

# Typological Approach to Organizational Climates: A Contingency View

Myung-Soo Park\*, Young-Sup Kim\*\*

.....<Table of Contents>.....

<b>(I) Introduction</b>
<b>(II) Theoretical Framework</b>
1. Studies of Organizational Climates
2. Typology of Organizational Sub-Climate: A Contingency View
1. Mechanistic Sub-climate
2. Humanistic Sub-climate
3. Self-renewing Sub-climate
<b>(III) Research Design and Methodology</b>
1. Variables and Hypothetical Assumptions
2. Case Study: Exposition Park District Office
<b>(IV) Findings and Interpretations</b>
1. Typology of Task Analysis
2. Analysis of Effectiveness Criteria
<b>(V) Conclusions and Implications</b>

## (I) Introduction

This paper attempts to identify the particular internal climates of a public welfare agency, to observe and analyze relationships between the normative typology of sub-climates and characteristic variables identified within each, and to posit a "mode" for their relationships as they are manifested between each sub-climate. Also, the study has postulated three internal climates which exist simultaneously in complex public organizations. These are the mechanistic, the humanistic, and the self-renewing sub-clima-

tes: in their totality they constitute the climate of the organization. Specifically, this study has undertaken the following:

1. The identification of structural dimensions which create unique sub-climates within an organization and classification of different typologies of organizational sub-climates,
2. The identification of what typical relationships prevail between such sub-climates; characteristic organizational variables such as assigned tasks, effectiveness criteria, and orientation of individual workers; and the manner in which these relationships have affected overall organizational effectiveness.
3. The testing of assumptions regarding the relevancy of organization and management

\*Associate Professor, School of Business & Organizational Sciences, Florida International University.

\*\*Professor, College of Law and Political Science, Hanyang University.

theory as it applies to a social welfare agency and advocate a contingency view of managing and administering public sector organization.

## (II) Theoretical Framework

### 1. Studies of Organizational Climates

The concept of organizational climate has been used in various contexts. Organizational climate and many other related terms such as organizational environment, situation, condition and characteristics have been widely used in analyzing complex organizations and interaction among their various components. Many researchers have investigated organizational climate in terms of such dimensions as structure, leadership, perception, autonomy, motivation, satisfaction and performance.

Recently, there has been a more sophisticated analysis of organizational climate studies.<sup>(1)</sup> A review of the literature reveals that the conceptualization and measurement of this area of inquiry may be categorized into three different approaches. The first category of studies falls into the structural approach to organizational climate. Organizational structures such as size, objectives and goals, degree of prescribed structures, systems complexity, leadership patterns, and hierarchical forms, are the determining variables for the organizational climate and influences on the behavior of the people in the organization. This orientation of the studies views the structural characteristics of organization as a cause of particular climates. (Lawler, Hall, and Oldham (1974), and Payne and Mansfield (1973).)

The second category of studies may be termed the subjective or perceptive approach to organizational climate studies, describing climate in terms of the "feel" or "perceive" that the employee has for the organization, as well as structural variables (Halpin and Crofts (1962), and Schneider (1973)). The third category of studies may be termed the synthesis approach from the combination of the structural and perceptive approach. According to Litwin and Stringer (1968), they approached organizational climate as an intervening variable between the structure of organizational variables and end-result variables such as performance and job satisfaction attributed by the perception of the organizational members. One of the sophisticated analyses of organizational climate has been advanced by Gilmer and Forehand (1964). According to them, the concept involves at least three sets of variables: (1) environmental, such as size and structure of organizations, (2) personal, such as attitudes, and motives, which the individual brings with him to the job situation, and (3) outcome variables, such as job satisfaction, job motivation and productivity, which are determined jointly by environmental and personal variables.<sup>(2)</sup>

Being cognizant of the diversities mentioned, this study defines the conceptual framework of organizational climate as: A relatively enduring quality of the internal environment of organization: (1) that has a set of particular characteristics; (2) that distinguishes one organization from another organization; (3) that modifies the different working behavior of individual work performance, and (4) that assumes uniquely related

(1) For an excellent summary of the research evidence, see Don Hellriegel and John W. Slocum, Jr., "Organizational Climate: Measures, Research and Contingencies," *Academy of Management Journal* (June 1976), pp. 255-80. Also see Benjamin Schneider, "Organizational Climates: An Essay", *Personnel Psychology*, (Vol. 28, 1975), pp. 447-279.

(2) G.A. Forehand and B Gilmer, "Environmental Variations in Studies of Organizational Behavior," *Psychological Bulletin*, LXII (1964), pp. 361-381. Also G.A. Forehand, "On the Interaction of Persons and Organizations," in Tagiuri, et al., Ed., *Organizational Climate*, 1968, pp. 65-80.

effectiveness criteria.

To classify and construct different typologies of organizational climate, the conceptual framework can be drawn from the contingency studies of organizational climate along the line with commonly identifiable organization and management literature such as structural, behavioral, or systems theories.

## 2. Typology of Organizational Sub-Climates: A contingency View

The attempt of the framework here is to formulate different paradigms of organizational climate and major characteristics associated with each.

