have values, what we think to be important influences our attitudes and our behaviour.

Values lay the foundation for the understanding of attitudes, personality and motivations. Individuals enter organization with perceived notice of what ‘ought’ and ‘ought not’ to be. They contain interpretation of right or wrong. The values are derived from parents, teachers,
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and friends and from views expressed in media (television, radio and newspaper). There are six types of values:

1. Theoretical value - high importance on the discovery of truth through a critical and rational approach.
2. Economic value – emphasizes the useful and practical
3. Aesthetic value - plans high importance on form and harmony
4. Social value - highest value given to love of people
5. Political value - places emphasis on requisition of power and influence
6. Religious value - concerned with the unity of experience and understanding of the cosmos as a whole.

Likewise there are seven levels of values:

Level 1: Practice - human beings react to basic physiological needs, Level 2: Tribalistic - individual characterized by high dependence influenced by, tradition and authority. Aggressive and selfish- they respond primarily to power level. Conformity - Individuals have difficulty in accepting people whose values differ from their own and desire that other accept their Manipulative- they are materialistic and actively seek higher status and recognitions level Socio-centric - these individuals consider it more important to be liked and to get along with others than to get ahead and Existential - they are outspoken, restrictive policies and arbitrary use of authority.

These seven levels of categorization of values contribute towards individuals different attitudes and varying behaviour. Attitudes are evaluative statement either favourable (or) un-favourable concerning objects, people or events. Attitudes are not same as values but they are closely related. Like values, attitudes are acquired from parents, teachers, and peer group members.
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Perception can be defined as a process by which individuals organize and interpret their sensory impressions in order to give meaning to their environment. A number of factors operate to shape or distort perception (i.e.) factor can reside in the perceiver, in the object or target being perceived or in context of the situation in which the perception is made. Our perception and judgment of a person’s action, significantly influenced by the assumptions we make about the person’s internal state. Organizational climate is usually an accident of all previous decisions and interactions. Yet climate is crucial to optimal contribution of the work force. Organizations also have a healthy internal environment. Management is not really concerned with what people think but it is very involved in what people may do as a result of thinking.  

Definitions of Organizational Climate:

Morgan defines as Organizational climate is concerned to a large extent with ‘atmosphere’ or ‘mood’. Climate may be thought of as the ‘personality’ of an organization as seen by its members.

According to Payne and Pugh, climate refers principally to the prevalent attitudes, values, norms and feelings of the employees, concerning the organization.

Litwin and Stringer define organizational climate as a set of measurable properties of the work environment, perceived directly or indirectly by the people who live and work in that environment, which influences their motivation and behaviour.

Forehand and Gilmer have defined organizational climate as a “Set of Characteristics that describe an organization and that (a) distinguish one
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organization from another organizations (b) are relatively enduring over time and (c) influence the behaviour of people in the organization”.

Pareek defined organizational climate as the perceived attitudes of an organization and its subsystems, as reflected in the way an organization deals with the members, groups and issues.

Pritchard and Karasick, observe that organizational climate is a “relatively enduring quality of an organization’s internal environment distinguishing it from other organizations: (a) which results from the behaviour and policies of members of the organization (b) which is perceived by members of the organization (c) which serve as a basis for interpreting the situation, (d) act as a source of pressure for directing activity”.

According to Koith Davis, “organization climate means the favorableness (or) un-favorableness of the environment for people in the organization”.

John Campbell et.al. define organizational climate as a “set of attributes specific to a particular organization that may be induced from the way the organization deals with its members and its environment”. Organizational climate reflects a person’s perception of the organization in which he is engaged. Organizational climate is a set of attributes and factor that are perceived by employees about their organization and which influence their behaviour.

Synthesize definition of organization climate offered by the authors Gilmer, Taguri, Meyer, Georgopoulos, Litwin, Stringer and Gillerman define organizational climate as a relatively enduring quality of an organization's internal environment distinguishing it from other organizations: (a) which results from the behavior and policies of members of the organization, especially top management (b) which is perceived by members of the organization (c) which serve as a basis for interpreting the situation; and (d) act as a source of pressure for directing activity.36

Development of the Conceptual Framework of Organizational Climate

The earliest reference of organizational climate is found in the article of Lewin, Lippitt and White37. The concept of organizational climate was first developed by Kivid Lewin in 1939 and it refers to the behavior, attitudes and feelings of the organization which influence its operational processes, such as problem solving and decision making. This article is focused on the experimentally created social climates of a number of groups of teenagers. But the author failed to provide any conceptual framework or the technique of measurement of organizational climate. The article mainly emphasized on the relationship between leadership style and social climate. Climate was again mentioned in an article by Fleishman.38 This article discussed the development of leadership attitude and its implication through the measurement of behavioral scales. In this article Fleishman discusses the leadership climate as a construct but he did not explain the concept of climate very elaborately.

Climate was comprehensively defined by Argyris39 (1958). In his attempt to diagnose the group dynamics in a bank, Argyris introduced the concept of organizational climate. In that paper Argyris defends climate in terms of formal organizational policies, employee’s needs, values and personalities. This paper
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triggers off the popular ambiguity between culture and climate that persisted till late 1970’s in the realm of organizational studies. The book, “The Human side of Enterprise” \(^{40}\) opened a new horizon of management science.\(^{41}\) It introduced many pioneering concepts of organizational and industrial psychology. McGregor in his book elaborated the concept of managerial climate. He argued that the climate is primarily determined by the managerial assumptions and relationship between the managers and the subordinates. There were, of course, draw backs on the conceptual framework of McGregor, because he did not present any technique of measurement of organizational climate. Secondly, it is culture, not climate which are measured by the set of assumptions. Climate is more dependent on perceptions rather than assumptions. Apart from this principal research work, there were also other studies and the collection of all the research work ultimately provided the initial frame work of organizational climate. Gregopoulos\(^{42}\) considered the Organizational climate as structure and defined organization climate as a normative structure of attitudes and behavioural standards which provided a basis for interpreting the situation and act as a source of pressure for directing activities.

Frederickson\(^{43}\) had drawn the following conclusions from his study of 260 middle managers: (i) innovative climate yielded greater productivity; (2) innovative climate yielded more predictable task performances; (3) subjects employed different work methods depending upon the climate ; and (4) climates which promoted freedom had administrators who dealt with employees in a more personal and direct sense, while in restrictive climates, the administrators tended to work through more formal channels. Frederickson gave more importance to type of climate namely innovative and restrictive
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climates but, Litwin and Stringer\textsuperscript{44} reported based on two studies, organizational climate was taken as an intervening variable and the leadership styles were independent variables and different styles of leadership could create different climates. Authoritarian climates lead to higher levels of power motivation, low satisfaction and negative attitudes towards the group and low innovativeness and productivity. Friendly climate on the other hand leads to high level of affiliation motivation, high satisfaction, moderate innovation and low performance. Achieving climate leads to a high level of achievement motivation and productivity. From the second study, a change in management and the employees in one plant (the experimental plant), showed higher levels of responsibility, risks, reward and organizational identity compared to the control plant. Litwin and Stringer have stated that the concept of climate is useful to characterize various environments, to allow cross environmental comparison as well as for planning, changing and evaluation of organizational change efforts\textsuperscript{45}.

Kaizka, E and Kricke\textsuperscript{46} found that performance was affected by organizational climate though not in all cases. Employee centered climate had higher performance (That is lower unit cost and high Profits) and it also yielded higher sociological and psychological satisfaction (that is work - group cohesion, low group pressure for task performance) than task - centered climate.

Friedlander and Margulis \textsuperscript{47} based on their study of 95 production workers reported that organizational climate was a significant determination of individual satisfaction in terms of interpersonal relations, task - involved self realization and advancement. In their extensive research work Litwin and
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Stringer (1966) provided a very comprehensive framework of six dimensions of organizational climate that include (i) structure (ii) responsibility (iii) reward (iv) risk (v) warmth and (vi) support. In another book by Litwin and Stringer (1968), emphasis was given on the concept of climate and its influence on the McClelland’s need factors of motivation (i.e.) n-power, n- achievement and n-affiliation. Attempt was also made to establish the operationalization of climate through the assessment of members’ perceptions. During this time the actual concept of organizational climate began to take shape.

But in a study by Schneider and Bartlett\textsuperscript{48} attempt was made to develop a measurement for climate study. The authors conducted extensive empirical study on the employees in Life Insurance Companies by developing two sets of separate dimensions. First was in the managerial level and another in the field agent component level. By this time the studies on organizational climate has established the fact that it can be conceptualized and measured through the shared perceptions of the organizational members and almost all the contemporary studies embraced the concept. Fried Lander and Greenberg\textsuperscript{49} in their study on a sample of 478 workers found that workers who perceived climate as supportive tended to rate their supervisors more favorably in job training situations, more effective in their work behavior and also as more competent than those who perceived climate as less supportive.

Pritchord and Karanasick\textsuperscript{50} in their study of 76 managers found that the organizational climate was more strongly related to job satisfaction experienced by the managers’ performance. They also concluded that highly supportive climate is more likely to be associated with higher job satisfaction,


irrespective of the managers’ personality characteristics. They considered five personality needs viz., the needs for achievement, affiliation, autonomy, order and dominance. However, managers with the high need for order tended to perform better in a highly structured climate. Similarly, managers with a high need for autonomy were more satisfied in a climate characterized as high in decision centralization.

