



ISSN (E): 2277-7695
ISSN (P): 2349-8242
NAAS Rating: 5.23
TPI 2023; 12(1): 1226-1229
© 2023 TPI

www.thepharmajournal.com

Received: 28-11-2022

Accepted: 30-12-2022

Tanya Saklani

Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Agricultural Communication, Govind Ballabh Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, Uttarakhand, India

VLV Kameswari

Professor and Head, Department of Agricultural Communication, Govind Ballabh Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, Uttarakhand, India

Examining organizational climate of SAUs in Uttarakhand

Tanya Saklani and VLV Kameswari

Abstract

Organizational climate is a fundamental quality of an organization. It represents the attitudes, opinions, and beliefs of its members. Additionally, it helps in setting one organization apart from another. Analyzing organizational climate can be helpful for evaluating and improving an organization, regardless of the industry. Even educational institutions can use organizational climate as a tool to guide their efforts toward effective outcomes. Institutional rules and procedures can be designed to provide an environment where students take ownership of and actively participate in their own educational experience. Teachers who operate in an open environment are also more willing to put forth extra effort to ensure organizational success. Therefore, it is crucial that educational institutions maintain a constructive and productive environment. The organizational climates of the two State Agricultural Universities in Uttarakhand were analyzed using MAO-C scale developed by Pareek (1989). Findings of the study revealed that GBPUAT had Dependent-Achievement climate profile while VCSG UUF had Affiliation-Control climate in the organization.

Keywords: Educational institutions, organizational climate, SAUs, teaching-learning

Introduction

Organizational climate is a concept which has been used in the field of management extensively. Based on the Field theory given by Lewin (1939) [6], organizational climate was operationalized by Litwin and Stringer (1966) [2]. They defined it as a “set of measurable properties of the work environment that is directly or indirectly perceived by the people who live and work in a particular organization and is assumed to influence their motivation and behavior”. Campbel *et al.* (1970) [1] defined organizational climate as a “set of attributes specific to a particular organization that may be induced from the way that organization deals with its members and its environment”. Thus, organizational climate is a dynamic and relative internal environment of an organization which differentiates it from others. Regardless of the industry, organizational climate is frequently measured as an aggregated construct made up of many aspects that can be helpful for evaluating and improving an organization. Educational institutions can also utilize organizational climate as a tool to help them focus on achieving effective outcomes. An increasing body of evidence has proved that organizational climate of educational institutions have an impact on student success; and work commitment, satisfaction and performance of the staff and faculty. Past studies have indicated a correlation between organizational climate and students’ performance. A positive work environment also promotes a healthy learning environment, which in turn helps students to perform better. Thus, it can be said that organizational climate provides a kind of working environment in which individuals feel satisfied or dissatisfied. Researchers have been trying to emulate the tools and methodologies used for measuring organizational climate into the descriptions of school/educational institutions. Understanding organizational climate can help to enhance the strategic initiatives for change in educational scenario in an institution.

Agriculture education in India is well coordinated under Indian Council of Agricultural Research (ICAR) and State Agricultural Universities (SAUs) (Pal *et al.*, 2012) [3]. SAUs are autonomous organizations with a responsibility for research, education and extension in the entire state. Since SAUs are striving for quality education, they have to redefine themselves to make use of local and global opportunities. To streamline this, it is imperative to take organizational climate into consideration so that necessary changes can be done for better. Hence, a study was designed to examine the organizational climate of SAUs in Uttarakhand.

