Chapter 4

STUDY OF A PLURALITY OF ORGANISATIONS — ORGANISATION DIAGNOSIS

The Oxford dictionary defines diagnosis as "identification of disease by means of patient's symptoms, etc." Margulies and Raia (1978) stated that "... a critical skill in organisational development is that of obtaining a good diagnosis of the organisation, including the problems of its component parts and how they are interrelated. At base, this consists of identifying and then elaborating a definition of "organisation". One of the major advances in recent years has been the development of the theories and concepts that treat the organisation as a social system (Katz and Kahn, 1966; Miller, 1971) According to this view, the social system consists of complex configurations of the behaviours of its individual members. It is therefore to a consideration of the nature and causes of such behaviours that diagnosis necessarily turns."

Chattopadhyay (1982) stated that diagnosis involved defining the episode under study by picking up the relevant "symptoms", arranging them into a pattern, and distinguishing them from other patterns. He goes on to add that "there are different expectations from the role of an organisational diagnostician:

(a) he should diagnose to the point of describing the present ailment; or

(b) he should add to it his prognosis, his estimates of the likely consequences over a period of time; or
(c) In addition to diagnosis and prognosis, he should recommend prescriptions of active interventions.

No firmly established norm has yet been developed regarding the extent to which the meaning of diagnosis should be extended. However, it may be pragmatic if the process of diagnosis includes prognosis and not interventions. More importantly, it should trigger a process of self-searching through a relationship of mutuality between the external diagnostician and the organisation.

The major objective of diagnostic studies, as contrasted with other types of studies, is to formulate or isolate the problem(s) faced by an organisation which is unique in time, place and people, constituted by a single or a set of multiple variables, affected by a single, or more often a set of multiple variables of possibly diverse nature, in the shortest possible span of time, in a dynamic organisational environment, in order to generate alternatives for action-decision.

An organisation is a dynamic system where things happen fast. Series of events move in a process. Collection of data at a given point of time is like taking a still shot of a moving object. It fails to capture the dynamic nature of the organisational reality. Diagnostic data often provide the still picture of the company. For example, a part of the problem can be visualised even by looking at the organisational chart. The chart may represent the positional structure at a given point of time, but
the dynamics that it obtains may be different six months later, if not six days hence. A diagnostician faces an added dilemma in this situation: (a) in an ever changing dynamic situation what is relevant in 'here and now' is not relevant in 'there and then', in the past or in the future; (b) a process is a continuity; the vision of the future together with the forces of the past moulds the 'here and now' of the organisation. The dilemma is the choice between discontinuity and continuity."

The position adopted in this study is diagnosis to the point of describing the present ailment.

A METHODOLOGY

The data on organisational diagnosis spans the following aspects:

- Organisation environment.
- Motivational climate.
- Perception of different Levels of employees about each other as well as their own Level.

Even though this research purports to focus on one organisation, diagnostic data was collected from four different organisations. The data from all the four organisations is presented in Table 4-1 to give a comparative picture of Indian organisations surveyed. These four organisations were chosen because of the diversity in the nature of their business as well as belonging both to the private and the public sectors. In every organisation, the sample
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Geographical Location</th>
<th>Nature of Business</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Year of Survey</th>
<th>Total No of Employees (Approx)</th>
<th>Total no of Officers</th>
<th>No of Levels</th>
<th>Sample (%age)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>East India</td>
<td>Steel rolling</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>57.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>East India</td>
<td>Coal mining</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>North India</td>
<td>Tyre manufacturing</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>69.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>North India</td>
<td>Explosives Production</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1. Comparative picture of Indian organisations surveyed and the sample of respondents from each organisation.
was drawn only from the levels of Officers in the organisation. The sample was restricted to Officers, because as discussed in chapter 2, the higher management are the makers, builders, maintainers and leaders of organisation culture, its values and systems that permeate down the line influencing organisational functioning.

The Officers were categorised into Levels 1, 2, 3, 4, etc. based on scales of pay and hierarchical position in the organisation with Level 1 representing the top-most level of Management, Level 2 the next lower level, and so on. In order to safeguard the identity of the organisations, they have been referred to as A, B, C and D.

All the diagnostic data were collected during the period 1983-1986. Three of the organisations belonged to the private sector while one was from the public sector.

