

## Organizational Climate: A Comparative Analysis of State Universities, Private/Deemed Universities and Affiliated Management Institutes of Haryana

Ms. Nisha Chanana

*Assistant Professor, Swami Devi Dyal Institute of Management Studies (Affiliated to Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra) India*

### Abstract

In the present study an attempt has been made to investigate the difference in the organizational climate of state universities, private/deemed universities and affiliated management institutes of Haryana. A sample of 218 management teachers from these institutes was the respondents in the present study. The organizational climate questionnaire was used to measure six dimensions of organizational climate namely work environment, team work, management effectiveness, involvement, competency, reward and recognition. Findings of the present study reveal that management teachers working in different setup of organizational structures perceived their organizational climate differently.

**Key Words:** Organizational Climate, work environment, Management effectiveness, Competency

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Organizational Climate is very important factor to be considered in studying and analyzing organization because it has deep influence on well being. More simply put, climate is people's perceptions of corporate environment: what it feels to work in a place. Lewin et al. (1939) were the first to use the term "climate" in psychological research. Lewin and Colleagues were interested in social climate. Argyris (1957, 1958) described Climate as the "homeostatic state" of the organization. McGregor (1960) discussed 'managerial climate' or the climate of supervisor subordinate relationship. Tagiuri (1968) proposed conceptual explanation of organizational climate as under: Climate is a relative enduring quality of internal environment of an organization that (1) is experienced by its members, (2) influences their behavior, and (3) can be described in terms of values of a particular set of characteristics (or

attributes) or the organization. Bowen and Ostroff (2004) viewed "Organizational climate as shared perception of what the organization is like in terms of practices, policies, procedures, routines, and rewards- what is important and what behaviors are expected and rewarded- and is based on shared perceptions among employees within formal organizational units."

Thus, Organizational climate is an outcome of the interaction between organizational components, namely organization design, individual job characteristics, co-worker relations, work environment, senior management, direct supervisor, work processes, communication, technology and customer satisfaction, team work, management effectiveness, involvement, competency, reward and recognition.

Organizational climate affects the behavior of the people. Employees create climate by observing what happens to them and

around them and then express conclusions about their organization's values and priorities.

## 2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A brief review of research on organizational climate has been conducted.

Ahluwalia and Ahluwalia (1990) conducted a comparative study of organizational climate of three types of schools of Delhi. This study included four public schools, four central schools and six government schools. The findings of this study revealed that organizational climate of different schools were different from each other. Heflich (1994) conducted a study to compare the climate of public and private school. Findings revealed significant difference between public and private schools climate. Gupta (2009) conducted a study on organizational climate in public and government schools. Results found a significant difference in the organizational climate of Public schools and Government schools. Surapuramath (2012) examined the organizational climate of colleges of education under Karnataka University. Significant difference in organizational climate of government colleges and private colleges of education was observed. Zahoor (2012) studied difference between teachers of private and government schools on organizational climate and found that teachers of private and government schools differ significantly with each other on organizational climate. Giri and Kumar (2007) observed that organizational climate differ at three managerial levels namely top, middle and junior in different Indian organizations. Solkhe and Chaudhary (2010) reported that the human resource development climate perceptions were more positive in private sector tractor industry as compare

to public sector in India. Gupta and Pyngavil (2012) compared organizational climate of State Bank of India and ICICI bank. Results revealed a significant difference between the organizational climate of State Bank of India and ICICI Bank. Babu and Kumari (2013) examined the type of organizational climate existing in different types of school (50 elementary teachers from government schools and 50 from private school) of Koderma district of Jharkhand. Analysis made it evident that open climate exists in government schools and closed climate exists in private schools. Kaur and Kaur (2013) reported significant difference in the perception about organizational climate of teachers teaching in government and aided schools as well as teachers teaching in government and private schools. However no significant difference in the perception of organizational climate of teachers teaching in aided and private schools was observed.

