CHAPTER V
THE PRESENT STUDY

SCOPE OF PRESENT STUDY

On account of the considerable homogeneity within the Ahmedabad industry in its management and organization traditions, the subject of OC may be said to be particularly apt for a research study, as the content of climate is invariably linked with the content of such traditions. Studies in OC have added significance at this point of time because of the industry's own search for alternatives in management strategies in a rapidly changing socio-economic environment and the corresponding concern for greater professionalization within the unique conditions of the industry. Any programme of interventions and change in such a context must benefit directly from an understanding of the nature and the content of the prevailing climate.

Objectives of the Study

To recapitulate, the general objectives of the study may be stated in the following terms:

1. A cross-cultural exploration in a large, well established, industry in India, with two of the most widely used instruments in the literature of OC; viz., the Organizational Climate inventory of Litwin and
Stringer and the Job Diagnostic Survey of Hackman and Oldham.

2. An exploration of the similarities, differences and overlaps between the two instruments in the attributes measured by them.

3. An exploration of the role of personality in the perception of attributes of the organizational environment.

4. An exploration of the relevance of the instruments chosen for the study in the personality-organization interaction model of work motivation.

5. An attempt towards the formulation of viable hypotheses within the general framework of the interaction model.

To accomplish the general objectives above, the immediate tasks in design were:

- to identify the specific variables relevant for observation and assessment in the study.

- to identify the instruments for the observation and measurement of the variables chosen.

- to specify a plan of analysis for the variables chosen by which the general objectives may be said to be served.
Chapter VI is a description of the methodology adopted in the study and deals in detail with the steps taken in the accomplishment of the tasks above. However, it would be in order to state here that the general objectives identified were translated into a smaller set of concise, technique-specific, task objectives on the following lines:

- Subject the available instruments assessing the perception of the organizational environment to a factor analysis to examine the factorial structure of the global perceptions that constitute climate.
- Test the significance of differences in climate perceptions on account of differences in chosen personality variables.
- Subject the totality of climate, personality, satisfaction and motivational measures to a series of multiple regression tests to determine the sequence of influence of the variables concerned.

Organizational Climate

The operationalization and measurement of climate has proceeded along two main lines:

1. Objective assessment of organization variables, and

2. Self reported assessment of organizational variables.

The objective approach has considered variables such as size, levels of authority, ratio of administrative personnel to production personnel,
formal rules, etc. Evan (1963), Palmer (1961), Lawrence and Lorsch (1967) and Prien and Ronan (1971) have relied largely on the objective approach in their studies. The main assumption in these studies is that the 'structural' features of the organizational environment influence behaviour (directly or indirectly), and is generally in line with the views of Sells (1963) and Bloom (1964) that it must be measured independently of individual perceptions.

On the other hand, many researchers have operationalized the concept of climate in terms of participant perceptions of different aspects of work organization. The measurement of climate is through suitably elicited reports of member perceptions. This line of work has its origins in the earliest phenomenological inquiries of Koffka (1935) who distinguished between the geographical environment, consisting of physical and social features, and the behavioural environment as perceived and reacted to by the individual. Koffka concluded that behaviour could be more meaningfully understood if it was related to the behavioural environment. This approach assumes that on the basis of perceptions of specific organizational practices and procedures, individuals develop global or summary perceptions of their organization, and that the perceptual states are by far the most significant influences for behavioural outcomes. The perceptual approach measures climate by having participants indicate the extent to which various attributes characterize individual work situations. Litwin and Stringer (1968) Schneider and Bartlett (1970), Payne and Fheysey (1971),
Moyer (1968), Friedlander and Margulies (1969), Thornton (1969), Likert (1967), to name a few, have measured climate through the perceptions of members. In India Sinha (1980), Rao and Chattopadhyay (1974), and many other researchers (as reported in Chapter III) have used a perceptual approach to assess organizational climate. In the present study, too, climate is measured through the perceptions of members of the organization. As stated in earlier chapters, this study emphasizes the understanding of organizational processes rather than the structural variables per se.