Organisation A was a steel rolling mill located in the industrial belt of Bihar. It was a private limited company set up in 1922. It produced tin plates used essentially for packaging purposes. Initial discussions with the Managing Director (MD) of the company featured the following major areas of concern:
- Problem-solving ability.
- Ability to explore options.
- Issues of collaboration between departments.
- Moving out of traditional modes of functioning.
- Issues related to "make or buy" decisions in terms of techno-
The organisation seemed to have had its heyday till about a year-and-a-half ago when it began to incur losses. The MD had already taken steps to correct the situation by taking action to procure raw material at lower costs, reducing wastage in terms of cost of production, and by promoting an approach of problem confrontation rather than problem avoidance. The MD thought that whatever the employees were doing then was under pressure with somebody telling them what to do and how to do it. He hoped that OD would help bring about a culture that would be self-renewing and could sustain itself in the absence of continuous close supervision and control. Or else, the treatment was likely to be symptomatic and short-term, but was unlikely to bring about long-term changes in the behavioural patterns in the organisation.

**Organisation B** was a coal mining organisation in the coal belt of Bihar. This was a part of a large group of companies in the private sector. The coal extracted from the five mines of the organisation used to serve as one of the raw materials for the parent company's manufacturing processes. The mining was underground using the traditional board-and-pillar system.

Two major issues were highlighted by the Top Management of the company. These were:
- Technology upgradation
- Managerial excellence
Other areas of concern included management of men, team functioning, lack of trust and confidence between different tiers of Management, personal "ego", fixing of objectives and targets, and motivating junior level Officers.

The Top Management hoped that OD would help them confront these issues and deal with them effectively, thereby improving the overall health of the organisation.

Organisation C was a tyre manufacturing company which was part of a multinational organisation. It had one factory located in North India with a marketing and sales network spread throughout the country. Initial discussions seemed to surface the following issues:

- A "we-they" situation. Related questions were as to how participation, emotional attachment and identification could go hand-in-hand with a contractual relationship?
- No appeal to the employees to think of the organisation as their own.
- A tacit sense of economic colonialism—expatriates and locals.
- Lack of critical managerial thinking.
- Prevalence of an over-simplistic theory of work based primarily on economic reward and punishment.
- Assumptions held by managers seemed to fall in McGregor's Theory X category.

It was hoped that OD would bring about better understanding, better communication, better problem-solving
ability, and a change in the attitudes of managers and workers.

Organisation D was a public sector organisation manufacturing explosives. It was part of a large group of companies. It had two manufacturing facilities—one in Central India and the other in Northern India.

The company was facing severe competition with 14 other companies in the fray in the country. Organisation D had about 24% of the market share. The capacity for manufacture of explosives sanctioned by the Government of India was far in excess of the demand. Prices had dipped while the input costs had gone up. The MD thought that they were on the brink of a very difficult situation.

Areas of concern for the organisation seemed to be:
- Dealing with the external environment, i.e., Government agencies and officials.
- Poaching of manpower by other private organisations who could compensate much more attractively.
- Lack of people within working together as a group finding solutions to difficult problems at relevant levels. The people had a number of ideas, but pooling the ideas and getting a plan through was not evident.
- A high degree of competitiveness to the extent that services were getting affected. A sense of urgency was missing.
- The people were good for the work that they were doing; but the demands of the new situation required extra mettle for which
the company had not provided the developmental challenge or opportunity.
- There was scope for cost reduction, increasing productivity, coordination between marketing and production, developing cheaper formulations, and diversifications.

OD was envisaged to help:
- Take care of the processes of change.
- Make coordination between production and marketing more effective taking care of the critical interpersonal processes, eventually resulting in cost reduction.
- Inculcate an urge, ability and skill to learn continuously.
- Bring about a realisation that for improving working life, a great deal had to be done by the people themselves.

While all the Officers in all the four organisations were invited to fill up the questionnaires and participate in the group interviews, the sample sizes (in %age) presented in Table 4-1 refer to those Officers who actually responded. In every case, it was a large sample representative of the total population of Officers in the organisation.

B FINDINGS AND OBSERVATIONS

The findings and observations on organisation environment and motivational climate are presented here. First, the presentation is on Organisation Environment.
1 Organisation Environment

The data on Organisation Environment was collected with the help of the questionnaire on Organisation Environment. Table 4-2 shows the data from the four organisations on the Organisation Environment dimensions perceived as ACTUAL. For each organisation, A, B, C, and D, the mean score obtained (scale: 0-100) along with the rank of each dimension is presented.

One of the ways of interpreting the data could be by adopting the following scheme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81-100</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-80</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-60</td>
<td>Average (neither good nor poor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-40</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-20</td>
<td>Very poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None of the organisations appeared to be excellent, good or very poor in the existing state as perceived by their Officers.

Three of the four organisations had at least one dimension which could be categorised as poor.

In other words, all the organisations could be categorised as either average or poor.