In the present study an attempt has been made to examine the difference between organizational climate of state universities, private/deemed universities and affiliated management institutes of Haryana

## 3. OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

To compare the perception of organizational climate among management teachers working in state universities, private/deemed universities and affiliated management institutes of Haryana.

## 4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

To fulfill the objective of the study a sample size of 218 management teachers i.e. 65 from state universities, 61 from private/deemed universities and 92 from affiliated management institutes was drawn by following convenience sampling procedure. The Organizational climate Questionnaire was used to measure six

dimensions namely work environment, team work, management effectiveness, involvement, competency, reward and recognition. To compare the difference of organizational climate between state universities, private/deemed universities and affiliated management institutes the response of the teachers were taken on the above mentioned questionnaire.

Organizational climate is measured on a five-point Likert scale containing of 32 items with values ranging from 1 to 5. The scale is used to investigate the organizational climate arising from six different dimensions. For checking the reliability of the questionnaire Cronbach's alpha values for the different dimensions of organizational climate has been calculated namely work environment (.876), team work (.896), management

effectiveness (.857), involvement (.898), reward and recognition (.908) and competency (.733) showing that all the dimensions have a high Cronbach's alpha value. The Cronbach's alpha value of the overall organizational climate scale is .945, indicating that the scale is highly reliable for this particular study. Data were analyzed by using non-parametric test.

## 5. RESULTS AND NTERPRETATION

The comparison of work environment, team work, management effectiveness, involvement, reward/recognition and overall organizational climate among management teachers working in state universities, private/deemed universities and affiliated institutes in Haryana has been analyzed by using Kruskal-Wallis test and post-hoc Mann-Whitney test.

**Table 5.1 Normality tests of Organizational Climate dimensions**

Shapiro-Wilk	Groups	Statistic	df	Sig.
Work Environment	SU	0.862	65	0.000
	P/DU	0.835	61	0.000
	AI	0.945	92	0.001
Team Work	SU	0.925	65	0.001
	P/DU	0.908	61	0.000
	AI	0.969	92	0.028
Management Effectiveness	SU	0.935	65	0.002
	P/DU	0.877	61	0.000
	AI	0.97	92	0.034
Involvement	SU	0.936	65	0.002
	P/DU	0.861	61	0.000
	AI	0.976	92	0.089
Reward and Recognition	SU	0.899	65	0.000
	P/DU	0.841	61	0.000
	AI	0.97	92	0.034
Competency	SU	0.979	65	0.335
	P/DU	0.887	61	0.000
	AI	0.984	92	0.303
Overall Organizational Climate	SU	0.967	65	0.077
	P/DU	0.852	61	0.000
	AI	0.971	92	0.035

Result found from table 5.1 reveals that shapiro-wilks test of normality had the significant value for most of the variables

under consideration less than 0.05 at 5% level of significance. Thus, scores are not normally distributed; it means the assumption of normality has been violated.

**Table 5.2 Homogeneity of Variances tests of Organizational Climate dimensions**

Homogeneity of Variances tests	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Work Environment	25.953	2	215	0.000
Team Work	9.411	2	215	0.000
Management Effectiveness	14.488	2	215	0.000
Involvement	18.006	2	215	0.000
Reward and Recognition	29.004	2	215	0.000
Competency	11.709	2	215	0.000
Overall Organizational Climate	35.091	2	215	0.000

All the variables have sig. value which is less than .05 ( $p < .05$ ). Thus, the assumption of homogeneity of variance is not met.

**H<sub>0</sub>1:** There is no significant difference in the perception of work environment among management teachers working in state universities, private/deemed universities and affiliated institutes of Haryana.

