RESEARCH AND PRACTICE IN HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Heterogeneity of Organisational Climate

Avinash Kumar Srivastav

ABSTRACT

Organisational climate, which depends on the perception of organisational members and significantly influences their motivation and behaviour, is a conceptual synthesis of characteristics that distinguish organisations from one another. The nature of organisational climate was investigated by measuring six climate motives on 453 executives in a large Indian public sector industry using motivational analysis of organisational climate. The sample was partitioned into groups representing lower, middle, and higher age; junior, middle, and senior management levels; low, middle, and high qualification levels; and R&D, quality, production, and miscellaneous functions. Rank ordering the means of climate motives (for the total sample and in each partitioned group) revealed that Dependency was the dominant climate motive for the company as a whole and across all the groups. The backup climate was Affiliation for the company as a whole, and for seven of the examined groups; and it was Control for the remaining six groups. Comparison with t-test on means were performed for each pair of groups under each type of grouping to reveal significant differences in the perception of climate across the groups formed within the organisation. Demonstrating the heterogeneous nature of organisational climate, the study helps provide a better appreciation of differences in employee behaviour across the company. The results can lead to formulating a contingency model to develop and manage employees for higher organisational effectiveness.

INTRODUCTION

Organisational climate is one of the most frequently researched topics in the field of organisational behaviour/psychology. And indeed, the concept and framework of organisational climate has evolved over a long time with the earliest available reference on the concept/framework of organisational climate being traced to 1939 (Lewin, Lippitt & White 1939). The work of Lewin, Lippitt and White related leadership with 'social climate', but did not provide any framework for its measurement. One of the most recent references to the organisational climate concept/framework is by Patterson, et al. (2005), who reported the development and validation of a multidimensional measure of organisational climate. Recently, Kundu (2007) has presented a review of research on the concept and framework of organisational climate.

Over three decades ago James and Jones (1974) classified three approaches for defining, conceptualising and measuring organisational climate. These approaches are, (a) Multiple Measurement - Organisational Attribute Approach (MMOAA), (b) Perceptual Measurement - Organisational Attribute Approach (PMOAA), and (c) Perceptual Measurement - Individual Attribute Approach (PMIAA). These three approaches to identifying the basic premise of organisational climate have attracted a great deal of interest from social scientists. For instance, under MMOAA, the definition of Forehand and Gilmer (1964) is most appropriate for they have described organisational climate as a set of relatively enduring characteristics that distinguish one organisation from another. The definition of organisational climate given by Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler and Weick (1970) is under PMOAA. These authors have defined the construct as attributes specific to the organisation, induced from how the organisation deals with its employees and environment. According to Hellreigel and Slocum (1976), organisational climate is a set of perceived attributes of the organisation (or its sub systems), induced from the way the organisation and its members deal with each other and with their environment. This definition is another example of PMOAA. Furthermore, Schneider and Hall (1972) have defined organisational climate as a set of global perceptions held by organisational members about their organisational environment. This can be classified under PMIAA. According to Pareek (1989), organisational climate is created by the perception of organisational members about the outcome of interactions among five components of the organisation. These interaction components are (a) structure, (b)

system, (c) culture, (d) leader behaviour, and (e) employees' psychological needs. This definition is another example of PMIAA. Having outlined the approaches to conceptualise climate change, it is desirable to understand the underlying differences between organisational climate and organisational culture, as the two concepts are often confused with each other (Hellriegel & Slocum 1974).

This paper investigates heterogeneity of organisational climate and has been organised in five parts. The first part introduces the subject of organisational climate, bringing out the succinct differences between organisational climate and organisational culture. The second part describes the framework of organisational climate with a particular reference to MAO-C framework which was selected for this study. The third part examines the outcome of organisational climate, develops the rationale for the study, and defines the objectives of the study. The fourth part deals with the methodology and the results about heterogeneity of organisational climate. The final part of the paper comprises discussions and a conclusion about the findings and their implications for contemporary policies and practices of human resource management.