Corresponding Author:

Tanya Saklani

Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Agricultural Communication, Govind Ballabh Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, Uttarakhand, India

Objectives

1. To assess the organizational climate of SAUs in Uttarakhand
2. To analyze the variation in the organizational climates of SAUs in Uttarakhand

Methodology

The present study was conducted in Uttarakhand (previously Uttaranchal) which is the 27th state of India. This study was conducted in both the State Agricultural Universities of Uttarakhand, viz. Govind Ballabh Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar and Veer Chandra Singh Garhwali University of Horticulture and Forestry, Bharsar. For the study, two colleges from each university were selected using the method of simple random sampling. Thus a total of four colleges were selected for the study. These included College of Agriculture and College of Fisheries from Govind Ballabh Pant University of Agriculture and Technology; and College of Horticulture and College of Forestry from Veer Chandra Singh Garhwali University of Horticulture and Forestry. The study focused on analyzing organizational climate of the universities based on a multi-informant analysis. Therefore, both faculty and students were chosen as respondents for the study. The researcher obtained a list of faculty members and students of the selected colleges from the Office of Registrar of both the universities. In case of faculty members, 50 percent of the teachers from each

college were selected. Thus, from GBPUAT, 50 teachers were selected, while 19 teachers were selected from VCSG UUHF. Yamane’s formula was used to compute the appropriate sample size for selecting the students. It can be expressed as:

$$n = \frac{N}{1+N(e)^2}$$

Where,

n = sample size

N = population of study

e = degree of expected error

Taking the degree of expected error to be 0.05 and total population of 1199 after eliminating the first year students from every college, the required sample size was computed as follows:

$$n = \frac{1199}{1+1199(0.05)^2} = 299.937 \sim 300$$

Using the above formula, 300 students were selected for the study using Probability Proportional to Size (PPS) method from UG, PG and PhD programmes as shown in Table 1. The study did not include first year students from each degree programme as they had completed most of their course work online due to Covid-19 pandemic. This made them less familiar with the existing climate on the campus.

Table 1: Selection of students

University	College	Degree Programme	Population after eliminating first year	Number of Respondents
GBPUAT	College of Agriculture	UG	576	144
		PG	126	31
		PhD	148	37
	College of Fisheries	UG	71	17
		PG	5	1
		PhD	3	1
VCSG UUHF	College of Forestry	UG	113	30
		PG	24	6
	College of Horticulture	UG	109	28
		PG	23	5
Total			1199	300

After data collection, incomplete responses were eliminated using listing deletion method for the purpose of data cleaning. This resulted in a respondent loss of 19%. Therefore, the sample size of the students was 243 and the consolidated sample size consisting of both faculty members and students was 312. Data was collected using self-administered questionnaires and Google forms. For analyzing organizational climate, MAO-C scale developed by Pareek (1989) [4] was used. The scale was a ranking scale which had six motives and 12 dimensions based on which the dominant climate and backdrop climate were analyzed.

Table 2: Total respondents for the study

GBPUAT	Faculty	50
	Students	174
VCSG UUHF	Faculty	19
	Students	69
Total		312

Results and Discussion

The study made an attempt to analyze the existing

organizational climate in the SAUs in Uttarakhand using an MAO-C scale developed by Pareek (1989). Results of the study are presented under three heads namely, Organizational Climate of GBPUAT, Organizational Climate of VCSG UUHF and motive-wise variation in the organizational climate of the SAUs.

Organizational Climate of GBPUAT

Table 3 presents the organizational climate profile of Govind Ballabh Pant University of Agriculture and Technology. The profile matrix clearly indicates that ‘Dependency’ was the dominant motive in the university with an Index score of 55. Likewise, ‘Achievement’ was the backdrop motive with an Index score of 53. Combining the dominant and backup motives, GBPUAT had an overall ‘Dependency-Achievement’ type of organizational climate profile. This means that although organizational members tend to rely on their superiors but at the same time have a high regard for accomplishing challenging goals. There is a dependency of the students on the faculty and of the faculty on their superiors for taking important decisions. Since GBPUAT as an organization focuses on achievement of goals and

attainment of objectives, major decisions are taken by the people in authority.

Moreover, 'Control' motive (index score 48) and 'Expert Influence' motive (index score 48) were relatively strong in

GBPUAT. With an index score of 47, the weakest motive prevailing in the university was the 'Extension' motive.