The research findings of the comparative studies which applied formal characteristics of organization to various contexts have indicated that the organization that deals with uniform tasks and routinized work performance requires a more mechanistic climate for the formal rationalization of bureaucratic forms; but in other situations that same characteristic is not applicable because the required task performance is much more complex (Burns and Stalker, 1961, Woodward, 1965, Lawrence and Lorsch, 1967, Morse and Lorsch, 1970). These approaches attempt to see different types of organizations and unique conditions of environmental demands that require different types of organizational effectiveness.

The contingency approach suggests that application of models and theories of organization and management may be appropriate and depends on different types of organization rather than universal applicability to all types of organization. The basic properties of contingency view are accurately described by Kast and Rosenzweig in that:

The contingency view seeks to understand the interrelationships within and among sub-systems as well as between the organization and its environment and to define patterns of relationships or configurations of variables. It emphasizes the multivariate nature of organization and attempts to understand how organizations operate under varying conditions and in specific circumstances. Contingency views are ultimately directed toward suggesting organizational designs and managerial practices most appropriate for special conditions.<sup>(3)</sup>

This approach has advocated situational theory of organization, in which the appropriate organizational structure and preferred behavior are contingent upon the nature of organizational environment and given objectives. Moreover, the contingency view suggests that functioning parts of organizations sometime show the same differences which distinguish one entire organization from another. One part of an organization will possess a given characteristic and others will not. This implies that certain types of internal climates are better applicable to certain types of organizational situations which depend upon the nature of the task to be accomplished.

Given recognition of the situational "fitness" of various internal climates to operational situations, a more explicit description of the models of organizations and theoretical assumptions on which they are based will be developed in terms of mechanistic climate, humanistic climate, and self-renewing climate as typologies of organizational sub-climate.

### 1. Mechanistic Sub-climate

The term "mechanistic" or machine model is described by Burns and Stalker (1961). Their definition of mechanistic organization is characterized by a rigid breakdown of jobs into functions and specialities and precisely defined duties. This system is also characterized by a well-

---

(3) Fremont E. Kast and James E. Rosenzweig, *Contingency Views of Organization and Management*, Science Research Associates, Inc., 1973, p. 3.

developed command hierarchy along which communication takes the form of orders rather than consultations. The earlier theories of management, such as the physiological organization concepts of Taylor (1947), the departmentalization developed by Fayol (1930), the coordination principles of Gulick and Urwick (1937), and Mooney and Reiley's (1939) principles of organization, and the later ideal type of bureaucracy of Max Weber (1946), provide a rational basis for many of the so-called "principles" or "ideal type." Such theories fall within the framework of the mechanistic approach to complex organizations.

The characteristics of mechanistic climate are viewed in terms of formal rationality of structure and prescribed procedures of organizational performance. The stress is not on behavior or the worker's motivation, but rather on the design and the roles to be recorded and applied in order to carry out the given tasks. The degree of bureaucratization of structure and working procedures are relatively higher than other sub-climates of the organization.

## 2. Humanistic Sub-climate

Behavioralists have approached organizational climate from a perspective which emphasizes the sociopsychological aspects of human workers and their interaction with the formal organization. The goals, feelings, aspirations, interactions, and psychological needs of the members of the organization constitute the focal point of their emphasis.

The list of contemporary scholars who advocate this new approach includes Leavitt (1963), Argyris (1957), Likert (1961), McGregor (1960) Maslow (1970), Herzberg (1966), Blake and Mouton, and Bennis (1964). These scholars attempt to view the organization in its entirety rather than a few of its component parts. Thus, to them, satisfactory working conditions, adequate compensation, and the necessary equipment

for the job are viewed as only a small portion of the requirements for an adequate motivational climate. Of greater importance are the creation of a climate of effective supervision, the opportunity for the realization of personal goals, congenial relations with others at the place of work, and a sense of accomplishment.

Under the humanistic climate of organization, the sub-part of any given organization is considered to be characterized by such features at less formal definition of job, less rigid and routinized procedure of working performance, as well as internalized directions among workers in order for them to perform their tasks effectively. The humanistic climate places more emphasis on communication and decision making along the hierarchy, tending more to seek the worker's consultations rather than utilizing the command potential of hierarchical authority.

## 3. Self-renewing Climate

The self-renewing approach recognizes both the external and internal environment of organizations and their dynamic interaction. The key words for organizational effectiveness are innovation, creativity, and change and adaptability. This is an approach utilizing organizations as self-generating mechanisms, with pro-active behavior required by the organization upon the components of human actors in the organization.

The open system approach contrasts with the mechanistic closed system, in the sense that the mechanistic approach tends to seek and accept equilibrium whereas the former does not accept that assumption. To study the concept of a self-renewing organization as an open dynamic system, one must observe not only complex structure and its rationality, but also the interaction and its processes the importation of energy from the environment, the through-put or transformation of the imported energy into some product which is characteristic of the system, the exploration of that product into the environment,

and the re-energizing of the system from sources in the environment. In this context, open systems have certain characteristics of negative entropy, feedback systems, homeostasis, differentiation, and equifinality (Katz and Kahn, 1966).