FRAME WORK OF ORGANISATIONAL CLIMATE

Organisational Climate and Organisational Culture

Organisational culture (Schein 1992) represents a pattern of shared basic assumptions learnt by the organisation for solving problems related to internal integration and external adaptation. Such a pattern of shared basic assumptions are believed to be valid and prescribed to new organisational members as the most desirable ways for solving future problems. Though appearing to be similar, organisational climate is not the same as organisational culture. On the one hand, organisational climate is behaviourally oriented, and it describes what is happening to organisational members (Schneider 2000). On the other hand, organisational culture provides the reasons for what is happening in terms of shared values and common beliefs held by organisational members (Svyantek & Bott 2004). Comprehensively, organisational climate explains how things are done in the organisation, but organisational culture explains why things are done in the organisation. The difference is succinctly given by Burke and Litwin (1992), who contend that organisational climate is in the foreground of organisational members' perception but organisational culture is in the background, and it is defined by values and beliefs. In practice, organisation climate research generally involves quantitatively based questionnaire measures, while organisational culture research generally, involves qualitative measures (Patterson, et al. 2005). A salient distinction is that organisational climate can be seen as a surface manifestation of organisational culture (Schneider 1990).

Several frameworks have been developed for the measurement of organisational climate (Forehand & Gilmer 1964, Campbell, et al. 1970, Schneider & Hall 1972, Pareek 1989, Patterson, et al. 2005). The framework of Motivational Analysis of Organisations - Climate (MAO-C), developed by Pareek (1989), was selected for this study. The choice of MAO-C was made because Gordon (2004) had branded MAO-C as a Classic Inventory for the measurement of organisational climate; and because MAO-C dimensions and motives were found to be very relevant for the company under study (as reflected by recent studies on organisational climate using MAO-C) (Srivastav 2006, 2007, Kunnanatt, 2007).

MAO-C is based on 12 dimensions of organisational working. These 12 dimensions are orientation, interpersonal relationships, supervision, problem management, management of mistakes, conflict management, communication, decision making, trust, management of rewards, risk taking, and innovation and change. For each dimension, MAO-C defines representative behaviours corresponding to each one of the six climate motives included in MAO-C framework. In other words, for each climate change motive, MAO-C defines representative behaviour for each one of the 12 dimensions of organisational working. MAO-C climate motives are briefly described as follows.

1. **Achievement**, which promotes quality, excellence, and attainment of organisational goals.
2. **Expert Influence**, which promotes the use of expertise for facing organisational challenges, solving organisational problems and improving organisational working.
3. **Extension** climate emphasises making oneself relevant to others in the work group, work team, section, department and organisation,
4. **Control** climate, which emphasises consolidation of personal power,
5. **Dependency** climate, that promotes excessive dependence on others, seeking direction or approval before taking action, and
6. **Affiliation** climate, which emphasises maintaining friendly personal relationship even when it comes in way of attainment of goals.

A study on heterogeneity of organisational climate is important because organisational climate has important outcomes. Understanding of these outcomes is necessary for elucidating the implications of heterogeneity of organisational climate.

OUTCOMES OF ORGANISATIONAL CLIMATE

A large number of studies have been conducted on the outcomes of organisational climate. Forehand and Gilmer (1964) suggest that organisational climate significantly influences the behaviour of organisational members. In addition, Litwin and Stringer (1968) have demonstrated that employees with a given motive work at their best when organisational climate is conducive for that motive. Moreover, Walton (1973) has reported that organisational climate influences the quality of work life in the organisation. Patterson, et al. (2005) have reported that organisational climate has several important outcomes at individual, group and organisational levels. For instance, organisational climate impacts leader behaviour and turnover intentions (Rousseau 1988), has the power to influence job satisfaction (Mathieu, Hoffman & Farr 1993), individual job performance (Brown & Leigh 1996), and organisational performance (Patterson, Warr & West 2004). It is important to understand the significance of connection between organisational climate and the 'bottom line'. The profit manifests at the end of performance. It can be predicted with some confidence that organisational performance will be poorer when the organisational climate is dysfunctional and organisational performance will be higher when the organisational climate is functional. Unlike profit (which is a lagging indicator of organisational performance), organisational climate is a leading indicator of organisational performance (Litwin, Humphrey & Wilson 1978). Furthermore, organisational climate helps in determining organisational success (Burton, Lauridsen & Obel 2004), and is important for achieving organisational effectiveness (Gunbayi 2007). Organisational climate indicates how well the organisation is realising its potential (Gunbayi 2007).

RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY

Understanding organisational climate, its nature and complexity are important, not only for enhancing organisational performance, but also for enhancing human well being in organisations. The knowledge of climate prevailing in an organisation as a whole and in different parts thereof can help in better harnessing of human resources, enabling their effective development and utilisation. Organisational climate is created from the perception of organisational members about organisational dimensions. Perception, being a cognitive process, is influenced by the personality, motivation, learning and experience of the individual. It is, therefore, expected that organisational climate is influenced by factors that influence perception.

Several studies have been conducted on the influence of personal variables on individual perception. Lynn, Barksdale and Shore (1995) have reported that age influences the perception of employee commitment to the organisation. In addition, Quazi (2003) has advanced that education level influences the perception of corporate social responsibility. Furthermore, Singh (1994) has reported that an employee's hierarchical level influences his/her perception of inequity in the organisation. Moreover, Schminke, Cropanzano and Rupp (2002) 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.

Objectives of the Study

The study has three prime objectives, which are listed.

1. To enhance the understanding of organisational climate, its nature and complexity across different types of groups formed in the selected company (on the basis of age, hierarchical level, educational qualification, and function performed)
2. To identify the dominant and backup climates (climate motive scoring the highest and the second highest, respectively) for each group under each type of formation
3. To determine the significant differences in the perception of organisational climate across the groups under each type of grouping

Detailed methodology for the realisation of these objectives is presented.

METHODOLOGY

Site and Sample

A large Indian public sector company was selected for the study. The company had multiple units located in different parts of the country. The sample consisted of 453 executives who were randomly selected from each production unit and from the corporate headquarters and of the company. The sample represented the diversity of age, hierarchical level, qualification level, and functional assignments obtained in the company.

Procedure

Workshops were conducted in the corporate headquarters and in each production unit of the company to explain the framework of organisational climate and its impact on individual and organisational performance and effectiveness. Care was taken in selecting the workshop participants to represent all the diversity in the company. The workshop participants were randomly selected executives. The participants were told that climate profile at the individual and organisational levels and implications thereof would be furnished to them. Organisational climate was measured after conditioning the respondents in this manner. Data collection (as explained) minimised the data errors due to possible manipulation of natural response by the respondents. Promised information and data were provided to the respondents after the measurement of organisational climate. Educational qualifications of the participants were numerically coded as shown in Table 1.

Table 1 Coding of qualifications

Low qualification		Medium qualification		High qualification	
NC	Qualification	NC	Qualification	NC	Qualification
1	Matriculation	6	Non technical postgraduate degree	8	Non technical doctorate degree
2	Higher secondary	7	Technical graduate degree	9	Technical postgraduate degree
3	Technical certificate			10	Technical doctorate degree
4	Non technical graduate degree				
5	Technical diploma				

Note: NC = numerical code.

Measures

Four personal variables were assessed. These variables were (a) age, (b) grade (hierarchical or management level), (c) educational qualification, and (d) functional affiliation (organisational function performed), were also recorded for each respondent. Motivational Analysis of Organisations - Climate (MAO-C) (Pareek 1989), was used for measuring the organisational climate. MAO-C measures the six climate motives (Achievement, Expert Influence, Extension, Control, Dependency, and Affiliation) by observing the frequency of associated behaviours under each dimension. The MAO-C instrument comprises 72 statements. For each organisational dimension, there are six statements representing each climate motive. Respondents are required to rank order the six statements under each dimension for the organisation or company or its constituent unit being studied (one denotes the least likely situation and six signifies the most likely situation. A scoring key reveals the correspondence of motives with each statement under each dimension. Respondent's score for each motive under each dimension is entered on the scoring matrix using the scoring key. The total score for each motive is obtained by adding the motive score for all dimensions.

Analysis

Personal and climate data collected from 453 respondents were analysed through rank ordering and t-tests. Means were calculated for each motive of organisational climate for the total sample, representing the company as a whole.

Rank ordering of the means of climate motives was done. The categories of "Dominant" (the highest scoring), and "Backup" (the second highest scoring) climate motives were identified for the company as a whole.

The total MAO-C sample was partitioned in four different ways, on the basis of respondent age, management level, educational qualification, and functional assignment. For each type of grouping, the respondents were mutually exclusive across the groups formed. However, there were common respondents between groups belonging to different types of grouping. On the basis of age, the sample was partitioned as the lower age group (23-29 years), the middle age group (30-39 years), and the higher age group (40-58 years). On the basis of management level, the sample was partitioned as the junior management level (grades: I-III), the middle management level (grades: IV and V) and the senior management level (grades: VI-VIII). On the basis of educational qualification, the sample was partitioned as the low qualification level, the middle qualification level, and the high qualification level, which are shown in Table 1. On the basis of functional assignment, the sample was partitioned as the R&D function, the quality function, the production function, and the miscellaneous function (representing the remaining functions in the organisation).