The review of the literature on OC presented in earlier chapters indicates the multidimensionality of the concept. Since there are many aspects of climate, it is necessary to assess these aspects separately.

The instrument used to measure organizational climate in the present study was developed by Litwin and Stringer (1968). The dimensions included in the instrument are appropriate for organizations functioning primarily around a task or group of tasks. The instrument was developed to study the impact of climate on achievement, affiliation and power motivation. In their research Litwin and Stringer constructed nine separate scales which they defined as follows:

1. Structure: the feeling that employees have about the constraints in the group, how many rules, regulations, procedures there are; is there an emphasis on "red tape" and going through channels, or is there a loose and informal atmosphere.
2. **Responsibility**: the feeling of being your own boss; not having to double-check all your decisions; when you have a job to do, knowing that it is your job.

3. **Reward**: the feeling of being rewarded for a job well done; emphasizing positive rewards rather than punishments; the perceived fairness of the pay and promotion policies.

4. **Risk**: the sense of riskiness and challenge in the job and in the organization; is there an emphasis on taking calculated risks, or is playing it safe the best way to operate.

5. **Warmth**: the feeling of general good fellowship that prevails in the work group atmosphere; the emphasis on being well-liked; the prevalence of friendly and informal social groups.

6. **Support**: the perceived helpfulness of the managers and other employees in the group; emphasis on mutual support from above and below.

7. **Standards**: the perceived importance of implicit and explicit goals and performance standards; the emphasis on doing a good job; the challenge represented in personal and group goals.

8. **Conflict**: the feeling that managers and other workers want to hear different opinions; the emphasis placed on getting problems out in the open, rather than smoothing them over or ignoring them.
9. Identity: the feeling that you belong to a company and you are a valuable member of a working team; the importance placed on this kind of spirit.

These scales have been used by several researchers to study organizational climate (e.g., Meyer, 1968; Waters, et al., 1974; Muchinsky, 1976; Sims and LaFollette, 1975). Fifty items describing the aspects of climate mentioned above were included in this study. Certain items were reworded slightly to fit the special environment of textile mills. A respondent had to indicate on a four point Likert type scale the extent to which the statements described climate in his own organization. The response categories were 'definitely true', 'somewhat true', 'somewhat false' and 'definitely false'.

Job Characteristics

A considerable amount of research has been conducted on the manner in which an individual responds to specific characteristics of his job and work content. In much of this research it was assumed that objective work/task design differences could be induced through variables such as functional specialization (e.g., Shepard, 1970). However, some researchers inferred work content through the job holder's perceptions (e.g., Blood and Hulin 1967; Turner and Lawrence, 1965; Hackman and Lawler, 1971).

Turner and Lawrence (1965) devised measures of six requisite task attributes, namely, variety, autonomy, required interaction, optimal interaction, knowledge and skill required, and responsibility. A Requisite Task
Attribute Index was used for examining and predicting workers' responses to task design. Hackman and Lawler (1971) adapted items from the Turner and Lawrence scales to obtain measures of four core characteristics: variety, autonomy, task identity and feedback.

Sims, et al. (1976) utilized a revised version of the Hackman and Lawler instrument and also studied the factor structure of the instrument. Hackman and Oldham (1974) revised the instrument used in the earlier study by Hackman and Lawler (1971) and the new instrument is called Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS). It is easily the most complete instrument in current use to measure perceived characteristics of the job. Pierce and Dunham's (1976) review of the literature on task design revealed that JDS is also the most widely used instrument to assess characteristics of the job. Examples of recent research on job design employing JDS would be those of Wall, et al. (1978), Brass (1981) and Oldham and Hackman (1981).

In the present study JDS was used to assess the work content of the technician, supervisory and middle management sample. JDS consists of the following scales:

1. Skill Variety: The degree to which a job requires a variety of different activities in carrying out the work; involving the use of a number of different skills of the person.
2. Task Identity: The degree to which a job requires completion of a 'whole' and identifiable piece of work; that is, doing a job from beginning to end with a visible outcome.