### 5.1 WORK ENVIRONMENT

**Table 5.3 Kruskal-Wallis Test of Work Environment**

Test Statistics <sup>ab</sup>	
Work Environment	
Chi-square	53.714
df	2
Asymp. Sig.	.000

a. Kruskal Wallis Test

b. Grouping Variable: SU,P/DU,AI

A Kruskal Wallis test (table 5.3) examines whether there is statistically significant differences in the perception of work environment among management teachers working in state universities, private/deemed universities and affiliated institutes of Haryana. The result revealed

statistically significant differences among management teachers [ $\chi^2 = 53.714, p = .000 < 0.01$ ] working in state universities, private/deemed universities and affiliated institutes. Hence, null hypothesis (**H<sub>0</sub>1**) is rejected.

**Table 5.4 Post-hoc Mann Whitney Tests of Work Environment**

Work Environment				
Comparing Group	Mann-Whitney U	z	Asymp sig. (2- tailed)	r
Group 1 (State Universities) to Group 2 (Private/Deemed Universities)	1521.00	-2.306	0.021	-
Group 1 (State Universities) to Group 3 (Affiliated Institutes)	871.50	-7.593	0.000	-0.60
Group 2 (Private/Deemed Universities) to Group 3 (Affiliated Institutes)	1833.00	-3.647	0.000	-0.29

A post-hoc test using Mann-Whitney tests (table- 5.4) with bonferroni correction showed that there is no significant

difference between state universities and private/deemed universities. However, a significant difference has been found

between state universities and affiliated institutes (U=871.500, z=-7.593, p=.000<0.0167, r=-0.60). Results also found a significant difference between private/deemed universities and affiliated institutes (U=1833.00, z=-3.647, p=.000<0.0167, r=-0.29).

## 5.2 Team Work

**H<sub>02</sub>:** There is no significant difference in the perception of team work among management teachers working in state universities, private/deemed universities and affiliated institutes of Haryana.

**Table 5.5 Kruskal-Wallis Test of Team Work**

Test Statistics <sup>ab</sup>	
Team Work	
Chi-square	29.559
df	2
Asymp. Sig.	.000

a. Kruskal Wallis Test

b. Grouping Variable: SU,P/DU,AI

Results from the table 5.5 reveals significant difference in the perception of team work among management teachers working in state universities, private/deemed universities and affiliated institutes [ $\chi^2$  (df = 2, N = 218) = 29.559, p

= .000<0.01]. Thus, null hypothesis is rejected. It can be inferred that management teachers of these respective institutions/universities differ on the dimension of team work.

**Table 5.6 Post-hoc Mann Whitney Tests of Team Work**

Team Work				
Comparing Group	Mann-Whitney U	Z	Asymp sig. (2- tailed)	r
Group 1 (State Universities) to Group 2 (Private/Deemed Universities)	1304.50	-3.328	0.001	-0.29
Group 1 (State Universities) to Group 3 (Affiliated Institutes)	1417.00	-5.632	0.000	-0.44
Group 2 (Private/Deemed Universities) to Group 3 (Affiliated Institutes)	2565.00	-.901	0.368	-

Result found no significant difference between private/deemed universities and affiliated institutes. Whereas, significant differences revealed between:

- State universities and private/deemed universities, Mann-Whitney U=1304.500, z=-3.328, p=.001<0.016. The effect size is small (r=-0.29).
- State universities and affiliated institutes, Mann-Whitney U=1417.000,

z=-5.632, p=.000<0.0167. The effect size is medium (r=-0.44).

## 5.3 Management Effectiveness

**H<sub>03</sub>:** There is no significant difference in the perception of management effectiveness among management teachers working in state universities, private/deemed universities and affiliated institutes of Haryana.

**Table 5.7Kruskal-Wallis Test of Management Effectiveness**

Management Effectiveness	
Chi-square	33.626
df	2
Asymp. Sig.	.000

a. Kruskal Wallis Test

b. Grouping Variable: SU,P/DU,AI

Kruskal-wallis test reveals significant difference (null hypothesis 3is rejected) in the perception of management effectiveness among management teachers working in state universities, private/deemed universities and affiliated institutes [ $\chi^2$  (df=2,  $N = 218$ ) = 33.626,  $p = .000 < 0.01$ ].