The dominant and backup motives of organisational climate were identified for each group under each type of grouping. Under each type of grouping, a t-test on means was performed to detect statistically significant differences for each motive of organisational climate between different pairs of groups. Two tailed significance with p < 0.1 was used for interpretation.

RESULTS

Table 2 shows the results of rank ordering of means done for the six climate motives for the company as a whole and for each one of the 13 groups formed. A total of two out of six motives are differently ranked across the age groups, and three out of six motives are differently ranked across the management levels. Two out of six motives are differently ranked across the qualification levels. Three out of six motives are differently ranked across the functions. While the dominant climate is uniform across the 13 groups (similar to what is obtained for the company as a whole), the backup climate is not uniform. One type of backup climate is obtained in seven out of 13 groups (similar to what is obtained for the company as a whole) and another type of backup climate is obtained for the remaining six groups.

Table 2 Mean and rank of climate motives

Groups	ACH		EXP		EXT		CON		DEP		AFF	
	Mean	R	Mean	R	Mean	R	Mean	R	Mean	R	Mean	R
Company as a whole (N = 453)	48.28	4	45.62	5	43.40	6	51.11	3	58.19	1	51.19	2
Age groups												
Lower (n = 58)	47.17	4	46.03	5	42.50	6	53.76	2	58.03	1	50.36	3
Middle (n = 135)	48.86	4	42.26	5	40.41	6	54.20	2	60.79	1	51.24	3
Higher (n = 260)	48.23	4	47.28	5	45.15	6	48.91	3	56.87	1	51.35	2
Management levels												
Junior (n = 247)	49.68	3	46.92	5	45.51	6	48.32	4	56.90	1	50.24	2
Middle (n = 175)	46.01	4	44.20	5	41.35	6	54.97	2	59.34	1	52.29	3
Senior (n = 31)	50.00	4	43.32	5	38.06	6	51.52	3	61.97	1	52.55	2
Qualification levels												
Low (n = 185)	48.21	4	47.33	5	45.48	6	48.97	3	56.10	1	51.38	2
Medium (n = 219)	48.30	4	44.47	5	41.94	6	52.64	2	60.14	1	50.62	3

	ACH		EXP		EXT		CON		DEP		AFF	
Groups	Mean	R	Mean	R	Mean	R	Mean	R	Mean	R	Mean	R
High (n = 49)	48.49	4	44.35	5	42.04	6	52.31	3	57.35	1	53.06	2
Functions												
R & D (n = 79)	47.56	4	47.39	5	43.75	6	50.32	3	55.65	1	53.14	2
Quality (n = 192)	48.77	4	46.12	5	44.85	6	49.74	3	57.92	1	50.69	2
Production (n = 64)	49.80	3	44.44	5	42.94	6	50.09	2	60.75	1	48.89	4
Miscellaneous (n = 118)	47.15	4	44.26	5	41.02	6	54.45	2	58.95	1	51.96	3

Note: N = number of samples for company as a whole, n = number of samples in the group, R = Rank, ACH = Achievement, EXP = Expert Influence, EXT = Extension, CON = Control, DEP = Dependency, AFF = Affiliation.

Table 3 shows the results of t-test on means for each climate motive in different pairs of groups under each type of group formation. Table 3 reveals that 21 out of 90 tests conducted revealed statistically significant differences. Significant differences in the perception of organisational climate were found in five out of 18 tests conducted for the age groups, seven out of 18 tests conducted for the management groups, four out of 18 tests conducted for the qualification groups, and five out of 36 tests conducted for the functional groups.

