CHAPTER III
EMPLOYEES' AWARENESS OF RIGHTS

The growing industrialization of cities in this country is said to have influenced not only the life styles of people but also the way they perceive themselves in relation to industrial organization. Awareness of their role in various organizations has already undergone a cognitive differentiation in terms of what they think they are capable of doing, what functions they should perform and what returns they should expect. Awareness of rights is one of the important issues discussed as a dominant force influencing the life styles of employees. Employees' growing awareness of their own rights is discussed often only in terms of their desire for monetary gains and hence is considered as an undesirable phenomenon; restricting industrial growth. Pilot study interviews with supervisors, engineers, and managers of various manufacturing organizations during the present research however, revealed that understanding of one's own rights involved some degree of cognitive complexity and individual differences. Objective of the present study therefore, was restricted to a systematic analysis of "rights" as a cognitive element.

The rights mentioned by employees were classified as (a) contextual rights, and (b) content rights. Contextual
rights included relatively stable organizational features such as working conditions, benefits, security, salary, human treatment, and guidance from superiors which are available in the organization only. Content rights included what employees expected in relation to their tasks. Such rights are participation, autonomy, authority, recognition, greater responsibility, promotion, status, and challenging work which Herzberg and various other researchers have identified as motivators.

The overall results show significant differences in percentage of employees mentioning various contextual rights \( (X^2 = 28.842, \text{df} = 5, P < 0.01) \) as shown in Table 3.1 (Appendix A), and in Figure 3.1 and 3.2. The results show that human treatment from superiors was the strongest desire closely followed by awareness of right to get benefits, guidance in work, and adequate salary (see Figure 3.1). Percentages of employees mentioning better working conditions, and security as rights were found to be extremely low. Strangely enough, managements of different organizations are under the impression that they are the highly effective factors in work motivation of employees.

The overall results also show significant differences in percentages of employees mentioning various content rights \( (X^2 = 50.730, \text{df} = 7, P < 0.01) \). As shown in Table 3.1 and in Figure 3.2, right to participate in decision making was mentioned by largest number of employees followed by right to have authority, and autonomy, recognition for the work done,
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right to be given greater responsibility, and promotion. Right to have status and challenging work were mentioned by very few number of employees. It does not mean however, that the challenging nature of work was not important to them. Perhaps participation, responsibility, and authority together were perceived as the challenging features of work by the employees.

The overall results indicate that managements should have a fresh look at their management practices and consider participative approach with adequate work autonomy and authority given to the employees as measures of increasing the effectiveness of their performance. The pattern of awareness of content rights discussed above also shows that the employees perceived themselves mature enough to handle their own work by exercising adequate autonomy and optimizing the use of authority through participative approach. Recognition, responsibility, promotion, and status seem to have been perceived by them as expectations which would be eventually fulfilled through such an approach.

The results were further analysed to study the relationship between the core, work biographical, and organizational variables on one hand and awareness of rights on the other.

Core Variables

**Age**

Chronological development of the individual is mainly
characterised by acquisition of new roles and modification of the existing ones. Variations in the task relevant and social experiences influence behaviour associated with the process of role learning. An attempt was made in the present study to analyse the relationship between employees' age and variations in perception of roles. Content and scope of awareness of employees' own rights was presumed to reflect their own understanding of their role in organizations.

The distribution of employees with differing awareness of content and contextual rights in relation to age is shown in Table 3.2 and 3.3 and in Figure 3.3 and 3.4.

Human treatment appeared to be the most important contextual right; and perceived to be equally important by employees of all age groups. Percentage of employees of the first age group mentioning human treatment as right was substantially higher than those of the other three groups. Better working conditions and security were found to have been mentioned by least percentage of employees of all the age groups. The percentage of employees mentioning better working conditions and security as rights was too low to reflect awareness of the same and hence the question of studying these rights in relation to core, work biographical, and organizational variables did not arise. Awareness of benefits as a matter of right was found to decrease with advancing age. This may suggest that the employees got used to whatever benefits they got as they continued to
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enjoy such benefits. As a result, awareness of benefits probably dropped down. The same explanation may be applicable to working conditions and security also.