Cawsey\textsuperscript{51} in his study of 600 Insurance personnel he used Litwin and Stringer’s Organizational climate questionnaire and reported the following findings: job satisfaction increased as the individuals perceived environment as having more achievement opportunities. Individuals in the achieving climate rated themselves as higher performers than those in less achieving climate. However, sub - samples showed differences: Salesmen were rated higher in performance if they perceived achievement climate, whereas in the case of clerks, power climate was related to their performance. The nature of jobs contributed to such differences.

In an unique effort, James and Jones\textsuperscript{52} reviewed all the previous relevant researches, definitions, conceptual frameworks and measurement approaches and differentiated them into three principal categories. According to them, all the major theoretical concerns and relevant researches related to organizational climate can be divided into 3 approaches.(i) Multiple Measurements Organizational Attribute Approach (MMOAA), (ii) Perceptual Measurements Organizational Attribute Approach (PMOAA) and (iii) Perceptual Measurements Individual Attribute Approach (PMIAA)\textsuperscript{53}
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**Multiple Measurements Organizational Attribute Approach**

The most suitable definition of organizational climate under this approach was provided by Forehand and Gilmar. They defined organizational climate as a set of characteristics that (i) distinguish the organization from the other organization (ii) are relatively enduring over time and (iii) influence the behaviour of the people in the organization.

According to Forehand and Gilmar’s model of MMOAA, dimensions of Organizational climate are

1. Size
2. Structure
3. Leadership style
4. Goal directions

They follow field studies and experimental studies as research design and individual perception and objective indices as measurement procedure.

Forehand and Gilmar approach is a much generalized conceptual framework and lacks the degree of precision that can provide the objective measurement of Organizational Climate. The precise nature and implication of organizational climate tends to be lost in the dimensions and parameters, derived from different areas of Industrial Psychology. Some studies under MMOAA are “An examination of Blau-Scott and Etzioni typologies”, by Hall, Organizational size and member participation some empirical test on alternative explanations by Indik and Studies on different organizational processes like leadership, conflict, reward, communication and control in the Organizational Model and Taxonomy area.

In Organizational context area, Study on Organization and environment by Lawrence and Lorsch, study on The construct of organizational structure by Purge et. al and study on Industrial organization by Woodward have carried on under MMOAA.
Porter and Lawler and Puge et. al. studied on Properties of organization structure in relation to job attitudes and job behaviour on the dimensions of organization structure under MMOAA.

**Perceptual Measurement - Organization Attribute Approach**

Under this approach the most appropriate definition was given by Campbell et al. Organizational climate was defined as ‘set of attributes specific to a particular organization that may be induced from the organization, deals with its members and its environment. For the individual member within an organization, climate takes the forms of a set of attitude and expectancies which describe the organization in terms of both static characteristics and behaviour outcome. The researchers proposed four parameters of organizational situation, viz. (i) structural properties (ii) environmental characteristics (iii) organizational climate and (iv) formal role characteristics. They presented four dimensions of organizational climate which are Individual Autonomy, Initiative, Reward and Consideration and Warmth and Support. The factors such as individual responsibility, agent independence, rule orientation and opportunities for energizing individual initiative are under Individual Autonomy dimension. The Initiative dimension factors are organization structure, managerial structure and closeness of supervision. Reward orientation factors are reward, general –achievement, orientation and profit and sales orientation. Managerial support and warmth and support are the factors under the dimension of consideration, Warmth and support.

PMOAA model suggested that organizational climate is an individual perception of the organization and the set of properties governs the individual behaviour. Climate itself was perceived as a situational variable or organizational main effect.

The perceptual model based on organizational attribute raised some difficulties. There may be significant difference between actual and perceived situation in terms of behaviour and attitude. It is also difficult to establish a
direct relationship between objective and perceptual factors. The difficulties uncounted by the PMOAA model was tried to be resolved through a model proposed by Indik. The linkage model stated that the bond between an independent variable and a dependent variable formed by two set of processes - organizational processes from the side of independent variables and psychological processes from the side of dependent variables.

The perceptually measured Organizational processes while the characteristics of the responses are determined by the psychological processes.

**Perceptual Measurements - Individual Attribute Approach (PMIAA)**

Schneider and his associates were the champions of the third approach in the research domain of organizational climate. Schneider and Hall presented organizational climate as a set of global perceptions held by individuals about their organizational environment. The set of perceptions are basically the result of interaction between personal and organizational characteristics. Schneider et al. used system approach to explain the concept. They considered individual as an information processor and the inputs used are: i) an objective events and characteristics of the organization and (ii) characteristics of the perceiver. Organizational climate was imagined as a summary evaluation of events based upon the interaction between actual events and the perception of these events. Schneider described climate perceptions as the results of a process concept formation, based on macro observations of the organization. This conceptualization of organizational climate bears many resemblance of the PMOAA model. In both approaches, organizational climate is viewed as the sum of total perceptions based on the interaction between individual perceptions and organizational environment.\(^{54}\) PMOAA emphasized organizational climate from the viewpoint of the organization and put greater emphasis on organizational attributes. PMIAA on the other hand focused on organizational climate as the sum total of the individual attributes neglecting
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the organizational parts. From a long series of studies by various organizational scientists, it was established that the perceptually measured organizational climate represents a set of responses to the organizational processes, while the characteristics of the responses are determined by the psychological processes.  

Collective Climate – An Union of Approaches

Both psychological and organizational climate have very strong influence on the individual in terms of job performance, work attitude etc. The Collective climates are based on the perceptions of the individuals who share common multidimensional description of their work environment. The concept of collective climate has been studied from the individual view points by James, James Joyce and Slocum. The concept has also been studied in terms of technology, workforce, demographics and required work interactions. Collective climate is the perception of particular organizational practices. Organization influences the perceptions with various factors but through structure, technology and control system. The collective climate unified the organizational climate from the organizational view point and psychological climate is based on individual’s perception on organizational practices and procedures. The organizational climate can be described as the aggregate perceptions of the characteristics of the organizations. The dimensions of the organizational attributes have been mixed up with the dimensions from individual attributes. James and Jones, insisted on the use of the term organizational climate in case of organizational attributes. In the case of individual attributes, the scholars use term psychological climate. James and Jones (1979) derived six dimensions based on the individual attributes are

a. Leadership facilitation and support
b. Work-group co-operation, friendliness and warmth
c. Conflict and ambiguity
d. Professional and organizational spirit

e. Job challenges, importance and variety
f. Mutual trust

In the latter researches, the individual attributes approach has gained more importance. Glick, in a study made critical review of Organizational and psychological climate theories. Ryder and Southy, in their study explored the usefulness of the measurement scales provided by James and Jones and established the validity of the dimensions provided by them.

This conceptualization of organizational climate bears many resemblance to the PMOAA model. In both approaches, organizational climate is viewed as the sum of total perceptions based on the interaction between individual perceptions and organizational environment. PMOAA emphasized on organizational climate from the view point of the organization and put greater emphasis on organizational attributes. PMIAA on the other hand focused on organizational climate as the sum total of the individual attributes neglecting the organizational parts. Measurement comes into picture once a model is established and boundaries are clearly defined. More over the dimensions of the organizational attributes have been mixed up with the dimensions from individual attributes. Cognitive approach regards the climate as individual perception and cognitive representation of the work environment. So assessment should be conducted at an individual level.

Following the work of Lewin, researches done during the late 1950s and the early 1970s emphasized the human context of organizations, with particular emphasis on individual-level and organizational outcomes. Climate or atmosphere created in the work place has important consequences such that the conditions created in the work place influence the extent to which an employee is satisfied, gives his or her services to the organization, and performs up to potential, directed toward achieving the organization’s objective. Different types of Climate Study i.e. Initiative climate, Supportive climate, Achievement

climate, Task oriented climate, Demographic (employee), Oriented climate etc. were conducted till 1981. But after 1981, the studies are concentrated on the relationship between Organizational climate and other variables. A large number of studies have consistently demonstrated relationships between psychological climate and individual level outcomes such as satisfaction, commitment, performance and stress. Likewise, a number of cross-level studies have consistently demonstrated positive relationships between unit or organizational climate and individual outcomes such as performance, satisfaction, commitment, involvement and accidents.

Organizational climate comprises of shared perceptions about organizational norms, beliefs, values, practices, and procedures that can be observed at general or specific levels. Organizational climate has been shown to predict organizational effectiveness, job satisfaction and performance, employee motivation, and organizational commitment (Patterson and West, 2004). Psychological research has revealed that if organizational climate is characterized by distrust, lack of communication, personal antipathies, limited individual autonomy, and unclear goals, the organizational effectiveness will inhibits the strong associations between organizational climate and performance.

Organizational climate, according to Veldsman, refers to the psychological structures of organizations and their sub-units, and can also be described as the personality or character of the organization’s internal environment. The internal environment is influenced by various forces and in turn influences aspects such as employee achievement, behaviour, attitudes and job satisfaction. Equity, friendliness, cooperativeness and challenge are intrinsically psychological. Constructs such as equity and challenge reflect the
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acquired meanings that environments have for individuals, which is why climate is usually defined as a product of cognitive appraisals of working environments. Aggregating organizational climate, like culture, is beyond the bounds of the present treatment, while the characteristics of organizational climate may vary from one organization to another, there are also common elements of climate across different organizations, Moran and Volkwein. The climate in the organization has a vital impact on individuals in the workplace. Furnham, describes the significant relationship between organizational climate and the job satisfaction and job performance of employees in the workplace. A further distinction can be made between actual climate and the perceived climate in an organization. Mullins, argues that a healthy organizational climate might be expected to exhibit such characteristic features as the integration of organizational goals and personal goals. A flexible structure with a network of authority, control and communications, and with autonomy for individual members Fisher and Fraser, Dorman et al. and Cresswell and Fisher. Bedell and Mumford (2007) have revived numerous approaches of climate assessment for creativity.