3. Task Significance: The extent to which a job has substantial impact on the lives or work of other people, whether in the immediate organization or in the external environment.

4. Autonomy: The degree to which a job provides substantial freedom, independence, and discretion to the individual in scheduling the work and in determining the procedures to be used in carrying it out.

5. Feedback from Job: The degree to which carrying out the activities required by a job results in the individual obtaining direct and clear information about the effectiveness of his performance.

6. Feedback from Others: The degree to which the individual receives clear information about his performance from his superiors and/or co-workers.

7. Dealing with Others: The degree to which the job requires the individual to work closely with other people in carrying out the work activities.

Each scale has three items and the respondent is required to indicate on a seven point Likert-type scale the extent to which it describes his work, where 1 = low or minimum and 7 = high or maximum.
The scales also yield a Motivating Potential Score. Following Hackman and Oldham, the scores from the first five job characteristics described above were combined into a summary score called Motivating Potential Score (MPS) that indicates the overall potential of a job to prompt high internal motivation and high quality performance. In other words, this score suggests the extent to which a job is enriched. The MPS score can range from 1 to 343 and is computed as follows:

\[
\text{Motivating Potential Score} = \left( \frac{\text{Skill Variety} + \text{Task Identity}}{3} + \text{Task Significance} \right) \times \text{Autonomy} \times \text{Feedback}
\]

The instrument has undergone many revisions, modifications and extensive research. An assessment was made of the focal jobs on the given dimensions not only by job holders but by their superiors and outside researchers. This was done to provide an indirect test of the 'objectivity' of job holder's ratings of their own jobs. The research has generally reported satisfactory inter-correlations between job holders, superiors and observers' ratings (Hackman and Oldham, 1974; 1975; Kiggundu, 1980).

It may be argued that when the objective is to predict or understand employee attitudes and behaviour at work, employee ratings of the job characteristics should be used, since it is the employee's own perception of the objective job which is the cause of his reactions to it. Therefore, in the present study only employees' job perceptions have been elicited to indicate descriptions about their work content.
Personality

Individual differences in motivation and work behaviour may also be attributed to differences in personal variables. A more specific sub-set of personal variables would be dimensions of personality as conceived and measured according to various theoretical formulations of personality. Within this class of measures would be both the 'acquired' aspects of personality, in terms of attitude-value configurations, and the 'constitutional' predispositions. An example of the former would be the much researched dimension of achievement motivation, and the latter would be represented by the Eysenckian dimensions of extraversion and emotionality.

Another personality variable which has been studied extensively in many areas of psychological research is locus of control. Bibliographies of research work on internal vs. external locus of control have been compiled by Throop and MacDonald (1971) and by MacDonald (1972). Reviews of research studies on this personality variable can be found in Rotter (1966), Lefcourt (1966), and Joe (1971). However, the possible significance of locus of control and its correlates in organization life has drawn the attention of researchers only since a decade or so. A person's perception about the origins and control of events which impinge on his life are contingent upon his behaviour. An 'internal' personal feels essentially in control of the things which happen to him, and an 'external' person believed that the events in his life are for the most part beyond his influence. Rotter
(1966) constructed the I-E scale to measure such a locus of control. The commonly used terms for designating the two ends of the continuum are the belief in skills and the belief in chance.

Various studies have shown that internals are more resistant to manipulation, they perceive themselves to be more efficient and competent on the job, and they have more self confidence on the job (e.g. Satmoko, 1972). Tseng (1970) found internals to show more ability to work with others and more co-operativeness, self-reliance, courtesy, reliability and work knowledge. Broedling (1975) studied the relationship of I-E control to work motivation and performance in a valence-instrumentality-expectancy theory of motivation. The internals were found to be more motivated to work than externals, they performed better and considered that working hard was more instrumental in obtaining what they wanted.

In the present study on I-E locus of control instrument was included to examine the relationship of this dimension of personality with perceptions of organizational climate and job characteristics, and to examine if these differences accounted for motivational and behavioural differences.