The data show that awareness of guidance and salary as rights was almost the same in the first and the last age groups and higher than employees of two middle age groups. With respect to guidance it may be said that at the time of appointment task relevant maturity of the employees being too low; they expected high task orientation from their leaders which they called guidance. Once they learned the task, the need for such guidance decreased. At the other end of the age range however, guidance assumed the form of relations orientation which was the need of the employees.

Awareness of content rights of employees of the fourth group was found to be significantly different from that of employees of the first group ($X^2 = 23.919, df = 7, P < 0.01$), and from those of the second group ($X^2 = 18.191, df = 7, P < 0.05$), and from those of the third group ($X^2 = 21.715, df = 7, P < 0.01$). The differences with respect to awareness of content rights among employees of the first three groups however, were not found to be significant. It seems that like contextual rights, differences in the awareness of content rights become apparent in the late middle age.

Highest age group was found to be more aware of authority, autonomy, and status; whereas the other age groups were observed to have mentioned participation in decision
making, responsibility, recognition, and promotion as rights. It is interesting to note that largest percentage of employees of each of the four age groups was found to have mentioned right to receive human treatment from others.

Younger employees appeared to be interested in maximizing their own competence and in getting recognition for such efforts in a relations oriented job context; while their middle age counterparts seemed to be more concerned with consolidating their own security and status by exerting greater authority and task autonomy. The role perceptions of employees of these two groups therefore, do not appear to be congruous with each other. Incongruent role pattern of middle age employees can thus be said to be one of the important causes of the so called middle age crisis.

The present approach of managements to merge the differences into generalizations does not sound appropriate in the light of variations in behavioural dynamics at different age levels. Provisions should be adjusted according to variations in employees’ expectations.

**Personality pattern**

Analysis of employees' awareness of rights in relation to their personality pattern was considered necessary because of the possibility of the latter influencing assertivity of various rights. Table 3.3 and Figure 3.5 and 3.6 show the distribution of employees of the following
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personality patterns in relation to their awareness of contextual and content rights.

**Pattern 1:** Employees scoring below Q 1 (Q 1 = -6) reflecting reserved-indisciplined-tenderminded personality pattern.

**Pattern 2:** Employees scoring between Q 1 and Q 3 (Q 1 = -6 and Q 3 = 24) reflecting ambidirectional personality pattern, (Q = 15).

**Pattern 3:** Employees scoring above Q 3 (Q 3 = 24) reflecting outgoing-controlled-tough-minded personality pattern.

No significant differences were observed in employees' awareness of rights in relation to their personality pattern.

**Value system**

Beliefs in one's own preferences (values) for different aspects of work can influence what one desires and expects from work. Intensity of one's own desires and expectations related to work can also be influenced by the nature of such beliefs. Analysis of employees' awareness of rights was therefore undertaken in relation to their beliefs or value system.

The distribution of employees' differing awareness of rights in relation to the following three value systems is shown in Table 3.4 and Figure 3.7 and 3.8.
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System 1: Employees scoring below Q 1 (Q 1 = 6) reflecting industrialism value system characterized by achievement-self control-independence-mechanistic management.

System 2: Employees scoring between Q 1 and Q 3 (Q 1 = 6 and Q 3 = 38) reflecting undifferentiated value system, (Q = 16).

System 3: Employees scoring above Q 3 (Q 3 = 38) reflecting post-industrialism value system characterized by self actualization-self expression-interdependence-organic management.

Percentages of employees with dominant post-industrialism value system mentioning various content rights namely participation, autonomy, recognition, and responsibility were found to be significantly greater than those with dominant industrialism value system ($X^2 = 18.322$, df = 7, $p < 0.05$).