**Table 5.8 Post-hoc Mann Whitney Tests of Management Effectiveness**

Management Effectiveness				
Comparing Group	Mann-Whitney U	Z	Asymp sig. (2- tailed)	r
Group 1 (State Universities) to Group 2 (Private/Deemed Universities)	1469.50	-2.517	0.012	-0.22
Group 1 (State Universities) to Group 3 (Affiliated Institutes)	1311.50	-6.003	0.000	-0.47
Group 2 (Private/Deemed Universities) to Group 3 (Affiliated Institutes)	2160.50	-2.414	0.016	-

Table 5.8 showed no significant differences between private/deemed universities and affiliated institutes. However, a significant difference found between ‘state universities and private/deemed universities’ and ‘state universities and affiliated institutes’. State universities and private/deemed universities (Mann-Whitney  $U=1469.500$ ,  $z=-2.517$ ,  $p=.012 < 0.0167$ ). The effect size

is small ( $r=-0.22$ ). State universities and affiliated institutes (Mann-Whitney  $U=1311.500$ ,  $z=-6.003$ ,  $p=.000 < 0.0167$ ). The effect size is medium ( $r=-0.47$ ).

#### 5.4 Involvement

**H<sub>04</sub>:** There is no significant difference in the perception of involvement among management teachers working in state universities, private/deemed universities and affiliated institutes of Haryana.

**Table 5.9Kruskal-Wallis Test of Involvement**

Involvement	
Chi-square	30.295
df	2
Asymp. Sig.	.000

a. Kruskal Wallis Test

b. Grouping Variable: SU,P/DU,AI

The result reveals statistically significant differences (Chi-square = 30.295, df=2, Sig. = .000) among management teachers

working in state universities, private/deemed universities and affiliated institutes. Thus, null hypothesis is rejected.

**Table 5.10 Post-hoc Mann Whitney Tests of Involvement**

Involvement				
Comparing Group	Mann-Whitney U	z	Asymp sig. (2- tailed)	r
Group 1 (State Universities) to Group 2 (Private/Deemed Universities)	1688.50	-1.442	0.149	-
Group 1 (State Universities) to Group 3 (Affiliated Institutes)	1369.00	-5.797	0.000	-0.46
Group 2 (Private/Deemed Universities) to Group 3 (Affiliated Institutes)	2072.50	-2.741	0.006	-0.22

Mann-Whitney tests revealed no significant difference between state universities and private/deemed universities. Whereas, a significant difference found between state universities and affiliated institutes (U=1369.00, z=-5.797, p=.000<0.0167, r=-0.46); private/deemed universities and affiliated institutes (U=2072.500, z=-2.741, p=.006<0.0167, r=-0.22).

### 5.5 Reward and Recognition

**H<sub>05</sub>:** There is no significant difference in the perception of reward and recognition among management teachers working in state universities, private/deemed universities and affiliated institutes of Haryana.

**Table 5.11 Kruskal-Wallis Test of Reward and Recognition**

Test Statistics <sup>ab</sup>	
Reward and Recognition	
Chi-square	42.598
df	2
Asymp. Sig.	.000

a. Kruskal Wallis Test

b. Grouping Variable: SU,P/DU,AI

Kruskal-wallis test (table 5.11) revealed significant difference in the perception of reward and recognition among management teachers working in state

universities, private/deemed universities and affiliated institutes [ $\chi^2$  (df = 2, N = 218) = 42.598, p = .000<0.01]. Therefore, null hypothesis 5 is rejected.