There are many studies reveals organizational climate is positive affects to the commitment relationship towards organization. The better organizational climate is, the more organizational commitment (Clercq and Rius, 2007; Pati and Reilly, 1977; Ruth, 1992). Many workers have experience the effect of organizational climate at some point on their performance and commitment. Since climate measures subsume the major organizational characteristics workers experience, virtually any study of employee perceptions of their work setting can be thought of as a climate study. Studies link climate features particularly leadership, communication openness and participative management and conflict resolution with employee satisfaction and inversely stress levels. Stressful organizational climates are characterized by limited
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participation in decisions, use of punishment and negative feedback (rather than rewards and positive feedback), conflict avoidance or confrontation (rather than problem solving), and non supportive group and leader relations. Socially supportive climates benefit employee mental health, with lower rates of anxiety and depression in supportive settings (Repetti, When collective climates exist where members who interact with each other share common perceptions of the organization, research observes that shared perceptions of undesirable organizational features are linked with low morale and instances of psychogenic illness. When research on climate adopts specific focus, as in the study of climate for safety in an organization, evidence is provided that lack of openness in communication regarding safety issues, few rewards for reporting occupational hazards, and other negative climate features increase the incidence of work-related accidents and injury (Zohar ).

A study across teacher groups formed in schools on the basis of subject taught, gender, marital status, educational level, age, and seniority has been reported by Gunbayi, 2007. Therefore, it is, proposed to study organisational climate across groups formed on the basis of age, hierarchical level, educational qualification, and function performed, Lynn, Barksdale and Shore have reported that age influences the perception of employee commitment to the organization. In addition, Quazi has advanced that education level influences the perception of corporate social responsibility. Furthermore, Singh has reported that an employee’s hierarchical level influences his/her perception of inequity in the organisation. Moreover, Schminke, Cropanzano and Rupp reported that an employee’s hierarchical level influences his/her perception of distributional and procedural fairness in the organisation. In addition, Waller, Huber and Glick have demonstrated that functional background is a determinant of the selective perception of executives. The influence of personal variables on individual perception has been illustrated by these studies. On the other hand, studies on the influence of personal variables on organizational

climate are not easy to find. Studies of organizational climate across groups formed on the basis of personal variables in companies have generally not been reported in the literature. Such a study across teacher groups formed in schools on the basis of subject taught, gender, marital status, educational level, age, and seniority, however, has been reported by Gunbayi (2007).

Climate represents a relatively homogenous set of beliefs and perceptions towards the organization, while climate theory is primarily focused on the process through which such homogeneity occurs (Moran and Volkwein). Climate theory has evolved considerably over the past twenty-five years, stemming from the structural approach where organizational dimensions, hierarchy and size, were theorized to be dominant contributors to climate. From these origins, climate theory and focus of climate research shifted to perceptual approach in which the individual was perceived to be the core factor in climate formation. These two approaches were widely criticized. Such criticism provided the impetus for the development of interactive approach formation. The structural approach was initially proposes by Payne and Pugh who argued that climate is an attribute of organizational characteristics such as size, structure, leadership style and systems complexity. While it is acknowledged in the structural approach that individual personality will play a role in the development of homogenous attitudes and perception, it is argued that exposure to similar organizational characteristics and experiences that play the dominant role (Schenider and Reichers). The perceptual or attraction attrition approach to climate formation proposes that climate originates from within the individual. In this approach, the individual is the source of climate imposing meaning on the organization and its components. The structural and perceptual approaches have both been criticized for each considering only one side of what is relatively complex process. i.e. the creation of homogenous

beliefs and perceptions. Organizations and individuals are complex and a
dynamic, changing and evolving over time to reflect the interaction that occurs
between the two. A more appropriate approach is that of the interactive
approach. The interactive to climate formation is a considerable advancement
from the structural and perceptual approaches. This approach argues that
through the interaction between the individual and their environment, a shared
perceptions or climate is generated. In the interactive, approach climate is
defined as aggregated effect of the interaction between the characteristics of the
person and the organization. Climate is created thorough the interaction
between members of the organization and the exchange of information through
communication. Therefore, through various common experiences and
conversations, a shared set of meanings are created. Zohar D demonstrate
that variation in behaviour at the level of the individual supervisor the group
climate level of analysis affected safety behaviours and it was plausible that
this would hold for other aspects of climate.

Neal, Griffin and Hart investigated link between general
organizational climate and specific safety climate and that these perceptions of
safety climate influenced safety performance through their effects on
knowledge and motivation. School climate research suggests that positive
interpersonal relationships and optimal learning reduce maladaptive
behaviour. A number of studies by Dennis Rose and colleagues, have found
a very strong link between organizational climate and employee reactions such
as stress levels, absenteeism, commitment and participation. Employees’
perceptions of their organizations’ climate can influence their tendencies to
behave positively or negatively or ethically. Because encompasses structure
and standards of organization, division of responsibility, reward system,
support and warm working conditions dimensions. Therefore, if organizations

climate, Human Relations, 45, 19-47.
68 http://shodhgana.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/12973/7/07/_chapter%202.pdf
69 Ibid.
70 Ibid.
treat their employees with trust and respect, adhoc fair policies, positive rules and procedures concerning with employees ‘ well being , so employee behaviors’ can be progress positive levels \(^{71}\)(Litzky et al..). Researchers have conducted various studies which show its causes on individual and organizational levels. Individual and organizational factors that have been demonstrated to have a significant effect on employee’s behaviors is organizational climate( Patterson) \(^{72}\). When organizational climate affects the prevalence of employees positive or counteractive behaviours and when organizational climate are perceived as more supportive socially and emotionally by employees, they generally tend to lower the level of counterproductive behaviors. (Kidwell and Valentine, 2009)\(^{73}\). Perceived organizational climate influence the attitude and behaviours of employees in organization influence the attitudes and behaviors of employees in a organizations as climate perceptions are believed to be the functional link between the employees and objective characteristics of the work environment like formal , informal policies, procedures and practices, Scheurer,2010. Thus, the climate is employee oriented, the employee would orient his or her behavior to attain organizational goal. A number of cross-level studies have consistently demonstrate positive relationship between unit or organizational climate and individual outcomes such as performance, satisfaction, commitment, involvement and accidents.

**Objective Versus Perceptual Climate**

In contrast to the approach based on Litwin’s work that climate was driven largely by leadership and practiced, Payne and Pugh \(^{74}\) suggested that

---


climate was produced by the objective context and structure of the organization, size, hierarchy, span of control, resources and rate of turnover. Controversy continued whether climate was an objective organizational property or a subjective and perceptual one. A related controversy centered on whether climate was an individual or organizational attribute. To resolve this issue, a distinction between *psychological climate* when climate is conceptualized and measured at the individual level and *organizational climate* when climate is conceptualized and studied as an organizational variable was proposed by James and Jones.

Nevertheless, debate continued during the 1980s over whether *organizational* climate should be measured through objective features of organizations or through assessments of how individuals perceive the organization by L. R. James, Joyce et al. James and his colleagues argued that since organizational climate arises out of cognitive appraisals and social constructions of individuals, measures of organizational climate should rely on the individual as the basic unit of theory and thus it is appropriate to describe organizations in psychological terms. When consensus among individuals in their perceptions of climate can be demonstrated, the perceptions can be meaningfully aggregated to represent unit or organizational climate. More attention was given to individuals’ perceptions than to organizational characteristics, and psychological meaningfulness became an explicit part of the definition. The distinction between psychological climate as an individual

---


perception and organizational climate as a shared perception is widely
accepted.\textsuperscript{80}

\textbf{Organization Climate and Culture: Relativity and Differences}

Pritchard and Karasick consider organizational climate as a casual factor in job satisfaction. Various climate dimensions are determinants of individual job satisfaction.

Rejecting the casual viewpoint, Johanesson\textsuperscript{81} claimed that climate and satisfaction are\textsuperscript{82} so similar that they are in the fact redundant measures. Climate researchers, instead of attempting to write items which are unique to climate, have borrowed items from established means. Thus, new measures have been created from ‘old’ satisfaction measures.

Perceptual researchers have tended to use methods of measurement (i.e. describe work situation) which are identical to those methods often employed by satisfaction researchers. Feelings influence descriptions. If feeling heavily influence description of perceptions, or the perception themselves, how can derivatives of them be called satisfaction dimension at one point in time and climate dimensions at another.

Commenting on Johansson’s criticisms of the organizational climate construct, Hellriegel and Slocum\textsuperscript{83} state:

At the conceptual level we would expect and be quite disturbed if the dimensions of climate did not include many of the same categories frequently found in satisfaction scales and instruments. Climate instruments allege to


\textsuperscript{82} Irancevich and Lyon, 1972, Prichard & Carasic, 1933.Organizational and organizational culture, Personnel Psychology, pp471-473

\textsuperscript{83} Johannesson, R.E, (1973). \textit{op.cit.}, PP. 118-144.
describe work environments whereas satisfaction instruments serve to evaluate them. While a number of studies have reported significant correlation between organizational climates and satisfaction. It is premature to asset that satisfaction affects climate or climate affect satisfaction. From a system point of view it is reasonable to expect considerable interrelationship between two concepts.

Thus Hellriogel and Slocum have made explicit the essential difference between measures of climate and measures of satisfaction. Degaingational climate attempt to measure properties of the work environment, where as satisfaction measures assets the affective response to facts of the work environment. Ivancevich and Lyon state:

It is author’s contention, based on previous organizational analysis and an extensive review of prior climate research that the casual direction is from climate to satisfaction. ……… various climate dimensions are determinants of individual job satisfaction.