In stressing the concept of negative entropy, feedback, homeostasis, differentiation, and equifinality in open systems, Walter Buckley (1968) develops the concept of morphogenesis emulated from second cybernetics by Maruyama (1963). He introduced different systems models such as mechanistic, organic, and the complex adoptive system in terms of morphostasis and morphogenesis. Buckley's morphogenic model of socio-cultural systems recognizes the dynamic open complex system as having certain properties of equilibrium which amplify energy in the system and give it new open insight to the self-renewing organization and its dynamic new behavior required on the behalf of human actors in an organization.

Under this climate, the task definition and its roles are more general and continually change in interaction, and require social and creative skills. The task content is highly complex so that precise definition of working procedures, obligation, and technical methods attached to each task role cannot be identified. The workers who perform this type of task require extremely less formal organizational constraints and direction and more is required of professional personal judgment in their daily performance of given tasks.

As mentioned previously, the theoretical objective of the study is the attempt to recognize the three different types of sub-climates which exist simultaneously in given situations. These three types of sub-climates are functionally essential in order to carry out organizational goals. It is critical not to assume that one particular model is a "best" model which will apply to all situations. There exists no permanent "one

best approach;" rather, what is best depends upon what is known about human behavior in a particular organizational environment and what is known about the priority of objectives at a particular time.

In reference to the rejection of the one best approach to the management of an organization and the recognition of a multi-dimensional approach to the different types of situations, the main theme is to instigate a typology which facilitates variation in the structure and pattern of working procedures in a sub-climate within an organization, indicating how it varies according to different situational conditions.

A conceptual framework of typology of organizational climate would identify the variants in organizational sub-climate systems that exist at any given time. Based upon such findings, new dimensions in organizational analysis and planning in the field of public welfare administration may be posed so as to improve existing welfare organizations through the modification of recruitment and training, the socialization of employees and the the reward systems to achieve more effective support for the service delivery system. This will be illustrated by the findings and interpretations acquired by Exposition Park District organization.

### (III) Research Design and Methodology

#### 1. Variables and Hypothetical Assumptions

The contributing characteristics and dimensions under each climate have been selected from three variables and further divided into nine sub-characteristic variables are: 1. *Typology of Tasks* (1. prescribed task, 2. prescribed plus discretionary task, 3. multidiscretionary task); 2. *Typology of Effectiveness Criteria* (1. forma-

lization, 2. humanization, 3. change and adaptability); 3. *Types of Worker* (1. social services workers (professional), 2. eligibility workers (semi-professional), 3. clerical workers (non-professional)). These variables are key contributions to the different types of organizational sub-climate and its differentiation.

In brief, the main hypothetical assumptions are the following:

- (1) Under the mechanistic sub-climate, prescribed task performance is required and a higher degree of formalization is imposed as an effective criterion. It is more likely that this work will be performed by non-professional workers.
- (2) Under the humanistic sub-climate, prescribed and discretionary task performance is required, and a higher degree of humanization is imposed as an effective criterion. It is more likely that this work will be performed by semi-professional workers.
- (3) Under the self-renewing organizational sub-climate, complex discretionary task performance is required and a higher degree of change and adaptability is imposed as effective criteria. It is more likely that this work will be performed by professional workers.

## **2. Case Study: Exposition Park District Office**

The subject of this research design was the Exposition Park District Office (Los Angeles). The areas of central concern were: (1) identification of particular conditions of the internal climate of the Exposition Park District; (2) classification of such condition into different typologies of organizational sub-climate; observation and analysis of the interaction among characteristics of sub-organizational climate; and (4) identification of the task, people, and unique effectiveness criteria so that inferences could be made regarding organizational effectiveness overall. The Exposition Park District is one of twenty-three districts in the Los Angeles County

Department of Public Social Services. A District Director heads the agency, and the six sectional divisions are supervised by individual Deputy Directors. These six divisions are composed of: one approved eligibility section, two social services sections, one intake and referral section, one administrative section and one eligibility section. Each section is further divided into various units directed by a unit supervisor and employing approximately five workers. The division of labor is well defined from the top to the bottom of the hierarchy according to different functions and tasks. Approximately five hundred employees were working in this agency during the study period.

This District has operated under a constantly changing environment wherein frequent reformations of national policies, changing of federally required rules and regulations, and local restructuring of intergovernmental systems existed. In addition, state and local (county) regulations and policies had an ongoing impact upon local public assistance district offices. Three divisions of this organization were chosen as different types of sub-climates by analyzing the task, effectiveness criteria, and the personal skills of employees. The three divisions encompassed forty-eight social service workers, forty-four eligibility workers, and forty-two clerical workers who were randomly selected and constitute a sample group for this study.