Table 3 Significance of difference for climate motives
t values for climate motives

Pair of groups	ACH	EXP	EXT	CON	DEP	AFF
Age groups						
Lower vs. middle	-0.75	1.61	0.95	-0.16	-1.36	-0.44
Lower vs. higher	-0.51	-0.58	-1.28	1.87*	0.60	-0.53
Middle vs. higher	0.39	-3.36***	-3.30***	2.57**	3.02***	-0.09
Management levels						
Junior vs. middle	2.43**	1.94*	2.98***	-3.45***	-1.92*	-1.60
Junior vs. senior	-0.10	1.47	3.10***	-0.84	-1.96*	-0.82
Middle vs. senior	-1.16	0.35	1.31	0.89	-0.99	-0.09
Qualification levels						
Low vs. medium	-0.06	2.03**	2.61***	-1.87*	-3.28***	0.60
Low vs. high	-0.11	1.50	1.37	-1.09	-0.56	-0.78
Medium vs. high	-0.08	0.06	-0.04	0.11	1.26	-1.12

Pair of groups	t values for climate motives					
	ACH	EXP	EXT	CON	DEP	AFF
Functions						
R&D vs. quality	-0.55	0.68	-0.57	0.21	1.30	1.35
R&D vs. production	-0.84	1.19	0.34	0.06	-2.32**	1.87*
R&D vs. miscellaneous	0.18	1.54	1.27	-1.40	-1.66*	0.63
Quality vs. production	-0.48	0.78	0.99	-0.12	-1.59	0.95
Quality vs. miscellaneous	0.96	1.15	2.30**	-2.09**	-0.68	-0.89
Production vs. miscellaneous	1.15	0.08	0.89	-1.38	0.89	-1.56

Notes: a. ACH = Achievement, EXP = Expert Influence, EXT = Extension, CON = Control, DEP = Dependency, AFF = Affiliation. b. * $p <= 0.1$, ** $p <= 0.05$, and *** $p <= 0.01$.

Discussion

Table 2 reveals that there are two different types of dominant-backup climate (instead of a single type) in the company under study. Dependency-Affiliation climate (Pareek 2004) found in the company as a whole and in seven out of 13 groups indicates that the top management controls all matters, using their own 'in group' members who have high loyalty to the top management. Dependency-Control climate (Pareek 2004) found in the remaining six groups indicates that the company is controlled by a few individuals having clear-cut channels of communication. These individuals regularly give the final approval for all decisions. The predominance of the Dependency climate in public sector has been reported by Trivedi (2005), while the dominance of Control climate in the public sector has been reported by Sandra and Frans (2002).

Table 3 reveals significant differences in 23 per cent of comparisons made for the six climate motives across groups under each type of grouping. At least one significant difference exists for each climate motive. At least four significant differences exist for each type of grouping. Organisational climate is, therefore, not uniform, but differential across various groups in the company. Differential organisational climate in teacher groups formed in schools on the basis of subject taught, age, and seniority has been reported by Gunbayi (2007). The existence of differential climate in organisations has also been reported by Drexler (1977), Powell and Butterfield (1978), as well as Joyce and Slocum (1984).

Conclusion

The nature of organisational climate has been investigated in this study. It is revealed that organisational climate in the company under study is not homogeneous, but heterogeneous. Since different types of organisational climate promote different kinds of employee behaviour (Pareek 1989), the knowledge of organisational climate obtained in different parts of a company would help better understanding, prediction, and management of employee behaviour across the constituent groups within the company. A better appreciation of differences in employee behaviour across the company would facilitate easier identification of underlying problems and designing the required solutions. This knowledge has potential to enhance the prospects of successful organisational change and lead to easier and more effective implementation of organisational strategy and policies. The findings of this study may contribute to the formulation of a contingency model to help managers to effectively manage and develop employees for higher organisational effectiveness.

Author

Avinash Kumar Srivastav (MS Engineering, Ph.D. Management), is Dean (Research), Icfai Business School, Bangalore. He served as External Consultant to International Labour Organisation; Executive Director, ITI Ltd., Bangalore; OD Advisor, Change Management Advisor and HR Director in Indonesian industries. He has authored

50 research papers in the field of organisational behaviour and development in national and international refereed journals and international conference proceedings, and has edited a book titled R & D Management, published by Tata McGraw-Hill. His papers have appeared in Pfeiffer Annuals, IIMB Management Review, Journal of Management Research and South Asian Journal of Management. He is currently the Consulting Editor of the Icfai Journal of Organisational Behaviour.

Email : aksrivastav@ibsindia.org or drkumar_ioc@yahoo.com

REFERENCES

Brown, S., & Leigh, T. W. (1996). A new look at psychological climate and its relationship to job involvement, effort, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(4), 358-368.

