

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE AND EMPLOYEES' ADJUSTMENT

S. SULTAN AKHTAR AND
D. M. PESTONJEE*

NELSON'S (1950) CLASSIFICATION OF organizational climates runs into four categories, viz., bureaucratic, autocratic, idiocratic and democratic. A critical evaluation of these types shows that bureaucratic and autocratic types are similar in many ways, while idiocratic and democratic types resemble each other. Thus, Nelson's typology may further be reduced to two suitable categories, the reduction being brought about on the basis of orientation and emphasis, as well as for convenience of classification. The first two may be classified as Regimentation type. Regimentation type may be defined as the organization which is management-oriented, devoted to the task of execution of management's policies, paying no attention to the reactions of those on whom the rules and regulations are imposed. In short, it is mainly concerned with the orders and the extent to which they are carried out by the workers. Democratic type may be defined as the organization which gives due recognition to the social and psychological aspects of work, the emphasis being either on the individual worker or a group of workers. It remains employee-oriented in which enforcement of order is replaced by the ungrudging co-operation of the worker. It takes into account, to the fullest extent, the human aspect of work; workers' needs, attitudes and satisfaction are considered to be important aspects of his performance.

As early as 1927, Houser in a study of American Executives reported that important determinants of executive policy were 'ego-motives of power' and 'self-expression'. Authority and power, according to him, relate to dominance over people, while 'self-assertion' compels the executive to do things his own way. Both these aspects were only shades of autocratic attitudes. Gouldner (1954) points out certain defects in industrial bureaucracy in that such an organization defies the existence of various strata present within each and every organization. And the things which are of prime importance for the workers are often neglected in such a set-up.

A bureaucratic organization further suffers from what Bass (1960) calls 'organizational rigidity'. The day to day work is to be carried out in such an organization on the basis of the policies and rules laid down by people who are both physically and psychologically away from the work group. There is a gross lack of adaptability because "bureaucracy demands reliability, predictability, and devotion to regulations". In such organizational structures, people have just to carry-out the functions of their positions. Everything goes on smoothly so long as everybody carries on his duties according to the formal expectations of his position.

The present study was directed to assess the effectiveness of Regimentational

*Dr. Sultan Akhtar is Lecturer in Psychology in the Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh and Mr. Pestonjee, Lecturer in Psychology in the Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi.

(bureaucratic) and Democratic types of organizational structures in terms of job adjustment (satisfaction).

SAMPLE

The sample of the present study comprises drivers and conductors of passenger-carrying vehicles engaged by the U.P. Government Roadways and private bus services. The U.P. Government Roadways represents a giant network of fully equipped modern workshops, depots and stations spread over the whole of the State. The drivers and conductors have to put in a stipulated "running" or "steering" duty everyday. They have to run on any "line" that is allotted to them and the two do not necessarily form a lasting "team". Matters related to cleaning, refuelling and repairs of vehicles are solely attended to by the workshop staff. The drivers and conductors are responsible to their respective supervisory staff (Traffic Superintendent, Asstt. Traffic Superintendent, as well as Senior and Junior Station Incharges) who in turn are responsible to their own superiors (General Manager and Asstt. General Manager). The workers have to follow and obey strictly the rules and regulations of the organization. Consistent and continued conformity to the supervisor's orders are accepted as the criterion of loyalty. The officers remain concerned with attaining the organizational objectives.

The private bus services, on the other hand, breathe a different air. A private bus owner seldom commands the resources for employing more than eight to ten drivers and conductors. Matters pertaining to business operation are jointly looked after by the owner and his drivers and conductors. The owner gives complete charge of the vehicle to his staff who attend to all minor mechanical repairs. Supervisory staff is non-

existent and, at times, the owner has to work with his staff.

It may be now clear that the Roadways are characterized by completely regimentational type of organizational structure, whereas the private bus services are representative of a democratic set-up.

For the purposes of the present study drivers and conductors of the Meerut Region were selected. The sample comprised 110 employees (drivers and conductors) of Roadways and 46 employees (drivers and conductors) operating private bus services in the same region. A list of employees was obtained from the Station Incharge (Roadways) and 20% of the cases were randomly selected. As regards the sample of private bus services, the list was compiled by the investigators with the help of private operators' Union and here also 20% of the cases were randomly selected. Attitude and Adjustment Inventory (Akhtar and Pestonjee, 1963) was administered to each selected driver and conductor of the two organizations.