Data gathered through the implementation of a questionnaire answered three essential questions. First, to what extent is the degree of formalization, humanization, and change and adaptability as an effectiveness criterion more suitable and applicable to different sub-sectors of this agency in order to effectively perform the given task? Second, what are the different characteristics in any of the three sub-sectors of an organization? Lastly, do different types of sub-climates exist in this agency: if so, then

to what extent can the different climates be associated with the typologies of different tasks, effectiveness criteria, and orientation of workers? These questions have been explicated into fifty-two open and closed-end questions, and divided into five sections. Because of the nature of the objectives of this study, the research design employed has been an ex post facto type of empirical analysis.<sup>(4)</sup>

#### (IV) Findings and Interpretations<sup>(5)</sup>

The research analysis was examined on the premise that the three sample groups would provide differing attitudes toward three categorized variables. The data acquired from the questionnaire was analyzed in detail and the frequency of each group's comments were recorded and tabulated. The nonparametric technique, chi square, was employed in assessing the data because of the nature of the data and the computational simplicity of the statistics. The six point scale in the questionnaires was converted into three categories of responses among the three groups. Three by three contingency tables were employed in the analysis in order to compare the respondent groups in various combinations and a 0.5 significance level was employed in rejecting the null hypotheses.

##### 1. Typology of Task Analysis:

1. Prescribed task, 2. prescribed plus discretionary task, 3. multidiscretionary task.

As defined earlier, the definition of task implies a specific assignment of work imposed by the organization upon individual workers where different skills and working procedures are required according to the degree of complexity of the task. It was hypothesized that variation of

different types of internal climates in the sub-sectors of an organization depends, to a large degree, upon the typology of given tasks such as route versus complex activities.

The task variable was converted into eleven questions in order to obtain information to validate the following hypothetical assumptions.

1. In the mechanistic sub-climate of a welfare organization, the higher the degree of prescribed task performance required, the more likely such work will be performed by non-professional (clerical) workers.
2. In the humanistic sub-climate of an organization, the higher the degree of prescribed plus discretionary task performance required, the more likely such work will be performed by semi-professional (eligibility) workers.
3. In the self-renewing sub-climate of an organization, the higher the degree of multidiscretionary task performance required, the more likely such work will be performed by the professional (social service) workers.

The null hypothesis in the analysis of typology of tasks was presented as: there is no significant relationship among the three groups in relation to the typology of tasks. Eleven questions were provided to the respondents for analyzing the task variables. The Chi square analyses of this typology of task variables strongly rejected (mostly at .001 level) the null hypothesis and accepted the theoretical assumption that there are significant differences among the three respondent groups.

##### 2. Analysis of Effectiveness Criteria:

1. Formalization, 2. Humanization, 3. Change and adaptability.

As noted earlier, this paper selected organizational effectiveness in terms of the degree of enforcing formalization, the degree of humani-

(4) See Fred N. Kerlinger, *Foundations of Behavioral Research*, (2nd Ed.), Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973, pp. 378-394).

(5) See Appendix 1, 2, 3 and 4.

zation, and change and adaptability in an organization. In brief, the main hypothetical assumptions used in the analysis of the typology of effectiveness criteria are the following: 1. Under the mechanistic sub-climate, a relatively higher degree of *formalization* is imposed as an effectiveness criterion than for any other sub-climate. 2. Under the humanistic organizational subclimate a relatively higher degree of *humanization* is imposed as an effectiveness criterion than for any other sub-climate. 3. Under the self-renewing sub-climate, a relatively higher degree of *change and adaptability* is imposed as an effectiveness criterion than for any other sub-climate.

The null hypothesis in the analysis of typology of effectiveness criteria was presented as: there is no significant relationship among the three groups in relation to effectiveness criteria.

*Formalization* was operationalized in terms of requiring official rules and regulations which imply not only a preponderance of rules defining jobs and specifying what is to be done but also the enforcement of those rules and regulations for the performance of daily activities in each of the different organizational subclimates. This variable was itemized into ten questions for the purpose of obtaining information from three respondent groups.

*Humanization* was defined as a managerial phenomenon emphasizing motivation and flexible climates for individual workers, while putting less emphasis on the high degree of formal rationality. Much of the research carried out on organizations has been directed at employee-centered types of effectiveness, particularly the relationships between employee attitudes, morale, satisfaction, and participation. This variable was operationalized into twelve questions for obtaining information from three sample groups. Statistical presentation of the data regarding the analysis of humanization has suggested that significant differences exist among the three

groups.

*Change and Adaptability* were operationalized into fourteen questions in order to observe the perceived variations with respect to: identification of the most pressing problems faced by the respondents and ascertaining how they solved those problems; the general notion of how change takes place in their section; and, future perspectives in terms of change and adaptability. The next nine questions were designed for the purpose of observing actual changes and adaptability by sub-systems as well as individual workers which occurred within the last six months in specific areas such as formal structure, processes or working methods, the section's objectives and goals, and methods of utilizing resources in each of the sub-sections.

In the mechanistic sub-climates of the organization, the findings indicate a lower degree of participation, and a lack of sense of identity prevailed with regard to the internal changes that have taken place in their sections.

In the humanistic sub-climate of the organization, most of the respondents commented that they had actively participated in order to solve various problems as members of groups in their section.

In the self-renewing sub-climates of the organization, most of the workers had actively participated as team members in identifying organizational problems and their possible solutions.

In brief, the statistical analysis on change and adaptability has indicated that large perceptual discrepancies exist among the three groups in response to this particular criterion of organizational effectiveness.