Burke W. W., & Litwin, G. H. (1992). A causal model of organisational performance and change. *Journal of Management*, 18(3), 523-545.

Burton, R. M., Lauridsen, J., & Obel, B. (2004). The impact of organisational climate and strategic fit on firm performance. *Human Resource Management*, 43(1), 67-82.

Campbell, J. P., Dunnette, M., Lawler, III, E. E., & Weick, Jr., K. E. (1970). *Managerial behaviour, performance and effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Drexler, J. A. (1977). Organizational climate: Its homogeneity with organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 62(1), 38-42.

Forehand, G. A., & Gilmer, B. von H. (1964). Environmental variations in studies of organisational behaviour. *Psychological Bulletin*, 62(6), 361-382.

Gordon, J. (Ed.) (2004). *Pfeiffer classic inventories, questionnaires, and surveys for training and development*. San Francisco, California: John Wiley & Sons.

Gunbayi, I. (2007). School climate and teachers' perceptions on climate factors: Research into nine urban high schools. *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 6(3), Article 7.

Hellriegel, D., & Slocum, J. W. Jr. (1974). Organizational climate: Measures, research and contingencies. *Academy of Management Journal*, 17(2), 255-280.

James, L. R., & Jones, A. P. (1974). Organizational climate: A review of theory and research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 81(12), 1096-1112.

Joyce, W. F., & Slocum, J. W. Jr. (1984). Collective climate: Agreement as a basis for defining aggregate climates. *Academy of Management Journal*, 27(4), 721-742.

Kundu, K. (2007). Development of the conceptual framework of organisational climate. *Vidyasagar University Journal of Commerce*, 12(1), 99-108.

Kunnanatt, J. T. (2007). Impact of ISO 9000 on organisational climate. *International Journal of Manpower*, 28(2), 175-192.

Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., & White, R. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behaviour in experimentally created social climates. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 10(2), 271-299.

Litwin, G. H., Humphrey, J. W., & Wilson, T. B. (1978). Organizational climate: A proven tool for improving performance. In W. W. Burke (Ed.), *The cutting edge: Current theory and practice in organization development* (187-205). La Jolla, California: University Associate.

Litwin, G. H., & Stringer, R. A., Jr. (1968). *Motivation and organisational climate*. Boston, Mass.: Division of Research, Harvard Business School.

Lynn, M. S., Barksdale, K., & Shore, T. H. (1995). Managerial perceptions of employee commitment to the organisation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(6), 1593-1615.

Mathieu, J. E., Hoffman, D. A., & Farr, J. L. (1993). Job perception - Job satisfaction relations: An empirical comparison of three competing theories. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 56(3), 370-387.

Pareek, U. (1989). Motivational analysis of organizations-climate (MAO-C), In J. W. Pfeiffer (Ed.), *The 1989 annual* (161-171). San Diego, CA: University Associates.

Pareek, U. (2004). *Understanding organisational behaviour*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Patterson, M. G., Warr, P. B., & West, M. A. (2004). Organizational climate and company performance: The role of employee affect and employee level. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77(2), 193-216.

Patterson, M. G., West, M. A., Shackleton, V. J., Dawson, J. F., Lawthom, R., Maitlis, S., Robinson, D. L., & Wallace, A. M. (2005). Validating the organizational climate measure: Links to managerial practices, productivity and innovation. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 26(4), 379-408.

Powell, G. N., & Butterfield, D. A. (1978). The case for subsystem climates in organisations. *Academy of Management Review*, 3(1), 151-157.

Quazi, A. M. (2003). Identifying the determinants of corporate managers' perceived social obligations. *Management Decision*, 41(9), 822-831.

Rousseau, D. M. (1988). The construction of climate in organisational research. In C. L. Cooper & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 3, 139-158). New York: Wiley.

Sandra, V. T., & Frans, L. L. (2002). The performance paradox in the public sector. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 25(3), 267-281.

Schminke, M., Cropanzano, R., & Rupp, D. E. (2002). Organization structure and fairness perceptions: The moderating effects of organization level. *Organizational Behaviour and Decision Processes*, 89(1), 881-905.