Litwin and stringer found that distinctive organizational climates could be created in the laboratory by varying leadership style. These climates could be created in short periods of time and have fairly stable characteristics. Once created, these climates have significant influence on motivation and correspondingly on performance and job satisfaction. 84

Schneider and Snyder present in the following distinction between organizational climates and job satisfaction.

Organizational climate is adequately conceptualized as a summary perception which people have in an organization. It is then a global impression of what an organizational is. The global nature of organizational climate is in no way suggest the concept is undimensional. Many different classes of events or organizational practices may contribute to the global or summary

84 Litwin, G.H and Stringer, R.A,(1968).Motivation and Organizational Climate, Harvard University, p.35
perception people have to their organization. Thus, each individual perceive or conceptualizes his organization in a number of different ways depending upon the concept and the standard of information about the organization which operate for the individual. He may perceive the climate as work oriented and innovation-oriented and supportive. Each such summary perception may be differently relevant to other organizational variable.

Regardless of the dimensions of climate under consideration, climate perceptions are perceptions of organizational event and conditions that occur in the work settings. Organizational climate is composed of a number of dimensions and those dimensions may be assessed by reference to a number of interrelated conditions. Thus organizational climate perceptions are descriptive of conditions that exist in the environment; the perceptions are not evaluative or effective.

Satisfaction is more likely to be representative of perception which has been compared to the person’s internal standard of needs and values and is more properly conceptualized as satisfaction.

Job satisfaction is more adequately conceptualized as a personalistic evolution of conditions existing as the job or outcomes that arise as a result of having a job (pay, security etc). Job satisfaction is the perception of internal response or feeling and it consists of filtered and processed perceptions, perceptions filtered through individual’s system of norms, values, expectations and so forth. Thus, organizational climate is organization and description oriented and satisfaction is individual evaluation oriented.\(^\text{85}\)

\[^{85}\text{Benjamin Schneider, (Personnal Psychology), p.471-473.}\]
Difference between Organizational Climate and Organization Culture

Climate is the atmosphere that employees perceive and it is created in their organization by practice, procedures and rewards. Perception based on the executive behavior and the actions they rewarded. Though climate resembles the concept of culture, there are some basic differences.

Schneider and Rentsch consider climate to the message that organizational routines Policies, practices, Procedures, etc… and reward systems supports, expectations and various kinds of reward systems. They define culture as values and norms underlying such organizational routines and rewards, in addition to the shared assumptions about organizational life reflected in these norms and values.

Organizational climate is a descriptive concept based on individual perceptions of the social environment of an organization. Employees observe what happen to them and around them, and then draw conclusions about their organization’s priorities. Thus, these perceptions provide employees with direction and orientation about where they should focus their energies and expectations. Climate represents experimental descriptions or perception of what happens, culture helps define why these things happen.86

Although culture and climate have been approached differently and have their roots in different disciplines, they are both about understanding psychological phenomena in organization. Both concepts rest upon the assumption of shared meanings – a shared understanding of some aspects of the organizational context. Thus climate is the manifestation or communicated form of culture. The organizational routines i.e the what measured in climate research are interpreted and given meaning i.e the why by organizational members, as assessed by cultural researchers.87

86 Organizational Culture and Climate, Chapter, 22, pp. 565-587 and p. 65.
87 Sangeetha Tripathi and Nachiketa Tripathi, “The Effect of Organizational Climate on Organizational Success”, Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, pp. 162.
Climate pertains to employees’ fundamental ideologies and assumption and influenced by symbolic interpretations of organizational events and artifacts. Culture represents an evolved context embedded in systems i.e. is more stable than climate, has strong roots in history is collectively held and is resistant to manipulation.\(^8\)

Thus climate is more immediate than culture. Individuals can sense the climate upon entering an organization through things such as physical appearance of the place, the emotionality and attitudes exhibited by employees and experience and treatment of visitors and new employee members.

In contrast, culture is deeper phenomenon based on symbolic meanings that reflect one core values and underlying ideologies and assumptions. This interpretative process explains the of organizational behaviour. Climate develops from the deeper core of culture, can result from exposed values and shared assumptions and reflects the surface organizational experience based on policies, practices and procedures.

Individuals’ background, characteristics and process of joining the organization are related to individual’s values and social cognitive processes, which in turn influence psychological climate. When these climate perceptions are shared across organization’s employees, organizational climate is said to emerge. These shared perceptions will develop when strong emergent processes are enacted in the organization Practice delivered in such a way as to create a strong situation, homogeneity of attributes among employees, social interaction processes and leadership. When the emergent process is weak, idiosyncratic perceptions within the organization develop which produces wide variability in perception of climate and can result in wide variability in individual attitudes and behaviours, diminishing the relationship to organizational performance.

\(^8\) Ibid., 566.
Individual level constricts are influenced in part by the existing organizational level constructs (individual climate perceptions are influenced by the existing organizational climate; individual attitudes and behaviours are influenced in part by collective attitude and behavior) and at the same time individual constructs have a role in creating the contextual variables.

The Approaches of Climate

In terms of the content of climate, attempts have been made to determine the dimensions and categories of climate. Different approaches and terms have proliferated. Accordingly there are three approaches namely the molar, generic, and strategic approaches.

Molar Climate Approach

Litwin and Stringer denoted climate as a molar construct that captures the motivational value of the total situation and Schneider provided a general definition of climate perceptions as “psychologically meaningful molar descriptions that people can agree characterize a system’s practices and procedures”. A similar view was proposed by James and James in that a higher-order factor underlies measurements of psychological climate, termed as psychological climate. Climate perceptions are based on emotionally relevant cognitions, and so they share a single latent component that reflects the subjective valuations of the environment. Molar climate is relevant for understanding individual-level or collective attitudinal outcomes. Thus molar

93 James, L. A., and James, L. R. (1989). op. cit., 74, 739–75
climate is based on an additive compensatory model. That is, scores on various dimensions of climate viz. autonomy, cooperation, leader support, and role stress are averaged or combined additively. A summed or aggregate score across dimensions has little practical meaning or utility as it does not allow for isolating the more important dimensions or those that are not in alignment. Thus, a system approach has been proposed to identify the configurations or patterns that exist across multiple dimensions or aspects of climate, that is, the pattern of high and low scores across all climate dimensions. Each configure system represents the overall pattern of climate across dimensions and can then be related to outcomes of interest and the whole is more than the sum of the parts.

Generic Climate Approach

In addition to molar climate, early attention was devoted to the study of multiple climates within an organization. Researchers attempted to define a set of broad dimensions that represent the most important aspects of organizational climate that are relevant across organizations. These attempts set the broad-based generalizable facets such as autonomy, structure, reward orientation and consideration, leader support, role stress, autonomy and cooperation, or affective, instrumental, and cognitive facets with associated dimensions for each facet.

Integration among Molar, Generic, and Strategic Approaches

Integrations of molar, generic, and strategic climates are emerging. At the molar level, Burke and his colleagues propose the existence of multiple higher order climates or multiple psychological climates that combine generic and strategic climates, that is, a higher order climate for well-being and a higher order climate for service. Another potentially useful framework for integrating climate approaches was developed by Patterson and his colleagues.

---

The climate survey developed based on this framework should allow researchers to simultaneously consider multiple types and approaches to climate as well as to make comparisons between culture and climate.

Antecedents of Climate

Lindell and Brandt revealed that climate mediated the relationship between a number of antecedents such as formalization, leadership and team process, and outcomes such as attitudes and turnover. The context, organizational practices and leadership are potentially important antecedent variables. Organizational-level variation in age has been shown to be important for organizational climate of age discrimination and the demographic composition of the organization has been related to women’s psychological climate perceptions of gender inequity across various occupation. Recently, research has supported the relationship between human resource practices and organizational climate. Finally, top management and leaders have proposed as important direct or indirect factors that are believed to influence organizational climate due to the fact that managers and leaders are largely responsible for communicating meaning. Leaders’ personality leader’s moral development Leadership style have influenced climate.

Outcomes of Climate

A climate has been related to various attitudinal and performance-based outcomes. Organizational Climate has a major influence on human performance through its impact on individual motivation and job satisfaction. Individuals in the organization have certain expectations and fulfillment of

these expectations depends upon their perception as how the Organizational climate suits to the satisfaction of their needs. Thus organizational climate provides a type of work environment in which individuals feels satisfied or dissatisfied. Since satisfaction of an individual goes a long way in exterminating his efficiency, organizational climate can be said to be directly related to his performance in the organization.

There are fourth mechanisms by which organizational climate affect performance, satisfaction and attitudes of people in the organization. First, organizational variables can operate as constraint systems in both a positive and negative sense by providing knowledge of what kinds of behaviour are rewarded, punished or ignored. The organization can influence behaviour by attaining different rewards and punishments to varying behaviours. This assignment of values to behavioural outcomes would then influence the behaviour of those people most interested in those specific values. Secondly, organizational variables may affect behaviour through evaluation of the self and others, and such evaluation will, in turn, influence behaviour. There are both physiological and psychological variables associated with this evaluation process. Thirdly, organizational factors work as stimuli. As stimuli they influence an individual’s arouse level, which is a motivational variable directing behaviour. The level of arouse will directly affect the level of activation and hence performance. Fourthly, organizational variables influence the behaviour in that they influence the individual to form a perception of the organization. This perception then influences behaviour, thus organizational climate influences the way an individual in the organization behaves. Climate influences individuals’ level outcomes through its impact on employee cognitive and affective states, Job satisfaction, morale, commitment and motivation. Level of employee satisfaction etc. mediates the influence of climate on people performance related outcomes.