ANALYSIS

Cumulative scoring of job and management areas of the Inventory yields adjustment score for 'within work' situation. Cumulated adjustment scores of each driver and conductor of the two organizations were obtained. Frequency distributions of adjustment score of the two organizations were separately prepared with equal step intervals ($i=4$). The Null Hypothesis (H_0) that "the two samples come from the same population" was tested by the Kolmogorov-Smirnov (two-tailed) test. This non-parametric test, according to Siegel (1956), is "sensitive to any kind of difference in the distribution from which the two samples were drawn—differences in location (central tendency), in dispersion, in skewness, etc."

TABLE 1

Organization	0-3	4-7	8-11	12-15	16-19	20-23	24-27	28-31	32-35	36-39	40-43	44-47	48-51
Democratic n ₁ = 46	0	0	0	.08	.13	.21	.41	.63	.76	.84	.93	1.00	1.00
Regimentational n ₂ = 110	.04	.23	.44	.63	.80	.83	.87	.90	.90	.93	.98	1.00	1.00

D (Maximum difference) = .67

$$x^2 = 4D^2 \left(\frac{n_1 \cdot n_2}{n_1 + n_2} \right) = 4 (.4489) \frac{5060}{156} = (.4489) (129.74) x^2 = 58.24$$

The value of x² with 2 df at 1% level of significance = 9.2

The calculated value was found to be highly significant at 1% level and this led to the rejection of the Ho. Thus it was concluded that the employees of the two organizations significantly differ with regard to adjustment to 'within work situation'. Mean and Standard Deviations of the two organizational structures were computed.

TABLE 2

MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION

Organizational structure	Mean	S.D.	C.V.
Democratic	29.41	8.64	29.3
Regimentational	15.10	10.52	69.6

Employees of the democratic organization obtained a higher Mean than their counterpart employed by the regimentational type. This suggests that, on the average, the employees of the former organization were much better adjusted than the employees of the latter organization. Relative to their own Means the employees under the two organizational structures show dissimilar variations. The S.D. of the regimentational organization is higher than the S.D. of the democratic type. This relationship is explicitly brought out by comparison of the two C.V.'s. The C.V. of democratic structure indicates that S.D. of this series is only 29.3% of the Mean whereas in case of regimental structure the S.D. is 69.6% of the corresponding Mean. The higher value of the S.D. of the regimentational organizational structure, clearly, points that the employees of this organization differ a great deal among themselves in their adjustment as compared to the employees of

the democratic type. It may be concluded that the employees of the democratic organizational structure are better adjusted and there is lesser variability as compared to the employees of the regimentational type. The marked differences in the Means and S.D's of employees adjustment of the two organizations further reinforce our earlier finding that the two samples bear totally different characteristics.

The analysis of the responses on the various items of the Inventory brought to light various factors that contribute to adjustment or maladjustment of employees working under the democratic and regimentational structures. 56.4% of the employees of the democratic as compared to only 19.8% of the employees of the regimentational type have expressed the view that they are 'rewarded' for good work. 71.6% and 18.9% of the employees of the democratic and regimentational types respectively,

admitted that good work is given '*recognition*'. A majority of employees (75.9%) of the democratic organizational structure and only a few (15.3%) of the regimentational structure stated that their superiors invite '*suggestions*' from employees. Again, 68.3% of the employees of the democratic as compared to 20.2% of the employees of the regimentational structure believed that their supervisors were '*considerate*'. 65.1% and 16.2% of the employees of the democratic and regimentational organizations, respectively, claimed that they get opportunities to *display their skill*, 41.2% of the employees of the former organization and 16.2% of the employees of the latter organization had no '*fear of dismissal*'. As regards '*nature of work*,' '*pay and prospects*,' '*fellow-workers*' and '*interest in the work*', we did not find any appreciable difference between the responses of the employees of the two organizations.