The following, Figure 1, is produced in an attempt to compare the theoretical assumptions as related to internal sub-climates of an organization and empirical findings acquired from the public welfare organization personnel.

This figure represents the relationship between

**Fig. 1. Theoretical assumptions and empirical findings**

Characteristics	Sub-Climates	Mechanistic Sub-Climates	Humanistic Sub-Climates	Self-Renewing Sub-Climates
<b>Analysis of Tasks</b>				
1. Prescribed Tasks		High X	Low	Low
2. Prescribed plus Discretionary Tasks		Low	High X	Low
3. Multidiscretionary Tasks		Low	Low	High X
<b>Effectiveness Criteria</b>				
1. Formalization		High X	High (X)*	High (X)*
2. Humanization		Low	High X	Low
3. Change and Adaptability		Low	Low	High X
<b>Analysis of Workers</b>				
1. Clerical Workers		High X	Low	Low
2. Eligibility Workers		Low	High X	Low
3. Social Service Workers		Low	Low	High X

\*Note: Formalization under each climate unexpectedly high from research findings (X).

theoretical assumptions and actual results of this research. The results of data analysis strongly support the assumption that significant differences exist among the three sample groups in response to the selected variables. However, the nature of chi square analysis as a statistical tool only suggests the measurement of "goodness of fit" or indicates the degree of association among the samples rather than providing exact distances of relationships. Therefore, being well aware of the limitations of chi square analysis, the ratio of frequencies and percentages for each respondent's group were presented in the following figure in order to indicate approximate relationships in terms of high or low degree of emphasis on each variable.

The data in Figure 1 indicates that the mechanistic subclimate is significantly associated with the performance of prescribed tasks, and places relatively greater emphasis on formalization as an effectiveness criterion, as well as most of the work performed by the clerical workers. The humanistic sub-climate is strongly associated with performance of prescribed and discretionary tasks, and relatively greater emphasis is placed

on humanization as a preferred criterion of effectiveness. The self-renewing sub-climate is strongly associated with the performance of multi-disciplinary tasks, and places relatively greater emphasis on change and adaptability as a preferred criterion of organizational effectiveness, and the work performed by social service workers. The findings have also indicated that a high degree of enforced formalization prevailed throughout the three sub-climates. It suggests the functions of the three sub-sections of this agency and especially worker performance, regardless of what type of task performed, is highly influenced by departmental rules and regulations.

### (V) Conclusions and Implications

The implications of this research for organizational theory are many. The findings of this study contribute in two critical areas: one, a theoretical contribution to organizational study; the other, practical implications to public management.

Complex public of various sub-systems and

distinctive suborganizations consist functions. As the findings of this study have indicated, more than one sub-climate existed and each sub-climate has distinctive characteristics. This implies that differing structural, procedural and styles managerial should be expected to be appropriate for different sub-parts of an organization. Further, there is no permanently "one best approach" to designing organizational structure or processes to achieve stated organizational objectives. As organizations have undertaken more complex tasks in more heterogeneous internal environments, self-renewing assumptions of managerial practices are preferable. In the case of simple routine tasks in a more homogeneous sub-environment, the practices of structured mechanistic organizational assumptions are suitable from the findings of this study.

One of the critical issues in contemporary studies of organizations is the problem of the incongruous relationship between organizational demands and individual needs. The dilemma in any organization is how to reconcile organizational demands and individual expectations in organizations. Literature in this area has explained this problem well but has not further specified what type of integration is necessary. The typological approach to internal climates of an organization might contribute a suggestion for integration in terms of recognizing different types of reconciliation processes such as mechanistic, humanistic, and self-renewing as integration processes according to different contexts of organizational sub-climates. The argument is that if more than one sub-climate exists in an organization then the processes of integration between individual workers and the organization must be reconciled according to the requisites of that climate. There is no universally applicable psychological contract; rather this contract varies with different types of organization and characteristic variables.

Another issue in the literature on organizational study is the problem of managerial styles and leadership. Research has emphasized that different types of management and leadership styles must be considered according to the different sub-cultures of an organization which demand particular styles of management. This implies that the organization needs to utilize different types of managerial leaders according to different sub-climates rather than utilizing either democratic or authoritative leadership as a single management style.

Climates of complex dynamic organization must be viewed from a multi-dimensional approach. Complex public organizations consist of various components such as human actors, given tasks and objectives, and complicated technologies. These components are highly interdependent and continually modify each other in different ways in achieving the unique objectives of an organization. Effectiveness criteria must be formulated and applied differently in the different context of sub-systems of an organization.

Knowledge of complex organizations and skills and its application will vary among managers of public welfare systems. The current theories of organization have suggested to the administrators the utility of certain models of organizational structures, climates, and functional processes which are universally applicable. Often, however, the practicing administrator who is supposed to utilize these theories of organization faces tremendous different cultures. The complex situations of organization demand different utilization of the current state of organizational knowledge.

Therefore, one of the important implications of this study is to provide a contextual as situational method of thinking for the welfare administrator. He had to recognize the importance of a diagnostic orientation in viewing his orga-

nization and its immediate internal environment. More specifically, given that welfare systems have developed into large-scale public delivery systems, the organization undertakes more complex tasks and tends to become more bureaucratic. The manager of a welfare system can use

the typological concept to sharpen his ability to discriminate intelligently among different types of tasks in each section and thus provide a proper internal climate in which the different given tasks are carried out.

