

A Study of Interplay between Organisational Change and Career Orientation

Payal Chandel Virendra Singh Nirban***

Abstract

The term motivation has been defined variously by different persons in the fields of Psychology and Management. This is an area which has always and shall continue to attract researchers. While a motivated employee is identified by his/her enthusiasm towards the job, efforts they make to get through a challenge and their performance on the job, on the other hand the non-motivated employee is also identified using the same criterion. The motivation level influences the relationship and sensitiveness of personnel and in turn a reciprocal effect is also there. The consequences of motivation in organisation is evaluated in terms of productivity / performance. The challenge which confronts most organisations today is about organisational change, motivational factors behind it and the resistance to change. This paper is an attempt to identify the career orientation of employees in relation to organisational change, sensitivity and motivation. A five page questionnaire was used for collecting data. Forty-five managerial level personnel responded finally, the sample being managers of higher, middle and junior level in an industry. The means, standard deviations and correlation analysis were the statistical tools used. Results have been interpreted and discussed. The limitations of the study and suggestions for future have also been mentioned.

Keywords: Career orientation, Organisational change, Turbulence-tolerance, Organisational sensitivity, Motivation.

*About Authors: *Associate Professor, Amity University Rajasthan, Jaipur*

***Associate Professor, BITS Pilani, Pilani Campus*

Introduction

The term motivation has been defined in many ways. It has been perceived to be a predisposition to act in a specific goal directed manner (Hellriegel& Slocum, 1979), a state of individual `s perspective representing the strength of his propensity to excel (Gibson 1980), it refers to goal directed behaviour (Chung 1977), considered as expression of a person`s needs (Davis 1981), it refers to expenditure of efforts (Dubrin 1974), it refers to “the reasons underlying behavior” (Guay et al., 2010). Paraphrasing Gredler, Broussard and Garrison (2004) broadly define motivation as “the attribute that moves us to do or not to do something”.

When employees enjoy their jobs, find their work challenging and like the work

environment, they will put forth their best efforts and perform their tasks enthusiastically. This means they are motivated to function at optimum levels. On the other hand, if a person feel that their work is terribly boring they`ll not do their best and just do the minimum to keep their jobs. This is indicative of the fact that they are not motivated.'Work and motivation' is an area which has always and shall continue to attract attention of managerial and psychology research community because the outcome of such research will always endeavour to enhance human performance. Since mid 80's numerous studies have addressed career motivation theory, its measurement, association with individual characteristics and firm level variables. Job satisfaction is a percieved state of being happy with whatever the job expected to deliver. Locke

(1976) opines that 'satisfaction with the job' can be understood as the pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experience . It can also be understood as how well the outcome meet or exceed expectations and it represents several related attitudes such as work itself, pay, promotion opportunities, supervision and coworkers which are most important characteristics of a job about which people have effective response (Luthans, 1998). In absence of satisfaction with the job, lethargy and reduced organizational commitment creeps into employees behaviour (Moser, 1997).

Theories of motivation like Maslow's Hierarchy of needs (1954), Herzberg's Two factor theory (1959) and McGregor's theory X and Y (1960), and a few other theories have all made efforts to bring about motivation for organizational effectiveness and better performance from personnel's.

Management personnel have always been on the lookout for factors which help in bringing about changes which help in consistent and if possible increasing motivation. Modern day organizations look at motivation not only as a consequence of basic need fulfilment or by catering to the hygiene factors but explore possibilities in the realm of higher order need. Motivational factors are also reflected in direct assessment and measurement. It is also inferred from the levels of identifications which one has with the organization i.e. the relationship which one has with the organization for which one is working. This phenomenon has been termed as 'equity sensitiveness' (Robbins 1993).

The consequence of motivation and similar factors in organization is evaluated for effectiveness and efficiency in terms of productivity /performance. Performance itself is evaluated on the basis of achievement of goals, ratio of input and output in the organization and the organizational growth leading from the achievement and output. Both personality and motivation are found to significantly influence

primary care managers' managerial competency (Shamsudin and Chuttipatana 2012).

Present day organisations have more or less managed to deal with the motivation to a satisfactory level but sustaining and building it towards excellence requires greater efforts. Moreover, understanding and application of certain other conceptualised factors which are influenced by motivation or have the capacity to influence motivation required to be considered in mainstream human resource management process.

One of the pressing challenges which confronts most organizations these days is dealing with the organizational change. These organizational changes are forced by or initiated as reactions to the changes in the nature of the work force, the technology, economic shocks, social trends, politics, competition etc. The resistance to these changes may be because of reasons associated with habit, security, economic factor, and fear of unknown and selective information processing at individual level. Moreover, it may also occur because of structural inertia, limited focus of change, group inertia, threat to expertise, threat to established power relationships and threat to established resource allocations at the organizational levels. It is not to suggest that these resistances cannot be overcome and organizational changes not managed it is suggested that education and communication, participation, facilitation support, negotiation, manipulation and co-operation and coercion can go a long way in helping manage organizational change.