Post-industrialism value system appears to be congenial to employees' self development. Desire for participation and recognition can be said to be congruent with the dominance of post-industrialism values namely organismic management, and interdependence; whereas right to have autonomy and greater responsibility can be said to be
congruent with their dominant values namely self expression and self actualization. It is interesting to see that these employees showed as strong an awareness of contextual rights as that of employees of other value systems. It seems that the employees with dominant post-industrialism value system were emancipated from the preoccupation with the satisfaction of contextual needs as a result of which their awareness of contextual rights was not significantly different from their counterparts with dominant industrialism value system. Those with dominant industrialism value system still continued to be preoccupied with the thoughts of contextual needs. The development orientation was the essential characteristic of post-industrialism value system. The results that such employees were more aware of the content rights (participation, autonomy, responsibility, and recognition) speak for the fact that in their cognitive world development orientation was more important than the subsistence orientation.

In view of the findings discussed above, it appears that employees with post-industrialism value system can prove to be an asset to the organization. Identifying employees with dominant post-industrialism value system may prove to be the first useful step. They can act as key agents of planning and implementing task relevant changes in organization. They may prove to be the pace setters for those with dominant industrialism value system to migrate to post-industrialism value system. It may be useful to give them
training in adopting leadership style appropriate to the situation. Practising situational leadership itself may be perceived by them as a challenge.

Work Biographical Variables

Frequency of job changes

Individual differences in frequency of job changes are repeatedly observed. Frequency of changes in job is likely to be closely associated with differences in employees' expectations from their work and work related environment. Differences in employees' expectations were also assumed to be reflected in their awareness of various rights. Frequency of job changes was therefore studied as a work biographical variable influencing employees' awareness of rights.

The distribution of employees' differing awareness of rights in relation to frequency of job changes is shown in Table 3.6 and in Figure 3.9 and 3.10.

Differences in percentages of employees of the three groups mentioning various content rights were not found to be significant. Awareness of contextual rights of employees of the third group was significantly different from that of the first group ($X^2 = 14.665$, df = 5, $P < 0.05$), and from that of the second group ($X^2 = 24.449$, df = 5, $P < 0.01$). The employees of the third group were found to be maximally aware of benefits and human treatment as their rights. This
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may be interpreted to mean that high frequency of job changes is closely associated with the inadequate provision of contextual factors in the organization.

**Uniorganizational experience**

Purpose of the present study was to analyse changes in employees' awareness of contextual and content rights in relation to their experience in one and the same organization. Such an analysis was expected to reveal the effects of relatively stable organizational environment on employees' awareness of rights.

The distribution of employees' differing awareness of contextual and content rights in relation to their experience in one and the same organization is shown in Table 3.7 and in Figure 3.11 and 3.12.

Differences in awareness of contextual rights of employees of the first two groups were not found to be significant. Employees of the third group showed pattern of awareness of contextual rights which was significantly different from that of the first group ($X^2 = 13.165$, df = 5, $P < 0.05$), and from that of the second group ($X^2 = 13.599$, df = 5, $P < 0.05$). Job context characterized by human treatment, better working conditions, and benefits was perceived as absolutely essential by employees for a long time with a single exception of human treatment which was found to recede into the background after ten years of service.
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With nonreinforcing organizational climate; their expectation of being treated in human manner seems to have ebbed away after a few more years.

The most senior employees appeared to have lowered their expectation of human treatment possibly because they might have changed their behaviour as a coping mechanism to deal with the stress resulting from unhealthy human treatment. Right to have better working conditions was found to have dominated their awareness. Better working conditions which they once saw as confined to their seniors were now perceived by them as their righteous gain which they should legitimately maximize.

Awareness of content rights of the most senior employees was found to be significantly different from that of their most junior counterparts ($x^2 = 17.120$, df = 7, $P < 0.05$) though not much different from those of the second group who had 6 to 10 years of experience to their credit.

It is interesting to see that right to participate in decision making was perceived to be less important by employees after six years of service in the organization followed by resurgence of the same after ten years. Like human treatment, desire for participation probably might have gone unreinforced for a long time. Seniority of over eleven years was perhaps perceived by employees as qualifying them to participate in decision making. It may also
mean that whatever limited desire the middle group had for participation, was satisfied thus leading to a decrease in such a desire. With a long period of service however, they expected to get participation at the higher level which was denied to them. Their heightened awareness of right to have greater authority seems to be congruent with increased awareness of right to participate and have autonomy.