**Table 5.12 Post-hoc Mann Whitney Tests of Reward and Recognition**

Reward and Recognition				
Comparing Group	Mann-Whitney U	z	Asymp sig. (2- tailed)	r
Group 1 (State Universities) to Group 2 (Private/Deemed Universities)	1617.00	-1.807	0.071	-
Group 1 (State Universities) to Group 3 (Affiliated Institutes)	1028.00	-7.022	0.000	0.56
Group 2 (Private/Deemed Universities) to Group 3 (Affiliated Institutes)	2023.50	-2.926	0.003	0.23

A post-hoc test using Mann-Whitney tests with bonferroni correction showed no significant difference in the table 4.54 between state universities and private/deemed universities. However, it has been found significant differences between:

- State universities and affiliated institutes, Mann-Whitney  $U=1028.00$ ,  $z=-7.022$ ,  $p=.000<0.0167$ . The effect size is large ( $r=-0.56$ ).

- Private/deemed universities and affiliated institutes, Mann-Whitney  $U=2023.500$ ,  $z=-2.926$ ,  $p=.003<0.0167$ . The effect size is small ( $r=-0.23$ ).

### 5.6 Competency

**H<sub>06</sub>:** There is no significant difference in the perception of competency among management teachers working in state universities, private/deemed universities and affiliated institutes.

**Table 5.13** Kruskal-Wallis Test of Competency

Competency	
Chi-square	22.736
df	2
Asymp. Sig.	.000

a. Kruskal Wallis Test

b. Grouping Variable: SU,P/DU,AI

Result reveals (table- 5.13) a significant difference in the perception of competency. Hence, null hypothesis is rejected. A Kruskal Wallis test revealed significant difference in the perception of

competency among management teachers working in state universities, private/deemed universities and affiliated institutes [ $\chi^2 = 22.736$ ,  $p = .000<0.01$ ].

**Table 5.14** Post-hoc Mann Whitney Tests of Competency

Competency				
Comparing Group	Mann-Whitney U	z	Asymp sig. (2- tailed)	r
Group 1 (State Universities) to Group 2 (Private/Deemed Universities)	1972.50	-.049	.961	-
Group 1 (State Universities) to Group 3 (Affiliated Institutes)	1677.00	-4.696	0.000	-0.37
Group 2 (Private/Deemed Universities) to Group 3 (Affiliated Institutes)	1948.00	-3.210	0.001	-0.25

Mann-Whitney tests with bonferroni correction revealed no significant difference between state universities and private/deemed universities. Further result showed the significant differences between state universities and affiliated institutes as well as between private/deemed universities and affiliated institutes. State universities and affiliated institutes, Mann-Whitney  $U=1677.00$ ,  $z=-4.696$ ,  $p=.000<0.0167$ . The effect size is medium

( $r=-0.37$ ). And private/deemed universities and affiliated institutes, Mann-Whitney  $U=1948.00$ ,  $z=-3.210$ ,  $p=.001<0.0167$ . The effect size is small ( $r=-0.25$ ).

### 5.7 Overall Organizational Climate

**H<sub>07</sub>:** There is no significant difference in the perception of organizational climate among management teachers working in state universities, private/deemed universities and affiliated institutes.



**Table 5.15 Kruskal-Wallis Test of Overall Organizational Climate**  
 Test Statistics<sup>ab</sup>

Overall Organizational Climate	
Chi-square	42.382
df	2
Asymp. Sig.	.000

a. Kruskal Wallis Test

tb. Grouping Variable: SU,P/DU,AI

Result of Kruskal-Wallis test revealed a significant difference in the perception of organizational climate among management teachers working in state universities, private/deemed universities and affiliated institutes [ $\chi^2$  (df = 2, N = 218) = 42.382, p

= .000<0.01]. Hence, null hypothesis<sup>7</sup> is rejected. These findings make it clear that management teacher of these organizations have differ perception about overall organizational climate.