It is evident from the research literature that there are certain correlates of motivation which directly or indirectly influence it and determine the total work behaviour of the individual. Individuals enter an organization with certain abilities and capacities which they consider as qualification for the job. On the job, they have to face certain situations /circumstances which give more clarity regarding their roles, task and actions on the job.

The execution of the role, together with the task and action, requires certain levels of motivation without which the individuals would find themselves inefficient. In modern day organization, motivation is brought about, sustained and manipulated through achievement, power and affiliation (these have been elsewhere referred to as needs and it is opined that for fulfilment of these needs individuals are motivated and hence these are termed as motivating factors). The motivation levels influence the relationship and sensitiveness of the individuals vis-a-vis the organization and its people. This sensitivity is to a certain extent determined by the motivation and in turn a reciprocal effect is also there. All individuals, no matter at what position or level they are, look for career development and consequently strive hard. This striving is reflected in the way they manage their work—deal with circumstances, overcome the turbulence of the workplace (propelled by the motivation and sensitivity and desire to achieve).

The present study looks into the relationships of the different factors and tries to find out the importance and role of motivation in making people choose their careers and reduce their resistance to organizational changes in terms of being more tolerant of workplace turbulence. The sensitiveness of the personnel or individuals towards the organization is also a determining factor as far as motivation is concerned and it is argued that such sensitiveness and motivation have a reciprocal relationship.

Method

Tools

A fifteen item, five point, scale designed by Steers and Braunstein (1976) was used for measuring motivation. For the measurement of sensitivity, a five item questionnaire, to be

responded on two alternatives, made by Miles et al (1989) and, was used. The forty-four-item scale was used to measure career aspiration/orientation (DeLong, 1982) the response was to be given on four-point scale. A questionnaire made by Vaill (1989) having 24 items, to be responded on a five-point scale, was used for measuring organizational change.

Sample

The study was carried out with a sample drawn from a cluster of industrial complex in Jodhpur involving executives/managers from senior, middle and junior level management. Forty-five personnel (all having an experience of five years or more) were included in the survey. Random sampling was used to draw the sample.

Results and Discussion

The mean of the total motivation score was 54.95 with S.D. of 6.59, power and affiliation motivation had higher mean compared to achievement motivation. The mean and Standard Deviation (SD) of sensitiveness were 31.75 and 6.31 respectively. Total mean and SD for career assessment scale were calculated as 176.53 and 6.32 respectively. The mean of organisational change was 49.62 with an SD of 5.77 indicating an average turbulence tolerance of the targeted sample.

This study was focused on how motivation is related to sensitivity and career assessment. All the correlations of motivation with sensitivity were significant at 0.05 level except for affiliation motivation. The correlations of motivation and its sub scales and career assessment and its sub scales formed a matrix of 36 correlations out of which 22 positive correlation were statistically

significant, 8 of them were significant at 0.01 level and 14 on 0.05 level. 4 correlations were not found to be significant but had higher values and could be taken as significant at 0.10 level. Only 10 correlations were found negative but they were not significant. The correlations of

motivation and turbulence tolerance showed us 2 significant and 2 non-significant correlations showing that turbulence tolerance is significantly related with power and affiliation motivation.

Table 1 : Showing means and standard deviation of motivation and its subscales, career assessment and its subscales, sensitivity and turbulence tolerance

	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
MOTIVATION(TOTAL)	59.95	6.59
Achievement Motivation	17.53	2.92
Power Motivation	18.98	3.08
Affiliation Motivation	18.67	2.49
SENSITIVITY	31.75	6.31
CAREER ASSESSMENT (TOTAL)	176.53	6.37
Technical Competence	22.42	7.41
Autonomy	21.27	1.73
Service	23.73	1.34
Identity	22.89	1.66
Variety	24.02	1.41
Managerial Competence	23.13	1.61
Security	21.91	2.32
Creativity	16.82	1.46
TURBULENCE TOLERANCE	49.62	5.77

Table 2 : showing correlations between motivation and its subscales with career assessment and its subscales, sensitivity and turbulence tolerance

	Motivation(total)	Achievement motivation	Power motivation	Affiliation motivation
CAREER ASSESS. (TOTAL)	0.392*	0.335**	0.382*	0.390*
Technical competence	-0.075	-0.071	-0.029	-0.081
Autonomy	0.354**	0.328**	0.405*	0.320**
Service	-0.082	0.301**	-0.067	-0.057S
Identity	0.298**	0.399*	0.334**	0.221
Variety	0.014	0.341**	-0.032	0.289**
Managerial competence	0.390*	0.373*	0.330**	0.172
Security	0.360**	0.329**	0.374*	0.380*
Creativity	-0.017	-0.067	0.301**	0.180
SENSITIVITY	0.325**	0.353**	0.362**	0.103
TURBULENCE TOLERANCE	0.188	0.050	0.465*	0.394*