The dimensions which occupied the top four and the bottom four ranks were:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>A MEAN</th>
<th>A RANK</th>
<th>B MEAN</th>
<th>B RANK</th>
<th>C MEAN</th>
<th>C RANK</th>
<th>D N</th>
<th>D RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>49.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>50.65</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46.97</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard of performance</td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51.22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall identity</td>
<td>48.50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>54.30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>46.75</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>53.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>44.75</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>47.05</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>44.75</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>47.57</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>42.75</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46.40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37.35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing problems</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42.20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Development</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>43.72</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Work</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>42.72</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 0-100

Table 4-2. Mean scores on organisation environment dimensions for each as ACTUAL.
Table 4-3 shows the data from the four organisations on the Organisation Environment dimensions perceived as DESIRED by the respondents. For each organisation, A, B, C and D, the mean score obtained (scale: 0-100) alongwith the rank of each is presented.

Using the same scheme for interpreting the data as was used for the ACTUAL, one may observe that the Officers in all the four organisations desired their organisations to be either good or excellent in all the dimensions of the organisation environment.

Notwithstanding the above, the dimensions which occupied the top four and the bottom four ranks, when the holistic view of the data from all the four organisations are considered simultaneously were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top four ranks</th>
<th>Bottom four ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>Decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Managing problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard of performance</td>
<td>Personal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall identity</td>
<td>Team work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIMENSION</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>87.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal development</td>
<td>86.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>85.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>85.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall identity</td>
<td>85.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Work</td>
<td>82.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing problems</td>
<td>81.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>81.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>81.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard of performance</td>
<td>78.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>77.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>69.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 0-100

Table 4-3. Mean scores on organisation environment dimension perceived as DESIRED.
Officers in all the four organisations seemed to be unequivocal about the dimensions of Innovation and Supervision taking the last priority.

Table 4-4 shows the difference of mean scores (scale: 0-100) between the DESIRED (D) and the ACTUAL (A) along each dimension of Organisation Environment along with the relative ranking for each of the organisations A, B, C and D. All the differences were found to be significant at the 0.05 level of confidence.

The dimensions which occupied the top four and the bottom four ranks when all the four organisations are viewed simultaneously were:

**Dimensions in top ranks**
- Recognition
- Personal development
- Structure
- Trust
- Overall identity
- Managing problems

**Dimensions in bottom ranks**
- Communication
- Decision making
- Standard of performance
- Innovation
- Supervision
- Managing problems
- Recognition

**Dimensions in top ranks**
- Personal development
- Recognition
- Team work
- Managing problems
- Decision making
- Trust
- Communication

**Dimensions in bottom ranks**
- Structure
- Standard of performance
- Innovation
- Supervision
- Overall identity
- Trust
- Communication
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIFFERENCE (D-A)</td>
<td>DIFFERENCE (D-A)</td>
<td>DIFFERENCE (D-A)</td>
<td>DIFFERENCE (D-A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCORE</td>
<td>RANK</td>
<td>SCORE</td>
<td>RANK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal development</td>
<td>47.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>44.75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Work</td>
<td>44.50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing problems</td>
<td>41.50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>41.25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>36.50</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall identity</td>
<td>36.50</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard of performance</td>
<td>29.50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>28.25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 0-100

Table 4-4. Organisation environment dimension—difference between D RED (D) and ACTUAL (A).
In all the four organisations, the highest gap was perceived on the dimensions of Personal development, and the least on the dimensions of Standard of performance, Innovation and Supervision.

Taking the data from all the four organisations on the dimensions of Organisation Environment perceived as Actual, Desired and the Difference, the following may be observed:

- These organisations, as perceived by their Officers, could be categorised as either average or poor.
- People desired their organisation to be either good or excellent on all the dimensions.
- People desired less emphasis to be given to Innovation, Supervision and Standard of performance.
- People perceived the highest gap on the dimension of Personal development.

2 MOTIVATIONAL CLIMATE

The data on Motivational Climate were collected with the help of the questionnaire on Motivational Analysis of Organisations (Climate)—MAO (C). Table 4-5 shows the rank order of the six motivations and the approach avoidance ratios in each of the four organisations A, B, C and D.

In three out of the four organisations, Dependency and Control occupied the top two positions, and Expert influence and
Table 4-5. Motivational climate.

All the four organisations seemed to be characterised by a high degree of approach-avoidance conflict. "To do or not to do," "to be or not to be," seemed to be the kinds of doubts that plagued the employees most of the time.

In Table 4-6 are presented ten dimensions of organisational climate and the impact they have on fostering one or the other of the six motivations in the four organisations A, B, C and D.