Schein, E. (1992). *Organisational culture and leadership*. (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schneider, B. (1990). The climate for service: An application of the climate construct. In B. Schneider (Ed.), *Organizational climate and culture* (383-412). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Schneider, B. (2000). The psychological life in organisations. In N. M. Ashkanasy, C. P. M. Wilderon & M. F. Peterson (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational culture and climate* (xvii-xxi). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Schneider, B., & Hall, D. (1972). Toward specifying the concept of work climate: A study of Roman Catholic Diocesan priests. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 56(6), 447-455.

Singh, P. (1994). Perception and reactions to inequity as a function of social comparison referents and hierarchical levels. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 24(6), 557-565.

Srivastav, A. K. (2006). Organisational climate as a dependent variable - Relationship with role stress, coping strategy and personal variables. *Journal of Management Research*, 6(3), 125-136.

Srivastav, A. K. (2007). Achievement climate in public sector - A cross functional study on relationship with stress and coping. *IIMB Management Review*, 19(4), 415-425.

Svyantek, D. J, & Bott, J. P. (2004). Organizational culture and organizational climate measures: An integrative review. In J. C. Thomas (Ed.), *Comprehensive handbook of psychological assessment: Industrial and organizational assessment* (Vol. 4, 507-524). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Trivedi, P. (2005). Designing and implementing mechanisms to enhance accountability for state owned enterprises. In *public enterprise and its management: New opportunities and unresolved challenges*, publication based on UN Expert Group Meeting on Re-inventing Public Enterprise and its Management, October 27-28, New York. Retrieved on October 11, 2008 from http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/UN/UNPAN022073.pdf.

Waller, M. J., Huber, G. P., & Glick, W. H. (1995). Functional background as a determinant of executives' selective perception. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(4), 943-974.

Walton, R. E. (1973). Quality of working life: What is it? *Sloan Management Review*, 15(1), 11-21.

Appendix 1 Motivational Analysis of Organisations - Climate (MAO-C)

Name: Organisation: Role: Date:

Completing this instrument will help you to assess the climate of your organisation (or your unit or department if you are answering the instrument for them). Given below are twelve categories representing twelve dimensions of organisational climate. Within each category there are six statements. You are to rank the statements in each category from 6 (most like the situation in your organisation or unit) to 1 (least like the situation in your organisation or unit). Do not give the same rank to more than one statement.

1. Orientation

a. People here are mainly concerned with following established rules and procedures. b. The main concern of people here is to help one another develop greater skills and thereby advance in the organisation. c. Achieving or surpassing specific goals seems to be the main concern of people. d. Consolidating one's own personal position and inf1uence seems to be the main concern here. e. The dominant concern here is to maintain friendly relations with others. f. The main concern here is to develop people's competence and expertise.

2. Interpersonal relationship

a. In this organisation most informal groups are formed around experts. b. The atmosphere here is very friendly and people spend enough time in informal and social relations. c. In this organisation strong cliques protect their own interests. d. Businesslike relationships prevail here; people are warm, but get together primarily to ensure excellence in performance. e. People here have strong associations mostly with their supervisors and look to them for suggestions and guidance. f. People here have a high concern for one another and tend to help one another spontaneously when such help is needed.

3. Supervision

a. The purpose of supervision here is usually to check for mistakes and to catch the person making the mistake. b. Supervisors here strongly prefer their subordinates to ask them for instructions and suggestions. c. Supervisors here take pains to see that their subordinates improve personal skills and chances of advancement. d. Supervisors here reward outstanding achievement. e. In influencing their subordinates, supervisors here try to use their expertise and competence rather than their formal authority. f. Supervisors here are more concerned with maintaining good relations with their subordinates than with emphasising duties and performance.

4. Problem management

a. People here take problems as challenges and try to find better solutions than anyone else. b. When problems are faced here, experts are consulted and they play an important role in solving these problems. c. In dealing with problems, people here mostly consult their friends. d. When working on solutions to problems, people here keep in mind the needs of organisational members as well as society at large. e. People here usually refer problems to their superiors and look to them for solutions. f. Problems here are usually solved by supervisors; subordinates are not involved.

5. Management of mistakes

a. When people here make mistakes, they are not rejected. Instead, their friends show them much understanding and warmth. b. Here the philosophy is that the supervisor can make no mistake and the subordinate dare not make one. c. Usually people here are able to acknowledge and analyse their mistakes because they can expect to receive help and support from others. d. When the subordinate makes a mistake here, the supervisor treats it as a learning experience that can prevent failure and improve performance in the future. e. Subordinates here expect guidance from their supervisors in correcting or preventing mistakes. f. Here, people seek the help of experts to analyse and prevent mistakes.