**Table I: Typology of Tasks as Perceived by Social Services, Workers Eligibility Workers, and Clerical Workers**

Sample	Number	1	2	3	4	5	6
Clerical workers (CW)	(42)						
Eligibility Workers (EW)	(44)	Strongly Disagree					
Social Services workers (SW)	(47)			Disagree	Agree		Strongly Agree

(Above six-point scale converted into three responses)

Item	Responses						
		(1)	(2)	(3)	$\chi^2$	df	$p\chi^2$
1. Most of the workers in my unit spent the majority of their time doing the same job in the same way every day.	CW	1	7	34	49.27	4	.001
	EW	9	16	19			
	SW	25	16	6			
2. My daily work tasks are composed of uniform events which include by definition, certain procedures, responsibilities, obligations, and technical competency	CW	1	8	33	48.15	4	.001
	EW	8	14	22			
	SW	26	15	6			
3. The majority of my working time is spent doing assignments which are normally routine.	CW	0	4	38	61.24	4	.001
	EW	9	24	11			
	SW	21	15	11			
4. Most of the work in my unit requires non routine procedures of the variety of job demands.	CW	31	7	4	55.02	4	.001
	EW	8	20	16			
	SW	5	12	30			
5. My daily work performance often requires social and creative skills.	CW	29	10	3	64.86	4	.001
	EW	7	16	21			
	SW	3	6	38			
6. The nature of my job is highly complex and the precise definition of working procedures, obligations, and technical methods can not explicitly be identified.	CW	27	11	4	58.47	4	.001
	EW	5	23	16			
	SW	5	9	33			
7. Circle the point on the scale which most nearly describes the degree of difficulty your unit has in accomplishing its assigned job. From extremely difficult to little.	CW	22	16	4	12.28	4	.001
	EW	15	21	8			
	SW	13	17	17			
8. Circle the point on the scale which most nearly describes how routine and predictable your unit's task is. From very unpredictable and very non routine to very predictable and very routine.	CW	28	11	3	46.38	4	.001
	EW	8	19	17			
	SW	5	13	29			

Item	Responses							
		(1)	(2)	(3)	$\chi^2$	df	$p\chi^2$	
9. Circle the point which most nearly describes your unit concerning the Importance of Formal Rules on daily work performance.	CW	10	18	14	7.68	4		Not Sig.
	EW	5	23	16				
	SW	14	25	8				
10. Circle the point which most nearly describes the amount of your Personal Judgement required to carry out your daily assignments. From my personal judgement is not required on performance of my tasks.	CW	31	4	7	74.48	4	.001	Sig.
	EW	5	18	21				
	SW	1	9	37				
11. Check the item below which most nearly describes the normal length of time it takes before information is available to you in order to decide the success or failure of your job performance.	CW	37	4	1	54.88	4	.001	Sig.
	EW	20	22	2				
	SW	9	21	17				

**Table 2: Degree of Formalization as Perceived by Social Service Workers, Eligibility Workers, and Clerical Workers**

Sample	Number	1	2	3	4	5	6
Clerical workers (CW)	(42)	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Mildly Disagree	Mildly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Eligibility Workers (EW)	(44)	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Social Services Workers (SW)	(48)	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree

(Above six scale points converted into three responses)

Item	Responses							
		(1)	(2)	(3)	$\chi^2$	df	$p\chi^2$	
1. Almost all of my daily work performance requires knowledge of law, regulations, and formal procedures.	CW	13	15	14	16.33	4	.01	Sig.
	EW	2	13	29				
	SW	13	19	16				
2. The law, regulations, and formal working procedures are well defined by my supervisor or our directors.	CW	10	19	13	5.45	4		Not Sig.
	EW	10	25	9				
	SW	18	17	13				
3. The daily activities in my unit are well organized and programmed.	CW	13	10	19	9.48	4	.05	Sig.
	EW	13	21	10				
	SW	20	17	11				
4. Ordinarily we don't deviate from standard policies and procedures in this unit.	CW	13	7	22	7.21	4		Not Sig.
	EW	10	19	15				
	SW	12	16	20				
5. The work in this unit is constantly being monitored to insure adherence to the rules.	CW	13	15	14	10.77	4	.05	Sig.
	EW	6	20	18				
	SW	21	17	10				
6. I feel that there are too many rules and departmental regulations which impose on my daily work.	CW	25	11	6	20.87	4	.001	Sig.
	EW	9	17	18				
	SW	10	18	20				

Item		Responses						
		(1)	(2)	(3)	$\chi^2$	df	p $\chi^2$	
7. The organizational rules and regulations provide a necessary means for guiding my activities.	CW	8	20	14	13.34	4	.01	Sig.
	EW	2	15	26				
	SW	14	17	17				
8. Things seem to be pretty well organized around here.	WC	18	15	9	4.60	4		Not Sig.
	EW	24	13	7				
	SW	30	14	4				
9. If you want to work more success fully in this unit, you have to follow the rules and regulations of work procedures.	CW	7	12	23	13.64	4	.01	Sig.
	EW	3	14	27				
	SW	11	24	13				
10. Most people in this unit cannot make their own rules on the job.	CW	9	9	24	21.03	4	.001	Sig.
	EW	6	5	33				
	SW	13	21	14				