To measure I-E locus of control, the scale developed by Rotter (1966) was used. It has 29 items, 6 of which are filler items that are not scored. Two alternatives are provided for each item. The respondent selects one of the two alternatives. Higher scores show higher degree of externality.
**Satisfaction and Work Motivation**

Research in job satisfaction and motivation attempts to make a distinction between the two concepts by suggesting, in general, the largely cognitive composition of the former and the predominantly affective character of the later. This distinction, however, is not corroborated to the fullest either through rigorous instrument validation or through longitudinal field studies.

Hackman and Oldham (1976) too, make a distinction between psychological states (influenced by job characteristics) and the motivational outcomes - regarded as intermediate and dependent variables respectively. The scales developed within JDS to measure these dimensions were included in the present study.

The following three psychological states were measured:

1. Experienced meaningfulness of work - the degree to which the employee experiences the job as one which is meaningful, valuable and worthwhile.

2. Responsibility for work outcomes - the degree to which the employee feels personally accountable and responsible for the results of the work he does.

3. Knowledge of results - the degree to which the employee knows and understands how effectively or how well he is doing the job.
Hackman and Oldham (1976) in their Job Characteristics Model treated these 3 psychological states as intervening variables mediating between job characteristics and outcome variables. They were described as "the causal core of the model" (P. 255).

There are four items tapping Experienced Meaningfulness of the Work; six items for Experienced Responsibility for Work Outcomes; and four items for Knowledge of Results. Eight of these items are directly stated; six of the items are in a reversed format. A seven-point scale is used, ranging from 'Disagree Strongly' through 'Neutral' to 'Agree Strongly'. The means of scores on the scales are computed to indicate the experienced states.

The following scales developed by Hackman and Oldham (1974) were used to measure satisfaction with work and specific aspects of work:

1. General Satisfaction:

Overall measures of the degree to which the employee is satisfied with the job.

2. Internal Work Motivation:

The degree to which the employee is self motivated to perform well on the job; that is, the employee experiences positive internal feelings from work.
Satisfaction with specific aspects:

(a) job security.
(b) pay and other compensation.
(c) social satisfaction.
(d) supervision.
(e) opportunities for personal growth and development on the job - growth satisfaction.

There are 5 items measuring General Satisfaction; 6 items measuring Internal Motivation; 2 items measuring Satisfaction with Security and Pay; 3 items each measuring Social and Supervisory satisfaction; and 4 items measuring Growth satisfaction.

Individual Effectiveness

To assess an individual's job performance, work behaviour or effectiveness, superior's ratings were obtained on a set of five point scales ranging from 'very high' to 'very low' on the following attributes:

(1) Amount or quantity of work.
(2) Quality of work.
(3) Handling of subordinates.
(4) Technical knowledge.
(5) Amount of effort made.
(6) Loitering.
(7) Punctuality.
(8) Overall performance.

It is important to note here that the majority of textile mills in Ahmedabad do not have a systematic performance appraisal procedures for employees. It is done mostly on an ad hoc basis. Since performance records were not available readily, the superior's ratings above were obtained through a specially constructed scale for the research study and, therefore, administered in a uniform manner in all the sample mills.

Other Personal Variables

Information on the following demographic variables was obtained from respondents:

(1) Age
(2) Education
(3) Present Designation
(4) Department
(5) Tenure on the present job
(6) Experience in the present designation
(7) Experience in textile industry
(8) Number of jobs changed (in textile industry)
(9) Salary per month (including allowances).
RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS IN THE VERNACULAR

All the instruments described above were available in both the English and Gujarati languages. The Gujarati versions have been prototyped and have had established usage in other studies at ATIRA; e.g., Padaki and Gandhi (1981a; 1981b) and Shrivastava and Dolke (1978). A copy each of the instruments used in the study is given in Appendix I.

A high proportion of respondents in the present study were Gujarati. Therefore, both versions of the instruments were employed. Respondents were encouraged to choose the language in which they would be more comfortable in working, and the instruments were distributed in the sessions accordingly.