Increasing experience in one and the same organization seems to have developed nonproductive orientation among the employees making them concentrate their efforts on consolidating their position power. Enhancement of personal power seems to be a far cry in the light of their unchanged awareness of other rights such as guidance, recognition, and responsibility. Emergence of effective leadership appears to be less phenomenal in organizations with a relatively stable work force of employees at different hierarchical levels.

**Multiorganizational experience**

Highly stable work force of employees is a rare feature of organization. Employees in one and the same organization differ with respect to their experience in various other organizations in the past. The aim of the present study was to analyse differences in employees' awareness of rights in relation to their multiorganizational experience.

The distribution of employees' differing awareness in relation to their multiorganizational experience is shown in Table 3.8 and in Figure 3.13 and 3.14.
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Differences between percentages of employees mentioning various contextual rights of the second and the fourth group were found to be significant ($X^2 = 20.625$, df = 5, $P < 0.01$). Such differences were also found to be significant between the third and the fourth group ($X^2 = 23.367$, df = 7, $P < 0.01$). All the groups of employees were found to be almost equally aware of security. Employees of the second group however, were maximally aware of salary, and those of the fourth group of human treatment. The differences in awareness of contextual rights between employees of the first and the fourth group were not observed to be significant.

Awareness of content rights of employees of the fourth group was found to be significantly different from that of the first group ($X^2 = 28.168$, df = 7, $P < 0.01$), from that of the second group ($X^2 = 28.545$, df = 7, $P < 0.01$), and from that of the third group ($X^2 = 37.163$, df = 7, $P < 0.01$). Significantly larger percentage of employees of the highly experienced group was found to have mentioned content rights namely right to be given greater responsibility, challenging work, and status whereas greater percentage of employees of the less experienced group were found to have mentioned right to get promotion.

It appears that highly experienced employees had an expectancy of maximizing the use of acquired task skills in terms of assuming greater responsibility, accepting
challenging work, and achieving status in a supportive job context characterized mainly by human treatment. The relatively least experienced employees however, seem to have been aware of salary, security and promotion as their rights. The results show that with increasing work experience, employees desire their job to be vertically enlarged. This is true in the light of their awareness of rights to participate, to have challenging work, and increased responsibility.

**Single and multiple organizational experience**

Employees working in one and the same organization were found to show heightened awareness of right to have better working conditions, and authority with increased work experience. Employees with multiple organizational experience on the other hand, were found to have become more conscious of right to share greater responsibility with increased work experience. In a relatively stable organizational setting, employees preferred to consolidate their position power expecting others however, to show relations orientation towards them. This is especially true in the context of their greater awareness of right to receive human treatment. Thus they seemed to have favoured relations oriented job context to fulfil their desire for power and authority.

Employees with multiple organizational experience however, favoured a secure job context for risking themselves in accepting greater responsibility and challenge. This is
true in the context of their relatively greater awareness of right to have security. It is interesting to see that awareness of right to get promotion of these employees had receded into background. In this connection it may be stated that generally people change their jobs for better prospects which usually include factors like participation, promotion, authority, responsibility, challenging work, and salary. It is very likely that their need for promotion was satisfied to a large extent resulting from their migration from one organization to the other.

Surprisingly enough, among the most senior employees with multiple organizational experience, there was a growing awareness of the right to have status. As a result of migration from one organization to another, the emigrants perhaps experienced a feeling of isolation leading to the perceived loss of status. Their desires for increased responsibility, challenging work, and status can be fulfilled through O.D. intervention strategies. There is a greater probability that such strategies would help the employees in relating themselves meaningfully to the organizational goals with a productive orientation. Conventional incentive schemes will have little value unless structure and formal control on their activities are kept optimum.

In an organization with a relatively stable work force, it appears that the desire for assuming greater responsibility, and challenge will have to be created among the employees by
providing reinforcement contingencies in such a way that the employees get opportunity to grow and develop.