---

Individual-Level Outcomes

Two types of studies have been conducted to examine the impact of climate on individual outcomes: (a) individual-level studies examining relations between psychological climate perceptions and individual outcomes and (b) cross-level studies whereby aggregated unit or organizational climate scores are related to individual outcomes. Two meta-analyses have demonstrated consistent relationships between psychological climate and individual outcomes. Climate (affective, cognitive, and instrumental) was related to job performance, stress, well-being, and withdrawal through their relationship on commitment and satisfaction. Similarly, psychological climate showed significant relationships to motivation and performance\textsuperscript{102}. Moreover, individuals’ perceptions of strategic climates have also been related to affective and behavioral outcomes. For example, meta-analytic results indicate that perceptions of climate for safety are related to commitment, satisfaction, safety behaviors, and accidents.

Organizational-Level Outcomes

Climate for service and climate for safety have been the most consistently examined climates “for” at unit and organizational levels. Studies examining climate for service have shown relationships to customer satisfaction\textsuperscript{103}. Climate for innovation has been found to relate to team creativity\textsuperscript{104}. Generic climate dimensions have also been related to organizational effectiveness. Finally, climate systems, configurable patterns of climate, have been linked to customer satisfaction and financial performance, whereas overall climate was related to employee attitudes\textsuperscript{105}.


Mediators

Climate is positioned as a mediator between practices and employee’s responses and performance outcomes. This linkage has been tested and supported at the organizational\textsuperscript{106} and individual level\textsuperscript{107} and unit level\textsuperscript{108}. In addition at the unit level of analysis, climate has also been shown to mediate the relationship between leadership style and construct space.\textsuperscript{109} Lynn, Barksdale and Shore have reported that age influences the perception of employee commitment to the organisation. Schminke, Cropanzano and Rupp have reported that an employee’s hierarchical level influences his/her perception of distributional and procedural fairness in the organisation. In addition,\textsuperscript{110} Waller, Huber and Glick have demonstrated that functional background is a determinant of the selective perception of executives. Lynn, Barksdale and Shore have reported that age influences the perception of employee commitment to the organisation. In addition, Quazi has a\textsuperscript{111} advanced that education level influences the perception of corporate social responsibility. Furthermore, Singh has reported that an employee’s hierarchical level influences his/her perception of inequity in the organisation. Moreover, Schminke, Cropanzano and Rupp have reported that an employee’s hierarchical level influences his/her perception of distributional and procedural fairness in the organisation. In addition, Waller, Huber and Glick (1995) have demonstrated that functional background is a determinant of the selective perception of executives.

The influence of personal variables on individual perception has been illustrated by these studies. On the other hand, studies on the influence of personal variables on organisational climate are not easy to find. Studies of organisational climate across groups formed on the basis of personal variables in companies have generally not been reported in the literature. Such a study across teacher groups formed in schools on the basis of subject taught, gender, marital status, educational level, age, and seniority, however, has been reported by Gunbayi (2007). It is, therefore, proposed to study organisational climate across groups formed on the basis of age, hierarchical level, educational qualification, and function performed, in a large company to examine whether the organisational climate is homogeneous or heterogeneous across such groups.

**Dimensions of organizational climate**

Goram Ekvall\(^{112}\) identified ten dimensions. There are

1. **Challenging**: How challenged, emotionally involved and committed are employees to the work
2. **Freedom**: How free is the staff to decide how to do their jobs
3. **Idea time**: Employees have time to think things through before having to act
4. **Dynamism**: Eventfulness of life in the organization.
5. **Idea support**: Organizations support new ideas
6. **Trust and openness**: People feel safe speaking their minds and offering different prints of view
7. **Playfulness and humor**: How released is the workplace is it okay to have fun
8. **Conflicts**: To what degree do people engage in interpersonal conflict
9. **Debates**: To what degree do people engage in lively debates about the issues.
10. **Risk - taking**: Is it okay to fail

\(^{112}\text{www.comcare.gov.au/ohs/docs/optimum-org/climate-pcotton.doc}\)
Campbell and colleagues\textsuperscript{113} proposed four primary climate dimensions
1. Individual autonomy,
2. The degree of structure imposed on posture
3. Reward, orientation and consideration
4. Warmth and support

\textbf{Hart’s\textsuperscript{114}} Organizational health mode incorporates ten dimensions of organizational climate. They are:
1. Supportive leadership
2. Role clarity
3. Participative decision – making
4. Co-worker interactions
5. Appraisal and feedback
6. Employee development
7. Goal alignment
8. Work demands
9. Workgroup morale
10. Workgroup distress

\textbf{Pritchard and Karasick}\textsuperscript{115} identified ten dimensions of climate on an organization wide basis. These dimensions are
1. Task structure: The degree to which the methods used to accomplish tasks are spelled out by organization
2. Reward: Punishment relationship. The degree to which granting of additional rewards such as promotions and salary increases are based on performance and merit instead of other consideration like seniorities, favourate and so forth.
3. Decision centralization: The extent to which important decision are reserved for top management

\textsuperscript{113} http://209-85-175.104/search?q1=cache:6\%20lxaxjbDuDu7\%20flygforsk%2C%20lu.selfiles/sophias-V…P.11
4. Achievement emphasis: The desire on the part of the people in an organization to do good job and contribute to the performance objectives of the organization.

5. Training and development emphasis: The degree to which an organization tries to support the performance of individuals through appropriate training and development experiences.

6. Security versus risk: The degree to which pressures in an organization lead to feelings of insecurity and anxiety on the part of its members.

7. Openness versus defensiveness: The degree to which people try to cover their mistakes and look good and communicate freely and cooperatively.

8. Status and morale: The general teaching among individuals that the organization is a good place to which to work.

9. Recognition and feedback: The degree to which an individual knows what his supervisor and management think of his work and the degree to which they support him or her.

10. General organizational competence and flexibility: The degree to which an organization knows what its goals are flexible and innovative manner. Includes the extent to which it anticipates problems, develops new methods and develops new skills in people.

Balder Sharma R’s nine dimensions of organizational climates are

1. Scope for advancement
2. Grievance handling
3. Money and benefits
4. Participative management
5. Objectivity and rationality
6. Recognition and appreciation
7. Safety and security
8. Training and education
9. Welfare facilities
Newman\textsuperscript{116}

1. Supervisory style: Degree to which supervisor is open, supportive, considerate.
2. Task characteristics: Degree to which tasks are characterized by variet, challenge, etc.
3. Performance – Reward relationship: Degree to which rewards are based on performance.
4. Co-worker relations: Degree to which co-workers are trusting, supporting, friendly, etc.
5. Employee work motivation: Degree to which employees show concern for quality of work.
6. Equipment and arrangement of people: Degree to which this allows for efficient and effective work operations.
7. Employee competence: Degree to which employees have proper background, training, etc.,
8. Decision making policy: Degree to which employees take part in decisions that affect their work situation.

Taguir\textsuperscript{117} has identified in factors in organizational climate on the basis of information provided by managers. They are:

1. Practices relating to providing a sense of direction (or) purpose to their jobs-setting of objectives, planning and feedback,
2. Valuable member of a working team the importance placed on this kind.
3. Opportunities for exercising individual initiative;
4. Working with co-operative and pleasant people
5. Being with a profit-minded and sales-oriented company

\textsuperscript{117} http://www.maces.ucsf.edu/Research/psychological/notebook/copying.html.
Kaha et.al.\textsuperscript{118} have identified in factors which affect individual performance in organization. They are

1. Rules orientation
2. The nurturance of subordinates
3. Closeness of supervision
4. Universalism
5. Promotion achievement orientation

Eight dimensions identified by Koys and Decotts\textsuperscript{119} are:

1. Autonomy (self determination with respect to work procedures)
2. Cohesion (perception of togetherness)
3. Trust (freedom to communicate openly)
4. Pressure (time demands)
5. Support (tolerance of member behaviour by superiors)
6. Recognition (contributions to the organization are acknowledged)
7. Fairness (organizational practices are equitable)
8. Innovation (change and creativity are encouraged)

Litwin and Stringer\textsuperscript{120} introduced a very comprehensive framework of organizational climate. They provided six dimensions of organizational climate that include (i) structure (ii) responsibility (iii) reward (iv) risk (v) warmth (vi) support. In another book by Litwin and stringer emphasis was given on the concept climate and its influence on the McClelland’s need factor’s of motivation (i.e) n-power, n-achievement and n. affiliation.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{118} Yuvarai,S., op.cit., pp.256-257
\item \textsuperscript{119} Edward A,( Spring 1998),”Ward Managerial power bases and subordinates manifest needs as influences on psychological climates”, Journal of Business and psychology, Vol.12, No.3  p-363.
\item \textsuperscript{120} George H. Litwin and Robert A. Stringer (1968). Motivation and organizational climate Boston: Division of Research, Harvard university ,Graduate School of Business Adminstration, , pp-45-65
\end{itemize}
Jones & James derived six dimensions based on the individual attributes, which are

a. Leadership facilitation and support
b. work-group co-operation, friendliness and warmth
c. conflict and ambiguity
d. professional and organizational spirit
e. job challenges, importance and variety
f. Mutual trust

Halpin and Crafts studied climate dimensions which they found in a Public School organization. The climate dimensions which they identified are the following:

1. Espirit - this is a morale dimension. It was perception by the employee that his social needs are being satisfied and, at the same time he is enjoying a sense of task accomplishment.
2. Consideration - this is a supportive dimension. The employee perceives his superiors as treating him as a genuine human being.
3. Production - This is a close-supervision dimension. The employee perceives management as closely supervising his job activities.
4. Aloofness - this is an ‘emotional’ distance dimension. The employee perceives the superiors behaviour as formal and impersonal.