**Table 5.16 Post-hoc Mann Whitney Tests of Overall Organizational Climate**

Overall Organizational Climate				
Comparing Group	Mann-Whitney U	z	Asymp sig. (2- tailed)	r
Group 1 (State Universities) to Group 2 (Private/Deemed Universities)	1645.50	-1646	0.100	-
Group 1 (State Universities) to Group 3 (Affiliated Institutes)	988.00	-7.137	0.000	-0.56
Group 2 (Private/Deemed Universities) to Group 3 (Affiliated Institutes)	2066.00	-2.758	0.006	-0.22

Result of post-hoc test in the Table 5.16 showed no significant difference between state universities and private/deemed universities. However, significant differences found between:

- State universities and affiliated institutes, Mann-Whitney U=988.00, z=-7.137, p=.000<0.0167. The effect size is large (r=-0.56).
- Private/deemed universities and affiliated institutes, Mann-Whitney U=2066.00, z=-2.758, p=.006<0.0167. The effect size is small (r=-0.22).

### CONCLUSION

This study examine the comparison among management teachers working in state universities, private/deemed universities and affiliated institutes of Haryana on the six dimensions of organizational climate

i.e. work environment, team work, management effectiveness, involvement, reward and recognition, competency. By comparing organizational climate of three systems significant difference in the perception of management teachers has been observed on all the dimensions of organizational climate.

The obtained findings of the present study are in conformity with the findings of Ahluwalia and Ahluwalia (1990) who found different organizational climate among different schools (public, central and government). Heflich (1994); Gupta (2009); Surapuramath (2012); Zahoor (2012); Babu and Kumari (2013); and Kaur & Kaur (2013) also reported significant difference on organizational climate between government schools and private schools.

**REFERENCES:**

- Ahluwalia, I.K. and Ahluwalia, T.P. (1990). A comparative study of organizational climate in schools. *Indian Journal of Psychology and Education and Education*, 21(2).
- Argyris, C. (1957). The individual and organization: Some problems of mutual adjustment. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 2 (1), 1-24.
- Argyris, C. (1958). Some problems in conceptualizing organizational climate: A case study of a bank. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 2, 501-520.
- Babu, Ajay and Kumari, Mandakini (2013). Organizational climate as a predictor of teacher effectiveness. *European Academic Research*, 1 (5).
- Bowen, D.E. and Ostroff, C. (2004). Understanding HRM-firm performance linkages: the role of the 'strength' of the HRM system. *Academy of Management review*, 29(2), 203-221.
- Giri, Vijai N. and Kumar, B. Pavan (2007). Impact of organizational climate on job satisfaction and job performance. *National Academy of Psychology, India*, 52 (2), 131-133.
- Gupta, M.L. and Pyngavil, Rajesh S. (2012). Effective team building in relation to organizational culture and organizational climate in banking sector: an inter-correlation analysis. *Prestige International Journal of Management and IT-Sanchayan*, 1 (1), 52-66.
- Gupta, Preety (2009). A study of values among school principals, their attitude towards modernization and its relationship with the organizational climate. Ph.D., Thesis in Education, Jamia Milia Islamia University.
- Heflich, R.G. (1994). Comparing teacher perceptions of school climate in selected new jersey independent and public high schools (Ed.D). Columbia University, Teacher's College in Dissertation Abstracts International, 55(A), 7, 1263-A.
- Kaur, Gurmanjit and Kaur, Surpreet (2013). Spiritual intelligence and organizational climate as predictors of life satisfaction of secondary school teachers. *International Journal of Research in Education Methodology*, 2 (3), 2278-7690.
- Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., and White, R.K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created 'social climates'. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 10, 271-299.
- Mcgregor, Douglas (1960). *The Human side of enterprise*. New York, McGraw Hill Publisher.
- Solkhe, Ajay and Chaudhary, Nirmala (2010). An empirical investigation of human resource development climate in Indian tractor industry. *Management Vistas*, 3 (1).
- Surapuramath, Kotreshwaraswamy(2012). A study of organizational climate of colleges of education under Karnataka university. *International Indexed and Referred Research Journal*, 3 (30).
- Tagiuri, R. (1968). *The concept of organizational climate, organizational climate: explorations of a concept*, Boston, Harvard University, 11-32.
- Zahoor, Z. (2012). A study of organizational climate and adjustment among private and government school teachers. *Golden Research Thoughts*, 1(12), 1-4.