**Table. 3: Degree of Humanization as Perceived by Social Services Workers, Eligibility Workers, and Clerical Workers**

Sample	Number	1	2	3	4	5	6
Clerical Workers (CW)	(42)						
Eligibility Workers (EW)	(44)	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Mildly Disagree	Mildly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Social Services Workers (SW)	(48)	Disagree		Disagree	Agree		Agree
(Above six scale points converted into three responses)							
2+1=1		4+3=2		6+5=3			

Item		Responses						
		(1)	(2)	(3)	$\chi^2$	df	P $\chi^2$	
1. I am satisfied with my current salary.	CW	24	14	4	28.92	4	.001	Sig.
	EW	2	13	29				
	SW	13	19	16				
2. I have strong feeling of accomplishment from the work that I am doing here.	CW	12	14	16	0.47	4		Not Sig.
	EW	13	17	14				
	SW	14	16	17				
3. I have close interaction with my supervisors in matters of my daily work.	CW	13	15	14	16.33	4	.01	Sig.
	EW	2	13	29				
	SW	13	19	16				
4. Interaction with my supervisor is not essential in my daily work.	CW	12	8	22	23.34	4	.001	Sig.
	EW	29	12	3				
	SW	18	14	15				

Item	Responses							Sig.
		(1)	(2)	(3)	$\chi^2$	df	$p\chi^2$	
5. I must participate as a team member on certain cases or on selected matters which require joint decisions and cooperative actions	CW	8	20	14	13.34	4	.01	Sig.
	EW	2	15	26				
	SW	14	17	17				
6. My daily work requires inter-action with my peer workers within my unit.	CW	14	5	23	17.35	4	.01	Sig.
	EW	8	8	28				
	SW	6	21	20				
7. Workers in this unit cannot make their own decisions without "approval."	CW	13	14	15	15.21	4	.01	Sig.
	EW	8	15	21				
	SW	24	16	7				
8. Most of the internal decisions made here are not up to the person doing the work.	CW	10	9	23	11.15	4	.05	Sig.
	EW	5	11	28				
	SW	15	17	15				
9. There can be little action taken here unless the supervisor decides.	CW	11	10	21	33.49	4	.001	Sig.
	EW	7	18	19				
	SW	31	12	4				
10. Any decision I make has to have the supervisor's approval.	CW	15	12	15	30.25	4	.001	Sig.
	EW	7	13	24				
	SW	33	8	6				
11. Most workers in my unit are primarily motivated by salary increases.	CW	5	10	27	24.96	4	.001	Sig.
	EW	19	12	13				
	SW	21	18	8				
12. In my daily work here, I am continually fulfilling my needs as well as those of the organization.	CW	7	12	23	10.80	4	.05	Sig.
	EW	16	18	10				
	SW	16	16	15				

**Table 4: Change and Adaptability as Perceived by Social Service Workers, Eligibility Workers, and Clerical Workers**

Sample	Number	1	2	3	4	5
Clerical Workers (CW)	(42)*	No, Not	Yes, to a	Yes, to a	Yes, to a	Yes,
Eligibility Workers (EW)	(44)	That I	Major	Medium	Minor	Com-
Social Services Workers (SW)	(48)	know of	Extent	Extent	Extent	pletely
(above five points converted into three responses)						
		1=1	2=2+3	3=4+5		

Item	Responses							Sig.
		(1)	(2)	(3)	$\chi^2$	df	$p\chi^2$	
1. What do you feel is the most pressing problem (if any) now facing your unit? Describe briefly.	CW EW SW	(An	Open	Question)				

Item	Responses							
		(1)	(2)	(3)	$\chi^2$	df	$p\chi^2$	
2. Have the members of your unit worked together as a group in order to discuss or alleviate the above problem?	CW	4	26	12	25.54	4	.001	Sig.
	EW	5	12	27				
	SW	5	8	35				
3. Within the last couple of months have the members of your unit worked together as a group to improve procedures and methods?	CW	1	20	21	15.09	4	.01	Sig.
	EW	2	12	30				
	SW	2	7	39				
4. To what extent do you feel that your suggestions have been helpful in bringing about needed changes in your unit within the last six months?	CW	0	29	13	22.52	4	.001	Sig.
	EW	2	14	28				
	SW	5	15	28				
5. To what extent do you think that your unit is "temporary," i.e., do you believe that it might change suddenly or dissolve within the next couple of years?	CW	3	32	7	72.26	4	.001	Sig.
	EW	3	11	30				
	SW	4	4	40				
6. **The work objectives or goals that the members of your unit are working toward have changed within the last six months?, i.e., the main mission of your unit.	CW	27	12	2	2.72	4		Not Sig.
	EW	24	15	5				
	SW	32	11	4				
7. The work objectives or goals of your unit should have changed?	CW	23	14	4	38.36	4	.001	Sig.
	EW	16	24	4				
	SW	6	16	25				
8. The above change(s) was/were initiated by superiors.	CW (22)	1	1	20	9.76	4	.005	Sig.
	EW (27)	3	9	15				
	SW (27)	3	10	14				
9. The methods of using the resources of your unit have changed? i.e., materials, information and ideas, works, technology, budgets, etc., used in doing your work within the last six months.	CW (41)	28	10	3	3.79	4		Not Sig.
	EW (44)	22	19	3				
	SW	28	17	2				
10. The methods of using the resources used by the members in your unit should have changed.	CW (41)	23	15	3	41.03	4	.001	Sig.
	EW (44)	1	25	6				
	SW (47)	5	16	26				
11. The processes within your specific unit which affect the way work is done have changed within the last six months? i.e., such things as daily working procedures, determination of eligibility, providing services, communications, progress reports, and evaluations, etc.	CW (41)	28	8	5	13.61	4	.001	Sig.
	EW (44)	19	17	8				
	SW (47)	29	18	0				
12. The above processes should have changed.	CW (41)	18	13	10	21.94	4	.001	Sig.
	EW (44)	11	25	8				
	SW (47)	6	16	25				