The other four dimensions were hindrance, intimacy, disengagement and thrust.

122 Link.springer.com/articles/10.1023%2FA%3A1024445024385#p.1
Forehand’s Classification\textsuperscript{124}

Forehand’s attributes interact to determine the totality of an organization’s climate which are

1. Size & Structure
2. Leadership Patterns
3. System and Complexity
4. Goal Direction and
5. Communication network

Six dimensions of Gavin,\textsuperscript{125} are 1) Clarity and Efficiency of Organizational Structure, 2) Hindrance, 3) Rewards 4) E-spirit, 5) Managerial Trust and Consideration, and 6) Challenge and Risk.

This study takes Work environment, Responsibilities, Rewards, interpersonal relationship, supportive environment, conflict, Loyalty and readiness to attend the patient (Risk) as organizational dimensions.

Organizational Climate and Effectiveness

Organizational climate can be used in either a technical or a colloquial sense. As a technical term, it is defined as ‘set of measurable properties of the work environment, based on the collective perception of the people who live and work in the environment and demonstrated to influence their motivation and behaviour’. Climate plays an important role in determining how people behave in an organization. If people perceive that certain kind of behaviour will be rewarded, they will be motivated to engage in those behaviours. If there is a feeling that other behaviour are punished, these will be avoided. Climate is a broader term designed to include the relatively constant variable in a work environment that are considered important to the efficient use of human resources. These variables are assumed to be measurable and manipulatable at
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least to some extent and are considered to defining characteristics that from another. Litwin and Stringer describe the concept as ... set or cluster of expectancies and incentives that represent a property of environments that is perceived directly or indirectly by the individuals in the environment. It is a molar construct which (1) permits analysis of the determinals of motivated behavior in actual, complex social situation (2) simplifies the problem of measurement of situational determinants by allowing the individuals in the situation to think in terms of bigger, more integrated chunks of their experience, and (3) makes possible the characterization of the total situational influence of various environments. So that they may be mapped and categorized and so that cross environmental comparisons can be made.\(^{126}\)

Organizational climate as a personality of organization, is dealing with perceptual realm. The climate of a particular organization is neither that which its employees believe neither it to be nor necessarily what it ‘really’ is if employees perceived the climate to be highly authoritarian, even if top management made every effort to democratic or employee-oriented, they would act accordingly. Climate does emerge which an organization represents is the main determinant of employee actions, and behaviour.

**Variable**

Organizational climate has been studied as an independent variable influencing employee satisfaction and performance. It has been intervening variable in between leadership style and employee performance or satisfaction. Organizational climate has been treated as dependent variable being influenced by leadership style, technology, organizational structure, and management assumptions and practice and competence, as well as leader’ s use of strutting and consideration behaviours.

Patient Satisfaction:

Patient satisfaction is regarded as one of the desired outcome of care, an element in health status, a measure of quality of care and as indispensable to measurement of quality as to the design and management of health care system. The effectiveness of the health care to some degree, is determined by satisfaction with the services provided. Satisfied patient is more likely to utilize health services, comply with medical treatment and continue with the health provider.

Donabedian regards satisfaction/dissatisfaction as a patient’s judgment on the quality of care in all its aspects, but particularly as concerns the interpersonal process. Whereas Ware et al’s definition of patient satisfaction as ‘a multi-dimensional concept, with dimensions that correspond to the major characteristics of providers and services’127.

Patient satisfaction is related to technical and interpersonal competence, more immediate and positive non-verbal behaviour, more social conversation, courtesy, consideration, clear communication and information, respectful treatment, frequency of contact, length of consultation, service availability and waiting time.

Understanding how things look through the patient’s eye should central part of any quality improvement programme. Patient satisfaction is sometimes treated as an outcome measure i.e. satisfaction will health status following treatment and sometime as a process measure, i.e. satisfaction with the way in which care was delivered.

‘Customer is always right’ has been the mantra for those providing consumer goods and services. Whether purchasing new technology or during at the newest restaurant, it has become generally accepted that customers will show their satisfaction through return visit, future purchase or referrals. But,

the healthcare industry is in the midst of an enormous change. The line of thinking in place of decades is quickly lasting traction as consumer-directed healthcare plans and policy for performance reimbursement arrangements increasingly emphasize the importance of improved outcomes, patient satisfaction and the entire care experience. The focus is shifting to consumers, who are more empowered to make choices related to their care and hospitals must now look at patient as customers - individuals who can choose where to receive care, weigh in treatment options and even selected the physicians who attend to them.

Most of the hospitals have strategies to improve patient satisfaction focusing on upgraded service amenities room service, dining, coffee - or revolve around improving the patient perception of care through cosmetic changes like attractive waiting areas and in-room - plasma televisions. Facilities may be better served for increasing patient satisfaction. Improvement that not only enhance the experience for their customers but also brings clinical benefits that can improve patient outcomes. To be successful, hospitals must commit to improve the quality of care in substantial ways rather than simply implementing superficial enhancements.

Satisfaction of patients is important because it is a component of care as well as an outcome cares both the immediate. When the quality of care is high, satisfaction will be measurably high. Improving and monitoring satisfaction of patients is a core concern of every health care institution and provider. Satisfaction of patients is an inseparable part of care, quality and successful operation. It is a patent mechanism for increasing and sustaining a facility’s quality, efficiency and market share\textsuperscript{128}.

Measuring Satisfaction of patients

Measuring the satisfaction of patients help to identify their expectations. Expectations are important because patients judge the quality of care they receive based on their internal standard of what defines quality. Those internal standards are based in expectations. In additions, it allows us to learn about patient’s perceptions of service. By understanding expectations and perceptions, bridge the gap between how health care providers and patients define quality service.

The quality of care has been defined as “the degree to which health services for individual populations increases the likelihood of desired health outcomes and are consistent with current professional knowledge “\(^\text{129}\).

Satisfaction of patients is regarded as one of the desired outcomes of care, an element in health status, a measure of the quality of care and as indispensable to assessment of quality as to the design and management of health care systems. Measurement of satisfaction of patients fulfils three distinct functions: understanding patients, experiences of health care, identifying problem in health care and evaluation of health care.\(^\text{130}\)

Relatively small increase in the level of patient satisfaction are associated with increase of earnings of the hospitals, for the average hospital patient satisfaction can also be closely linked to the financial strength of profitability for a healthcare facility, A 51 hospital study found a strong relationship between hospital financial performance and patient’s reactive of care.\(^\text{131}\)

Patient satisfaction knowledge helps the institutions, to improve the patient loyalty, to increase the referrals, to evaluate health care provider

\(^{129}\) http://www.springerlink.com/content/m361/uh156+5g625k/ "Measuring patient satisfaction". Arvin Koruthan George and Martion G. Sanda Harward School of Medicine, MA., 2007, pp. 253 -256.

\(^{130}\) http://fmd article.eom/p/articles/mi-m0843/is - 4 - 30 / ai_h6133532, p.l.

performance, to pinpoint areas for improvement and help the management to highlight the opinion on

1. Waiting time
2. Waiting room and procedure room environment and cleanliness
3. Patient - physician communication and interaction
4. Staff courtesy and compassion
5. Ease of getting appointment and referrals
6. Billing procedures and personal
7. Facility access and portiny
8. Desire new services.

Revisit appointment, complete information to call back in case of an emergency, contacting patient movement service for comfortable escort to the patients or arranging for an ambulance/taxi, can all be done at a single point. A smoothly flouring appointment schedule minimizes waiting time and is a significant ingredient for patient satisfaction and successful practice.

Physical facilities (doctor, display, cheerfulness of the facility )have been given importance, patient surroundings, natural - lighting, ventilation and windows overlooking beautiful landscapes are also a patient satisfier.

Water et. al. defined patient satisfaction is a multidimensional concept based on a relationship between experience and expectations. The term patient satisfaction means the positive emotional reaction to the consultation and the positive experience of the treatment in its various aspects.

Good communication, comprehensive assessment of patient’s needs and provision of information, shared decision-making, supportive and well understanding physician - patient relationship, the physician’s personal

qualities or simply positive treatment results for the patient have all been shown to improve the satisfaction of the patients.\textsuperscript{136}

**Definition of Patient Satisfaction**

Ware et al., definition of patient satisfaction as multi-dimensional concept, with dimensions that correspond to the major characteristics of providers and service.