DISCUSSION

Rupe's (1951) investigation revealed that among motivating factors utilized by successful executives were complimenting, thanking, recognising and rewarding the meritorious workers. Carter (1952) has reported that outstanding civilian or military leaders show '*consideration*' towards employees. Lawshe and Nagle (1953) obtained high correlation between group productivity and employees' perception of how '*considerate*' their superiors were. It is reasonable to believe that '*recognising*' and '*rewarding*' workers and being '*considerate*' towards them help the workers in their job adjustment. Thus, the presence of these supervisory practices in the democratic organizational structure and their absence in the regimentational structure may be considered to be responsible for making the employees of the former organization better adjusted than their counterparts in the latter organization.

Display of skill has often been considered by psychologists (Fairchild 1930), (Harrell 1958), as an important factor responsible for making employees satisfied with their job. We, too, observed that the employees of the democratic structure get greater opportunities to display their skill and this might be responsible for making them adjusted to their work-situation. Display of skill as such cannot be deemed to bear fruitful results. If it goes together with '*rewarding*', and '*recognising*', then it is of immense help to the employees in their job adjustment.

The reasons why the regimentational structure fails to elevate the satisfaction and adjustment are more than one. Apart from the factor of organizational rigidity, there is an ever hanging fear that the letter of the rule may be inadvertently violated and then there is none to protect an erring employee. Again, rewards for conformity are few but punishments for non-conformity are many. Job insecurity has been reported by several investigators as having an adverse effect on job adjustment. Investigations and comments by Hall (1934), Watson (1942), and Grove and Kerr (1951) have indicated job insecurity as a very potent factor for making employees dissatisfied. The present authors also observed that the majority of employees from the regimentational structure had a feeling of insecurity.

Another important factor adversely influencing the satisfaction and adjustment of employees from regimentational structures is the absence of ego-involvement. The democratic structure allows the workers to have greater ego-involvement in their job. There are no written regulations in the case of the democratic structure; the worker is given full responsibility to maintain and run the services as efficiently as he can. He is virtually the owner of the vehicle when on duty. Minor repairs, keeping to schedule and

looking after the passenger comforts are absent in case of workers in an organization directly his responsibilities. These features are absent in case of workers in an organization where the bureaucracy reigns supreme.

REFERENCES

1. Akhtar, S. S. and Pestonjee, D. M. (1963) "A Study of Employees Adjustment Within and Outside Work Situation". *The Indian Journal of Social Work*, Vol. XXIII, 4, p. 328.
2. Bass, B. M. (1960) *Leadership, Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, New York: Harper, p. 416.
3. Carter, J. H. (1952) "Military Leadership". *Military Rev.*, 32, pp. 14-18.
4. Fairchild, M. (1930) "Skill and Specialization". *Personnel J.*, Vol. 9, pp. 128-175.
5. Gouldner, A. W. (1954) "Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy.." Illinois: The Free Press, pp. 26-27.
6. Grove, E. A., and Kerr, W. A. (1951) "Specific Evidence on Origin of Halo Effect in Measurement of Employee Morale". *J. Soc. Psych.*, 34, pp. 165-170.
7. Hall, Q. M. (1934) "Attitudes and Unemployment". *Archiv. Psych.*, No. 165.
8. Harrell, T. W. (1958) *Industrial Psychology*. New York: Rinehart, p. 263.
9. Houser, J. D. (1927) *What the Employer Thinks*. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, pp. 93-96.
10. Lawshe, C. H. and Nagle, B. F. (1953) "Productivity: Attitude Toward Supervision". *J. Appld. Psychol.*, 37 pp. 159-162.
11. Nelson, C. W. (1950) *A New Approach to Leadership*. Industrial Relations Center, Univ. of Chicago. Chicago (Int. Harw. Res. Project).
12. Rupe, J. C. (1951) "When Workers Rate the Boss". *Personnel Psychol.*, V. pp. 271-290.
13. Siegel, S. (1956) *Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences*. New York: McGraw-Hill, p. 127.
14. Watson, G. (1942) "Morale during unemployment", in G. Watson (ed.) *Civilian Morale*. New York: Harper & Bros., pp. 273-348.