Table 3: MAO-C profile matrix of GBPUAT

	Dimensions of OC in GBPUAT	Motives							
		Achievement (Ach)	Expert Influence (EI)	Extension (Ext)	Control (Con)	Dependency (Dep)	Affiliation (Aff)	Dominant Climate	Backdrop Climate
1	Orientation	3.69	3.86	2.87	3.89	3.53	3.16	Control	EI
2	Interpersonal relationships	3.66	2.75	4.00	2.75	4.16	3.66	Dep	Ext
3	Supervision	3.91	3.21	3.16	3.82	4.09	2.79	Dep	Ach
4	Problem management	3.86	3.32	3.33	2.74	4.11	3.55	Dep	Ach
5	Management of mistakes	3.52	3.22	3.76	2.83	4.03	3.55	Dep	Ext
6	Conflict management	4.22	3.59	3.26	3.26	3.06	3.59	Ach	EI & Aff
7	Communication	3.69	2.94	4.02	3.48	4.05	2.79	Dep	Ext
8	Decision making	3.20	3.45	3.68	3.49	3.44	3.70	Aff	Ext
9	Trust	3.15	3.90	3.58	3.42	3.70	3.28	EI	Dep
10	Management of rewards	4.40	3.79	3.02	3.03	3.23	3.47	Ach	EI
11	Risk-taking	3.33	3.85	2.29	3.80	3.50	4.20	Aff	EI
12	Innovation & change	3.10	3.16	3.29	4.60	4.21	2.58	Con	Dep
	Total Scores	43.73	41.04	40.26	41.11	45.11	40.32	Dependency	Achievement
	Overall MAO-C Index	53	48	47	48	55	47		
	Rank	II	IV	VI	III	I	V		

Organizational Climate of VCSG UUHF

The data presented in Table 4 reveals that the dominant motive of VCSG UUHF was Affiliation motive with an Index score of 52, while the backdrop motive was Achievement motive with an Index score of 52. Combination of the dominant and backdrop motives indicate that Affiliation-Achievement climate prevailed in the university. This reveals that members of the organization have a tendency to form and maintain immediate personal relationships with each other. The achievement motive drives the members towards excellence in their work. Although accomplishment of results is stressed upon, the members of the organization also form firm cliques based on mutual interests. This can sometimes

result in faculty and students getting rewards and recognitions based on their social connections rather than their actual performance. Since the members are focused on maintaining friendly relationships, efficiency and goal attainment may be hampered.

In addition to this, Control (Index score 52) and Dependency (Index score 52) were fairly strong in the university. It is a matter of concern as both of these motives are unfavourable for maintaining a conducive organizational climate. Control motive indicates the prevalence of bureaucracy and dominating nature of the authority. The weakest motive was Extension (index score 47) which hints at a weak researcher to farmer linkage.

Table 4: MAO-C profile matrix of VCSG UUHF

	Dimensions of OC in UUHF	Motives							
		Achievement (Ach)	Expert Influence (EI)	Extension (Ext)	Control (Con)	Dependency (Dep)	Affiliation (Aff)	Dominant Climate	Backdrop Climate
1	Orientation	4.11	3.29	3.74	3.63	3.09	3.20	Ach	Ext
2	Interpersonal relationships	3.31	3.27	4.02	3.59	3.44	3.35	Ext	Control
3	Supervision	3.73	3.68	3.05	3.43	3.21	3.88	Aff	Ach
4	Problem management	3.45	3.48	3.01	3.30	4.17	3.59	Dep	Aff
5	Management of mistakes	3.69	3.42	3.29	3.47	3.47	3.63	Ach	Aff
6	Conflict management	3.09	3.82	3.17	3.03	4.14	3.69	Dep	EI
7	Communication	3.30	3.25	3.77	4.14	3.40	3.14	Control	Ext
8	Decision making	3.27	3.38	3.69	3.59	3.45	3.60	Ext	Aff
9	Trust	3.28	3.31	3.23	4.05	3.64	3.46	Control	Dep
10	Management of rewards	3.52	3.37	3.18	3.78	3.61	3.54	Control	Dep
11	Risk-taking	3.78	3.42	3.17	3.06	3.84	3.71	Dep	Ach
12	Innovation & change	4.20	2.88	3.04	3.52	3.07	4.26	Aff	Ach
	Total Scores	42.69	40.57	40.36	42.59	42.53	43.05	Affiliation	Achievement
	Overall MAO-C Index	52	48	47	52	52	52		
	Rank	II	V	VI	III	IV	I		