Ware et al. argued that patient characteristics are the determinants of satisfaction, whereas, interpersonal manner, technical quality, accessibility, cost, efficacy, continuity and the physical environment availability of resources as the components of satisfaction.\textsuperscript{137}

Press defines patient satisfaction as “a person’s experience and perception of care”\textsuperscript{138} the way patients feel emotionally as well as physically - can determine whether they returns to a facility or recommend a doctor / healthcare facility to their family and friends. According to David Tarantino, patients expectations of the service and their perceptions of the actual service they received are two factors for measuring patient satisfaction.\textsuperscript{139}

According to Margret S. West Away, Paul Pheeder, Panic G. Vanzyl and John R. Seager, (University of Pretonia, South Africa) interpersonal dimensions and organizational dimension are the two factors which affect patient satisfaction. Support, consideration, friendliness and encouragement labeled the interpersonal dimension. Availability of seat and toilet in the waiting area and cleanliness labeled organization dimensions.\textsuperscript{140} Sitzia recommended twelve items for measurement provider characteristics (friendliness, encouragement, helpfulness, response consideration, support,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{136} http://www.hado.com/content/b/1/74. health & quality of outcomes,2008, 6.74.
\item \textsuperscript{137} http://intahc.oxford journals or/cgi/content/full/15/4/337 p 4
\item \textsuperscript{138} http://infectionin control today.com / articles / patient-warming clinical -outcome, p3 html
\item \textsuperscript{139} http://find articles com/p/articles/mi-mo843/is-4-30/ai-6133532 “How should we measure patient satisfaction, P-1.
\item \textsuperscript{140} http://www.chest journal org/content/118/1/92, abstract “validation of an Instrument measuring patient satisfaction with chest physics therapy techniques in cystic fibrosis p-1.
\end{itemize}
listening skills, expectations, competence, information and communication and thirteen items measurement of service characteristics maintenance of contact, follow-up, equity, availability, waiting time, availability of a set and toilet in the waiting area, cleanliness, privacy during consultation, thoroughness of examination, cost of attendance, medicine received and convenience of the service.141

The amount of courtesy and reassurance, concern and consideration, individual attention and willingness to listen and overall interpersonal skill, among others are social psychological factors that have been overwhelmingly correlated with satisfaction.142 As a result, patients assessments of these issues are positively associated with their assessments of the care they receive.143 Assessment of ‘physician competence and explanations’, “physicians warmth and commitment and reputations of hospital and physicians’ relationship were important determinants of patient satisfaction and intention to continue.144

Donabedian’s framework for assessing quality of care can fit the work system model and provide satisfaction. Satisfaction of patients Donabedian’s model145, the structure includes the organizational structure (work system model element’s organization.) the material resources (work system model elements - environment, tools technology) and the human resources (work system model elements, worker, tasks) Dinabedian’s two other means of assessing quality includes evaluating the processes of care - how health care worker and clinical processes provided and evaluating the outcome of care- assessing the clinical results and impacts. Donabedian expressed that a direct relationship exists between Structure, process and outcome146.

141 http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi-ga3912/is-199811/ai-n8822368.
142 Ibid., p.4
143 http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi-ga3912/is-199811/ai-n8822368
145 En.wikipedia.org/wiki/the-Donabedian-Model
146 Handbook of human factors and Ergonomics in Health care art
A patient is one who is sick on being treated for an illness or injury (Curington, 2000) and Patient satisfaction is the individualized cognitive evaluation and the clients perception of care and health care visit (Davis, 1995).

Components of satisfaction of Patients

Risser, reported that four components emerged - the cost, the convenience, the provider’s personal qualities and the nature of the interpersonal relationship; and finally the provider’s professional competence and the perceived quality of care received.

A classification with, eight dimensions was presented in a review by Ware (1983) at al manner-feature, technical quality of care-competence, accessibility /convenience - factors involved in paying for medical service, efficacy, outcomes of care (the result) of services provided), continuity of care-constancy in provider or location of care, physical environment features of setting in which care is delivered and availability - presence of medical care resources.

In a thorough review of studies of patient satisfaction with hospital patient care, Rubin listed the following as important components, nursing care, medical care, communication, ward management, ward environment and discharge procedure.

Abrahamowity et al. proposed ten components for hospital care namely medical care, housekeeping, nursing care, nursemaids, staff explanations of procedures and treatments, noise level, food, cleanliness pothering services and

overall quality. Baker identified five components of satisfaction in the U.K. primary care setting, continuity of care, accessibility of the surgery, quality of medical care, premises and availability of doctors. In the outpatient context, proposed accessibility, waiting times, waiting environment, attitude of staff, and patient information as critical components.

The researchers Mclver et al. included the following as the components of patient satisfaction. They are:

1. Expectations
2. Comprehension
3. Participation
4. Information and informed consent
5. Risk perception
6. Preference

Measuring patient satisfaction depends on using the “accurate measures because it comprises of standards that incorporate dimensions of technical, interpersonal, social and moral aspects of care (Kane et. al., 1997). Kelly and Hurst in health care quality Indicators project conceptual Framework paper states that one such method that accepted globally is given by Donabedian which describes the indicator as being structure, process or outcome in nature.

Structure indicators are based on health care system that constitutes of doctors and paramedic staff, Training equipment collectively. The health care system and the individuals in society and their interaction constitute structure. Mere existence of health care does not ensure appropriateness of process and their outcome. The non-medical determinant of health care system which is

151 S. Abramowity, a.A. cote
154 Ibid.
measured under structure is physical infrastructure that constitutes the environment and availability of spacious rooms. Process indicators of quality refer to the things done to and for the patient by practitioners in the course of treatment process relates to health care system and patient is measured by selecting following key process Indicators (Kelly et al., 2006)

1. **Appropriateness**

   Appropriateness is considered as performance dimension and relation of providing health care based on clinical need. It should be based on clinical evidence of the effectiveness of the process concerned and ‘consistent with current professional knowledge. Appropriateness comprises a series of dimensions essential for addressing the interpretation of performance as measured through indicators. Those dimensions include provider and patient expectations, local norms for the provisions of medicine, ethical aspects and most certainly, issues of social equity (Value et al., 2002)

2. **Timeliness**

   It is the degree to which patients can receive care as quickly as possible and existence of such co-ordination where patients are facilitated from one provider to another and different stages of procedures. The clinical elements that are measured consist of time taken in laboratory diagnosis, duration in which X-rays are provided and waiting time for first response by hospital.

3. **Acceptability**

   Kelly and Hurst identify Acceptability as conformity to the realistic wishes, desires and expectations of health care users and their families. (Donabedian 2003). It is measured from response of patients on their satisfaction level and extent of their understandability of medical procedures that are being offered.
4. **Patient centeredness**

It refers to the partnership and relationship that is established among doctor, patients and their families. Patient is considered the most central figure to the functioning of the health care system (Kelly, 2006). The indicator is measured in terms of doctor care and involvement about sharing their findings. It also incorporates patient’s views and suggestions.

5. **Staff ability**

Competence constitutes the training and abilities of health care staff in terms of technical and cultural aspects and their ability of communication with patients (Kelly 2006).

**Conceptual Issues of Patient satisfaction**

The study of Patient Satisfaction did not begin in earliest until the late 1970’s and early 1980’s. This might be attributed to the commercialization of medicine and by increasing interest in “individual experience” among social scientists.155

Patient Satisfaction is the result of a process of evaluation (and comparison) of the service obtained from the object (ex. Physician) in the patient’s health care system. It is composed of multiple objects or constituencies such as the physician, hospital and insurance provider.

Hulka and her associates attempted to undertake the initial steps in the conceptualization of the Patient Satisfaction concept. Hulka, Zyzanski, Cassel and Thomson, Zyzaski, Hulka and Cassel defined “satisfaction of the patients’ attitude towards physicians and medical care”156. More specially a composite index of an individual’s evaluative judgements concerning the quality of medical care received from physicians, nurse and other relevant sources is

hypothesized to represent the individual’s; level of “satisfaction”. This conceptual definition has been accepted by Wolinsky, Hines et. al., Doyle and Ware, Ware et al., Lacker and Dunt\textsuperscript{157}.

The researchers have challenged this conceptual definition from at least three perspectives. The first perspective notes that the situation is a major source of variation in satisfaction evaluations\textsuperscript{158}. This is posits that Patient Satisfaction is better defined as an individual’s evaluation of the quality of care in a specific medical care situation and not just as a global attitude aggregated across situations. Individual patient – physicians encounters “the basic unit of medical care” and therefore assessing satisfaction for “individual encounters may contribute to a fuller understanding of the nature of physician – patient relationship”. This argument is exemplified by Shore and Franks (1986) and advanced by Inni and Carter (1985)\textsuperscript{159}.

Second category of researchers in the consumer satisfaction literature take issue with the definition of satisfaction as a cognitively based evaluation of product/service attributes. Satisfaction is an emotional or affective response to a product or service use (consumption) situation, (Olices). Attribute based satisfaction\textsuperscript{160} judgements are more appropriate because they allow a richer measure of Patient Satisfaction level and identifies areas (attributes) which contribute to satisfactory or dissatisfactory experiences. Third, set of researchers Roos et al.\textsuperscript{161}, argue that restricting Patient Satisfaction to perceptions of the “quality” of health care received is an “inherent weakness”. These researchers support their position by noting that a “healthy but unhappy” patient have been found in several empirical studies. Thus Ross et al., suggest that the conceptualization of Patient Satisfaction should be enlarged to include

\textsuperscript{157} http://www.acrwebsite.org/search/view-conference-proceedings.aspx.pdt=6900
\textsuperscript{161} www.acrwebsite.org/search/view-conference-proceedings.aspx?Id=6900
other evaluations viz. waiting time, cost etc. in addition to support. In particular ware, Davies, Avery and Stewart have attempted to categorize the various health care evaluations into eight distinct “dimensions”\(^\text{162}\).

**Theories of Patient Satisfaction in Healthcare**

Five key theories are (i) Discrepancy and Transaction Theory, (ii) Expectancy Value Theory, (iii) Determinants and components theory, (iv) Multiple Model Theory, and (v) Healthcare quality theory

1. Discrepancy and Transaction Theory of Fox and Storms advocate that as patient’s healthcare orientation differed and provider conditions of care differed, then, if orientations and conditions were congruent then patients were satisfied, if not then they were dissatisfied\(^\text{163}\).