Item	Responses							
		(1)	(2)	(3)	$\chi^2$	df	$p\chi^2$	
13. The formal structure of your unit has changed within the last six months? i.e., hierarchy of authority, new division of work, new functional layout, new assigned tasks, etc., used to practice in your unit.	CW (40)	18	15	7	4.62	4		Not Sig.
	EW (44)	25	10	9				
	SW (47)	30	9	8				
14. The formal structure of your unit should have changed.	CW (41)	18	15	8	31.92	4	.001	
	EW (44)	15	20	9				
	SW (47)	5	10	32				

\*The fluctuation of sample numbers happened because some of the questions did not require certain respondents answer them.

\*\*Items 6-14 converted into six points from strongly disagree to strongly agree and this in turn converted into three responses.

## References

- Renato Taguiri and George H. Litwin, (eds.), *Organizational Climate: Explorations of a Concept*, Div. of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, Boston, 1968.
- Paul R. Lawrence and Jay W. Lorsch, *Organization and Environment*, Div. of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, Boston, 1967.
- Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, *The Social Psychology of Organizations*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1966.
- Myung S. Park, *Organizational Effectiveness: A Typological Approach to Internal Climate*, (English translation), Chang Mun Kak, Seoul, Korea, 1973.
- John J. Morse and Jay W. Lorsch, "Beyond Theory Y," *Harvard Business Review*, XL, No. 3, May/June, 1970, pp. 61-62.
- Gary Dessler, *Organization and Management: A Contingency View*, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1976.
- John W. Newstrom, William E. Reif, and Robert M. Monczka, (eds.), *A Contingency Approach to Management: Readings*, McGraw Hill, 1975.
- Henry L. Tosi and Stephen J. Carroll, *Management: Contingencies, Structure, and Process*, St. Clair Press, 1976.
- George H. Litwin and Robert A. Stringer, Jr., *Motivation and Organizational Climate*, Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1968.
- N. Frederickson, "Some Effects of Organizational Climates on Administrative Performance," Research Memorandum RM-66-21, Educational Testing Service, 1966.
- Edward E. Lawler, Douglas T. Hall, Greg R. Oldham, "Organizational Climate: Relationship to Organizational Structure, Process and Performance," *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, Vol. 11, 1974, pp. 139-55.
- H. Hand, M. Richards, and J. Slocum, "Organizational Climate and the Effectiveness of a Human Relations Training Program," *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 16, 1973, pp. 185-95.
- J. George and L. Bishop, "Relationship of Organizational Structure and Teacher Per-

- sonality Characteristics to Organizational Climate," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 16, 1971, pp. 467-76.
14. R. Pritchard and B. Karasick, "The Effect of Organizational Climate on Managerial Job Performance Job Satisfsaction," *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, Vol. 9, 1973, pp. 110-19.
  15. Walter Buckley, (ed.), *Modern Systems Research for the Behavioral Scientist*, Aldine Publishing Co., Chicago, 1968.
  16. Tom Burns and G.M. Stalker, *The Management of Innovation*, London: Tavistock Publications, 1961.
  17. R.B. Duncan, "Characteristics of Organizational Environments and Perceived Environmental Uncertainty," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 17, 1972, pp. 313-327.
  18. R. Golembiewski, R. Manzenrider, A. Blumberg, S. Carrigan, and W. Mead, "Changing Climate in a Complex Organization: Interaction Between a Learning Design and an Environment," *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 14, 1971, pp. 465-483.
  19. J.W. Hall, "A Comparison of Halpin and Croft's Organizational Climates and Likert and Likert's Organizational Systems," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 19, 1972, pp. 586-590.
  20. A. Halpin and D. Croft, "The Organizational Climate of Schools, U.S. Office of Education, H.E.W., Washington, D.C.: Contract No. SAE543 (8639), July, 1962.
  21. R. Johannesson, "Some Problems in the Measurement of Organizational Climate," *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, Vol. 10, 1973, pp. 118-145.