Variation in the organizational climates of GBPUAT and VCSG UUHF

Table 5 depicts contrast in the organizational climate of GBPUAT and VCSG UUHF with reference to all the six motives. There was a significant difference in Dependency

and Affiliation motives of both the SAUs. GBPUAT had a higher mean score in Dependency motive (45.397) which indicates the reliance of the organizational members on their superiors. VCSG UUHF had a higher mean score in Affiliation motive (43.704) which hints at the tendency of the

organizational members to maintain cordial interpersonal relations with each other. Both these motives can have an adverse effect on running of an efficient organization.

However, GBPUAT had higher mean scores for the positive motives like Achievement (46.674), Expert influence (41.022) and Extension (40.50).

Table 5: Motive-wise variation in the OC of GBPUAT and VCSG UUHF

Organizational Climate	Universities	N	Mean	SD	t-value	Sig. Level
Achievement	GBPUAT	224	46.674	5.554	1.166	.246
	UUHF	88	42.738	6.670		
Expert Influence	GBPUAT	224	41.022	6.046	0.522	.603
	UUHF	88	40.625	6.054		
Extension	GBPUAT	224	40.50	7.426	0.233	0.816
	UUHF	88	40.28	7.779		
Control	GBPUAT	224	40.665	10.468	-1.577	0.117
	UUHF	88	42.634	9.713		
Dependency	GBPUAT	224	45.397	7.108	3.399	0.001**
	UUHF	88	42.590	6.336		
Affiliation	GBPUAT	224	40.665	5.947	-3.400	0.001**
	UUHF	88	43.704	7.512		

Conclusion

It was observed that the organizational climate of GBPUAT was Dependency-Achievement where the dominant motive was Dependency and backdrop motive was Achievement. In this type of settings, the members of the organization tend to rely on each other and their superiors for important decisions along with being motivated towards achievement of results. VCSG UUHF, on the other hand, had Affiliation-Achievement type of organizational climate. In such climate, the members are focused on establishing positive relationships at their workplace and achievement of outcomes becomes secondary. Expert Influence was scored third lowest in GBPUAT and second lowest in VCSG UUHF while both the SAUs scored the lowest in Extension motive. Thus, both the SAUs scored very low in the motives characteristic for an ideal educational institution *viz.* Expert Influence and Extension. A comparison of the organizational climate of both the SAUs indicates that GBPUAT had higher scores in those motives which make for a better working environment.

References

1. Campbell JP, Dunnette MD, Lawler EE, Weick KE. Managerial behaviour: performance and effectiveness. McGraw-Hill, New York; c1970.
2. Litwin GH, Stringer RA. Motivation and Organizational Climate. Boston, Harvard University Press; c1968.
3. Pal S, Raheja M, Bientema N. India-recent developments in Agricultural Research. Agricultural Science and Technology Indicators (facilitated by IFPRI). Country Note, June, 2012, 1-2.
4. Pareek U. Motivational Analysis of Organizations–Climate (MAO-C). The 1989 Annual: Developing Human Resources. 1989;15(9):161-180.
5. Srivastava SK. Job satisfaction and organizational climate among University teachers. Journal of Higher Education. 1990;15:51-54.
6. Lewin K, Lippitt R, White RK. Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created “social climates. The Journal of social psychology. 1939 May 1;10(2):269-99.