Organizational Variables

Size of the organization

Differences in organizational climate are known to be associated with differences in organizational size and hence results regarding employees' awareness of rights were analysed in the present study in relation to size as an organizational variable.

The distribution of employees' differing awareness of rights in relation to the organizational size is shown in Table 3.9 and in Figure 3.15 and 3.16.

The results show that differences in awareness of rights among employees belonging to organizations of different size were not found to be significant. Assuming that work environments of organizations varying in size are different, size of the organization as such did not seem to influence employees' awareness of rights.

Production technology

Opportunities available to the employees for influencing their own process of work vary with the nature of their work. Highly automated process technology at the one end does not permit such opportunities to the employees, on the contrary, such technology controls the behaviour of employees;
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whereas unit and small batch technology at the other end characterized by variations in products and procedures permits maximum freedom to the employees of planning and controlling their own activities. Mass production technology, occupying a position in between, may offer such opportunities to the employees so far as they are in constant active interaction with their tasks that are highly structured and routine. It is possible that employees' expectations emerge out of their interaction with the tasks which they perform. Purpose of the present study was to analyse employees' awareness of rights in relation to technology of production as an organizational variable.

Table 3.10 and Figure 3.17 and 3.18 show distribution of percentage of employees mentioning various contextual and content rights in relation to production technology.

The pattern of awareness of contextual rights of employees belonging to process technology organizations was found to be significantly different from that of employees belonging to unit and small batch technology ($X^2 = 20.258$, df = 5, $P < 0.01$), and from that of employees belonging to mass production technology ($X^2 = 22.697$, df = 7, $P < 0.01$). Employees of process technology organizations were found to differ significantly from those of unit and small batch technology in terms of their awareness of content rights ($X^2 = 16.595$, df = 7, $P < 0.01$).
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Significantly small percentage of employees from process technology organizations was found to have mentioned guidance, and human treatment as contextual rights; and autonomy, authority, recognition, and responsibility as content rights. It is important to note however, that no significant differences were found between the awareness of rights of employees belonging to small batch and mass production technology. Functionally least active involvement of employees of process technology organizations in their own work seems to have postponed an emergence of figure and ground pattern of awareness of various rights. It seems that the training of these employees prior to joining such organizations had psychologically predisposed them to accept the kind of organizational climate in which such factors could not be provided.

If identifying the dominant needs and expectations of employees is a sound step to understand their work behaviour, accomplishing such a purpose through an understanding of their awareness of rights appears to be a tough job for managements as well as for the behavioural experts working in process technology organizations.

It must however be admitted that the analysis presented above may not have greater degree of generality since size of the sample of employees drawn from process technology organizations was too small.
Employees' hierarchical position

Differences in the scope of formal authority and control sanctioned to the employees at different hierarchical levels are capable of giving rise to differences in the awareness pattern of relative dominance of various rights. From this viewpoint, an analysis of employees' awareness of rights was undertaken in relation to their hierarchical position in the present study.

Distribution of employees' differing awareness of various contextual and content rights in relation to their hierarchical position in organization is shown in Table 3.11 and in Figure 3.19 and 3.20.

Larger percentages of managers and engineers were found to have mentioned contextual rights namely right to have guidance, better working conditions, and benefits; whereas relatively greater proportion of supervisors was observed to be conscious of right to have security.

Content rights namely right to participate in decision making, right to share greater responsibility, right to be given recognition and right to be promoted were mentioned by significantly greater proportion of supervisors than by managers and engineers. Greater percentage of managers and engineers were found to be aware of right to have greater autonomy. Such differences in awareness of rights themselves explain why supervisors have been proverbially characterized by a feeling of being psychologically distant from their superiors.
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Clerks and assistants were found to be significantly more aware of contextual rights particularly of human treatment, benefits, and better working conditions. With respect to content rights no such greater awareness was found among them. This finding may suggest that clerks and assistants continue to be dominated by the consideration of maintenance needs.

Trainees did not appear to be significantly more aware of any of the contextual and content rights except status and nature of work.