2. Expectancy Value Theory of Linder Pelz (1982)\(^\text{164}\) advocate that satisfaction was mediated by personal belief and values about care as well as prior expectations about care. He identified the important relationship between expectations and variance in satisfaction ratings and offered an operational definition for Patient Satisfaction as “positive evaluation of distinct dimensions of healthcare”\(^\text{165}\) Linder Pelz model was developed by Pascoe to take into account the influence of expectations on satisfactions on satisfaction and then further developed by Strasser et al., \(^\text{166}\) to create six factor psychological model cognitive and effective perception formation, multi dimensional construct dynamic process; attitudinal response; iterative and ameliorated by individual difference.

---


3. Determinants and components theory of Ware et al., propounded that Patient Satisfaction was a function of Patient’s subjective response to experienced care mediated by their personal preferences and expectations.¹⁶⁷

4. Multiple Model Theory of Fitz Patrick and Hopkins propounded that expectations were socially mediated, reflecting the health goals of patients and the extent to which illness and healthcare violated the patient’s personal sense of self.¹⁶⁸

5. Healthcare quality theory of Donobedian argued that satisfaction was the principal outcome of interpersonal process of care. The expression of satisfaction or dissatisfaction is the patient’s judgement on the quality of care in all aspects, but particularly in relation to the interpersonal component of care.

**Instruments to measure patient satisfaction in Healthcare**

The work of Hulka et al.,(1970)¹⁶⁹ began the initial steps to measure patient satisfaction in the healthcare area with the development of the “Satisfaction with Physician and Primary Care Scale”. This was followed by Ware and Snyder(1975)¹⁷⁰ with their “Patient Satisfaction Questionnaire”, aimed at assisting with the planning, administration and evaluation of health service delivery programs. At the end of the 1970s, the “Client Satisfaction Questionnaire” was developed by Larsen et al.,(1975)¹⁷¹ as an eight item scale for assessing general patient satisfaction with healthcare services, and was superseded “by their “Patient Satisfaction Scale”. Since that time, numerous instruments have been developed but the question remains as to how valid and


reliable those instruments really are. Further, the measurement of satisfaction varies depending on the assumptions that are made as to what satisfaction means (Gilbert et al., 2004)\textsuperscript{172} and a number of approaches to measurement can be identified: expectancy-disconfirmation; performance only: technical-functional split; satisfaction versus service quality; and attribute importance by Gilbert and Veloutsou, (2009)\textsuperscript{173}.

Nguyen et al.,(1983)\textsuperscript{174} indicated that, in the absence of standardized instruments as well as satisfaction scores across studies being so high, it was almost impossible to make meaningful comparisons between different patient satisfaction scale scores. Further Ware et al.(1983)\textsuperscript{175} reported that between 40 and 60 percent of respondents exhibited some form of acquiescent response set bias, and Coyle and Williams(1999)\textsuperscript{176} argued that dependence prevented patients reporting dissatisfaction. In addition most patient satisfaction tools have been developed in the USA for “ad hoc” hospital useHardy et al.,(1996)\textsuperscript{177}. Van Campen et al., noted that patient satisfaction had been extensively investigated, identifying over 3,000 published articles and “dozens” of measuring instruments developed in the ten years prior to their review. Interestingly, they noted that quality of care from the patient’s perspective (QCPP) had often been measured as patient satisfaction. They reported that only five of 113 selected instruments were theoretically or methodologically rigorous, and of those five, only two that had been used were actually designed

to measure perceived service quality) SERVQUAL by Parasuraman et al., and the Patient Judgment of Hospital Quality instrument by Meterko et al. (1990), with the latter being the only one which offered a method for generating items that directly represented patients’ views. However, it should be noted that whilst SERVQUAL has been used in healthcare, it was not designed specifically to measure perceived health service quality and it certainly does not measure satisfaction. A review by Sitzia found that 81 percent of studies used a new instrument, an additional 10 percent had modified an existing instrument and 60 percent failed to report any psychometric data. Sitzia concluded that the instruments evaluated by the meta-analysis demonstrated a little evidence of reliability or validity. A more extensive review of patient satisfaction measures identified over 38,000 articles on patient satisfaction using the Medline/Pub Med database plus over 10,000 websites through internet based search by Hawthorne.

A number of main approaches to measurement can be identified: expectancy-disconfirmation; performance only: technical-functional split; satisfaction versus service quality; and attribute importance given by Gilbert and Veloutsou.

**Patient satisfaction and perceived service quality in healthcare**

Healthcare sector research into patients’ perceptions of the dimensions of service quality (perceived service quality) has been limited by Denies et al., 2001. According to Lee et al. (2006), yet studies seeking to assess the components of the quality of care in health services predominately continue to

---

measure patient satisfaction\textsuperscript{183}. There is no consensus on how to conceptualize best the relationship between patient satisfaction and their perceptions of the quality of their healthcare. O’Connor and Shewchuk (2003)\textsuperscript{184} emphasized that much of the work on patient satisfaction is based on simple descriptive and correlation analyses with no theoretical framework. They concluded that with regard to health services, the focus should be on measuring technical and functional (how care is delivered) quality and not on patient satisfaction.

A study by Gotlieb et al.(1994),\textsuperscript{185} offered evidence of a clear distinction between perceived service quality and patient satisfaction. They found that patient satisfaction mediated the effect of perceived service quality on behavioural intentions, which included adherence to treatment regimes and following provider advice. Cleary and Edgman-Levitan (1997)\textsuperscript{186} pointed out that satisfaction surveys in the health care sector did not measure quality of care as they did not include important aspects of care items such as being treated with” respect and being involved in treatment decisions. In addition, Taylor (1999)\textsuperscript{187} highlighted that confusion continued in the sector regarding the differentiation of service quality from satisfaction and reported that some authors, for example Kleinsorge and Koenig(1991)\textsuperscript{188}, referred to them as synonymous terms. Nevertheless patient satisfaction continues to be measured as a proxy for the patient’s assessment of service quality by Tunis(2005)\textsuperscript{189}.

**Consumers and healthcare quality**


The traditional concept of healthcare relationships is based on three primary assumptions: the professional is the expert; the system is the gatekeeper for socially supported services; and the ideal patient is compliant and self-reliant a view given by Thorne et al., (2000)\textsuperscript{190}. Historically the definition and management of Healthcare quality has been the responsibility of the service provider and health services have been largely introspective in defining and assessing quality, focusing mainly on the technical provider components. As a result there is comparatively a little work investigating patient perceptions of health service quality – Bell(2004)\textsuperscript{191}. However, there has been some work on clinical governance which has sought to emphasize the importance of the patient perspective but, in general, this work has been based on areas defined by service providers as important rather than on what actually matters to patients viewed by Bell.\textsuperscript{192}. Further, Weingart et al., report that service quality deficiencies in a Boston teaching hospital are so common amongst medical in-patients that they appear to be the norm.

In contrast, the literature shows significant reductions in the total cost of care when the patient’s perception of the quality of the service improves, with the dynamics of poor service delivery often involving wasted effort, repetition, and misuse of skilled employees. Kenagy et al.,(1999)\textsuperscript{193} point out that an increase in functional quality results in improved outcomes generally in medical illness and specifically in controlled studies of diabetes, hypertension, asthma and rheumatoid arthritis. Surgical outcomes show similar effects with fewer complications and shorter hospital stays. Therefore, improvements in functional quality will result in better health outcomes.

**Perceived health service quality:** the theoretically proven construct

A healthcare service is one that requires high consumer involvement in the consumption process, and Lengnick-Hall (1995) argued that the traditional health sector views of technical quality and patient satisfaction were inadequate to manage the complex relationships between the healthcare provider and the patient. Importantly, effective healthcare relies significantly on the co-contribution of the patient to the service delivery process. Studies of O’Connor et al., Irving and Dickson, Sandoval et al.,(2006) have also evidenced that compliance with medical advice and treatment regimes is directly related to the perceived quality service and the subsequent resulting health outcome.

Over the past few decades in the services marketing sector, much work has been undertaken to evaluate the consumer’s perception of service quality, and a number of service models have been developed, with the gap model (Parasuraman et al.,(1985) and its accompanying SERVQUAL Parasuraman et al.(1988), having offered significant advances to the understanding and measurement of perceived service quality. Perceived health service quality has been studied extensively in the private healthcare sector; with SERVQUAL having been used frequently in a modified form and predominantly in the “for profit” American health sector (O’Connor and Trinh (2006). Brady and Cronin advanced the multidimensional hierarchical conceptualization offered by Dabholkar et al., by combining that model with the three factor model of Rust and Oliver, and proposed a hierarchical multidimensional model of...


service quality. Based on this work, Dagger et al.,(2007) have proposed service quality as a multidimensional, higher order construct, with four overarching dimensions (interpersonal quality, technical quality, environment quality and administrative quality) and nine sub-dimensions. They suggest that consumers assess service quality at a global level, a dimensional level and at a sub-dimensional level, with each level influencing perceptions at the level above. From their work with private oncology patients, Dagger et al., have shown that their model reflects the private patient’s service quality perceptions, and they have developed and tested a scale for measuring perceived private healthcare service quality. Yet this work has had little impact, as the study and measurement of patient satisfaction continues to be the key target for consumer research in the health sector.

Further, only a few studies have sought to evaluate the provider understanding of the patient’s perceptions of health service quality O’Connor et al., and very few studies of perceived public healthcare service quality have been undertaken by Sanchez-Perez et al, 7. Finally, Brown editorially highlighted that the patient is becoming an ever more silent partner in the health care system, as their views of quality have largely been sidelined by the number of attempts to exclusively determine patient satisfaction with health care. Research that focuses on strengthening the understanding of the meaning, measurement, and management of perceived service quality from the patient’s perspective in healthcare is now arguably paramount.