In all the four organisations, the manner in which a person was oriented to the organisation fostered Achievement motivation.

The manner in which rewards were managed fostered Affiliation motivation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Climate dimension</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Interpersonal relationship</th>
<th>Supervision</th>
<th>Managing problems</th>
<th>Managing mistakes</th>
<th>Managing conflicts</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Trust</th>
<th>Managing rewards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependency</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert influence</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ Highest impact
- Least impact

Table 4-6. Organisation Climate dimensions and Motivations.
The manner in which problems were managed had the least impact on fostering Extension motivation. In three out of the four organisations, managing problems, managing mistakes and communication fostered Dependency motivation. And decision making encouraged Control motivation. The manner in which a person was oriented, interpersonal relationships were practiced and rewards were managed fostered Extension motivation to the minimum, while communication had the least impact on promoting Expert influence motivation.

Taking the data from the four organisations on Motivational Climate, it may be observed that:

- These organisations, as perceived by their Officers, were characterised by Dependency and Control motivations.
- Approach-avoidance conflict pervaded the motivational climate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Climate dimension</th>
<th>Motivational Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal relationship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing problems</td>
<td>Dependency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing mistakes</td>
<td>Dependency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Dependency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing rewards</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-7. Climate dimension and motivational impact.
Table 4-7 summarises the relationship between the climate dimensions and their impact on fostering one or the other motivation.

**PERCEPTIONS**

The perceptions of different levels of Officers in each organisation A, B, C and D about how they perceived the employees at the other Levels as well as their own Level, was collected through group interviews conducted separately for each Level. These perceptions may be indicative of their attitudes towards each other.

Tables 4-8 to 4-11 present these perceptions in organisations A, B, C and D respectively.

The figures in each cell are in percentage. The diagonals represent the self perception of each Level.

In Table 4-8, out of a total of 25 cells, 14 showed more negative perceptions than positive, i.e., the overall perceptual images in organisation A were more negative than positive. The ratio of the negative to the positive images was 1.3 : 1.

The self-images of the lower Levels of Management (Levels 3-5) were more positive than negative; while those of the higher Levels of Management (Levels 1 and 2) were more negative than positive.

The lowest Level of Management (Level 5) had a predominantly
Table 4-8. Perceptions of different Levels in organisation A.

negative image of all other Levels of Management other than their own.

Levels 3 and 4 held more positive images about their own Levels and those below them, while holding more negative images about Levels 1 and 2 above them.

In Table 4-9, out of a total of 25 cells, 22 showed more negative images than positive, i.e., the overall perceptual images in organisation B were predominantly more negative than positive. The ratio of the negative to the positive images was 2.4 : 1.

The self-images of the top-most Level (Level 1) and the lowest
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Held by</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-9 Perceptions of different Levels in organisation B.

Level (Level-5) was more positive than negative; while that of the middle three Levels (Levels 2-4) were more negative than positive.

In Table 4-10, out of a total of 25 cells, 20 cells showed more negative images than positive, i.e., the overall perceptual images in organisation C were more negative than positive. The ratio of the negative to the positive images was 2.2 : 1.

The self-images of the top two Levels (Levels 1 and 2) was more positive than negative, while that of the lower three Levels (Levels 3-5) were more negative than positive.
Table 4-10. Perceptions of different Levels in organisation C.

On the whole, Level 1 perceived other Levels more positively than negatively. Level 1 was also perceived by other Levels more positively than negatively. In all the other Levels, mutual perceptions were more negative than positive.

In Table 4-11, out of a total of 16 cells, 14 showed more negative images than positive, i.e., the overall perceptual images in organisation D were predominantly more negative than positive. The ratio of the negative to the positive images was 2.2 : 1.

The self-images of every Level was more negative than positive.
Table 4-11. Perceptions of different Levels in organisation D.

With this technique, it is possible to diagnose the state of mutuality, taking any two Levels at a time. This can be indicative of the state of interrelationship also.

Taking the data from all the four organisations on Perceptions, the following may be observed:
- The negative images about each other were more than the positive images.
- No generalisation seems possible regarding the self-image of different Levels.

This completes the presentation of the organisational diagnosis data from the four organisations, A, B, C and D on the Organisation Environment, Motivational Climate and Perceptions. Emerging from the data, general observations have been made at
the end of each section taking all the four organisations into account.

However, as stated earlier, this research intends to focus on the effectiveness of behavioural process interventions in an (one) organisation. The organisation chosen for the purpose was organisation B. We now turn to a detailed presentation of the diagnostic data from this organisation.