6. Conflict management

a. Most interpersonal and interdepartmental conflicts here arise as a result of striving for higher performance. In analysing and resolving these cont1icts, the over-riding consideration is high productivity. b. Here, conflicts are usually avoided or smoothed over to maintain a friendly atmosphere. c. Arbitration or third-party intervention (usually performed by experienced or senior people) is sought and used here. d. In a conf1ict situation here, those who are stronger force their points of view. e. In resolving conf1icts here, appeal is made to principles, organisational ideals, and the larger goals of the organisation. f. Experts are consulted and their advice used in resolving conf1icts here.

7. Communication

a. After due consideration, those in authority here issue instructions and expect them to be carried out. b. Most communication here is informal and friendly. It both arises from and contributes to warm relations. c. People here ask for information from those who are expert on the subjects. d. Relevant information is made available to all who need it and can use it for the purpose of achieving high performance here. e. People here communicate information, suggestion, and even criticism to others out of concern for them. f. Communication is often selective here; people usually give or hold back crucial information as form of control.

8. Decision Making

a. While making decisions, people here make special attempts to maintain cordial relations with all concerned. b. Decisions are made at the top and communicated down ward, and people here generally prefer this. c. People who have demonstrated high achievement have a big say in the decisions made here. d. Decisions here generally are made without involving subordinates. e. Decisions here are made and influenced by specialists and other knowledgeable people. f. Decisions are made here by keeping in mind the good of the employees and society.

9. Trust

a. Only a few people here are trusted by management, and they are quite influential. b. Trusting and friendly relations are highly valued here. c. Here, high value is placed on trust between supervisor and subordinate. d. Specialists and experts are highly trusted here. e. A general attitude of helping generates mutual trust here. f. Those who can achieve results are highly trusted here.

10. Management of Rewards

a. Here, the main thing that is rewarded is excellence in performance and the accomplishment of tasks. b. Knowledge and expertise are recognised and rewarded here. c. Loyalty is rewarded more than anything else here. d. The people who are rewarded here are those who help their junior colleagues to achieve and develop. e. The ability to control subordinates and maintain discipline is afforded the greatest importance in rewarding supervisor here. f. The ability to get along well with others is highly rated and rewarded here.

11. Risk Taking

a. When confronted by risk situations, supervisors here seek the guidance and support of friends. b. In risky situations, supervisors here strongly emphasise discipline and obedience to orders. c. In risky situations, supervisors here have a strong tendency to rely on expert specialists for their advice. d. Supervisors here generally go to their supervisors for instruction in risky situations. e. In responding to risky situations, supervisors here show great concern for the people working in the organisation. f. In responding to risky situations, supervisors here take calculated risks and strive above all to be more efficient or productive.

12. Innovation and Change

a. Innovation and change are initiated and implemented here primarily by experts and specialists. b. Here, innovation to change is primarily ordered by top management. c. Before initiating innovation or change, supervisors here generally go to their supervisors for sanction and guidance. d. Those who initiate innovation or change here demonstrate a great concern for any possible adverse effects on others (in the organisation or outside) and try to minimise these effects. e. Innovation or change here is mainly initiated and implemented through highly result-oriented individuals. f. Supervisors here seldom undertake innovations that disturb their existing friendships

in the organisation or earn the enmity of organisational members.

Appendix 2 MAO–C scoring key
Motives

Dimensions of organisational climate

	Ac	EI	Ex	Co	De	Af
1. Orientation	c	f	b	d	a	e
2. Interpersonal relationship	d	a	f	c	e	b
3. Supervision	d	e	c	a	b	f
4. Problem management	a	b	d	f	e	c
5. Management mistakes	d	f	c	b	e	a
6. Conflict management	a	f	e	d	c	b
7. Communication	d	c	e	f	a	b
8. Decision making	c	e	f	d	b	a
9. Trust	f	d	e	a	c	b
10. Management of rewards	a	b	d	e	c	f
11. Risk taking	f	c	e	b	d	a
12. Innovation and change	e	a	d	b	c	f

Note: Ac = achievement, EI = expert influence, Ex = extension, Co = Control, De = Dependency, Af = Affiliation.