Significant at 0.01 level *

Significant at 0.05 level **

As evident by mean scores we found that the motivation level of personnel was on the higher side. The sensitivity towards organisation is also more than average showing the commitment of managers to their organisation. The relation between motivation and sensitivity is reciprocal as is evident by the positive correlation. Same is the case with career assessment / orientation. All the subscales of motivation dimensions and it's totality have positive and significant correlations with total career assessment scores. The correlations of subscales of motivation with the subscales of career assessment and most of these being significant demonstrating both of them to be important factors in developing the personnel as well as the organisation. There were only two significant correlations between motivation and turbulence tolerance.

Conclusion

For the purpose of studying “career assessment / orientation in relation to organisational changes with reference to organisational sensitivity and motivation”, a four sectioned questionnaire was used, viz. motivation, sensitivity, career assessment and organisational change. The results showed that motivation and sensitivity in terms of organisational commitment were significantly correlated. The correlation of motivation and career assessment together with their subscales were 36 in all, only 10 were negative but non-significant, 22 were positive and significant and only 4 were non-significant and of them also only one was very low. In the light of present study, it may be suggested that to increase the motivation of personnel their sensitivity, turbulence tolerance and career orientation should be increased.

References

- Broussard, S. C., & Garrison, M. E. (2004). The relationship between classroom motivation and academic achievement in elementary school aged children. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal*, 33(2), 106-120.
- Broussard, S. C., & Garrison, M. E. (2004). The relationship between classroom motivation and academic achievement in elementary school aged children. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal*, 33(2), 106-120.
- Chung, K. H. (1977). *Motivational theories and practices*. Columbus, Ohio; Grid 7.
- Newstrom, J. W., & Davis, K. (1986). *Human behavior at work*. New York. McGraw-Hill.
- DeLong, T. J. (1982). Reexamining the career anchor model. *Personnel*, 59(3), 50-61.
- DuBrin, A. J. (2013). *Fundamentals of organizational behavior: An applied perspective*. Elsevier.
- Gibson, C.F. (1980). *Managing organizational behaviour*, Homewood three. R.D.IRWIN, 496.
- Grzeda, Maurice M. and J. Bruce Prince (1997)., Career motivation measures: a test of convergent and discriminant validity. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management* 8:3, pp.172-196
- Guay, F., Chanal, J., Ratelle, C. F., Marsh, H. W., Larose, S., & Boivin, M. (2010). Intrinsic, identified, and controlled types of motivation for school subjects in young elementary school children. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 80(4), 711-735.
- Hellriegel, D. And Slocul (1979) *Organizational behaviour*. New York: West publishing, 390.

- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B. S., & Snyderman, B. (1978). *B. (1959). The motivation to work.* New York: John Willey.
- Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp.1297-1349). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- London, M. (1985). Employee guided management: Steps for involving employees in decisions and actions. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 6, pp.3 8.
- London, M. (1983) 'Toward a Theory of Career Motivation'. *Academy of Management Review*. 8:, pp.620-630
- London, M. (1993) 'Relationships between Career Motivation, Empowerment and Support for Career Development, *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 66: pp.55-69
- London, M., & Mone, E. M. (1987). *Career management and survival in the workplace.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- London, M., & Noe, R. (1997). London's career motivation theory: An update on measurement and research. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 5(1), pp.61 80.
- Luthans, F. (1998). *Organisational Behaviour.* Boston: Irwin McGraw-Hill.
- Noe, R.A., NM, A.W. and Bachhuber, J.A. (1990) 'An Investigation of the Correlates of Career Motivation', *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 37, pp.340-56.
- Maslow, A. (1954) *Motivation and personality.* New York: Harker and Row.
- McGregor, D. (1960) *The human side of enterprise.* New York: McGraw hill.
- Miles, E. W., Hatfield, J. D., & Huseman, R. C. (1989). The equity sensitivity construct: Potential implications for worker performance. *Journal of Management*, 15(4), 581-588.
- Mohd-Shamsudin, F., & Chuttipattana, N. (2012). Determinants of managerial competencies for primary care managers in Southern Thailand. *Journal of health organization and management*, 26(2), 258-280.
- Moser, K. (1997). Commitment in organizations. *Psychologies*, 41 (4), pp.160-170.
- Robbins, S. P. (1987). Basic motivation concepts. *Organizational Behavior, Concepts, Controversies, and Applications* (6th ed.). New-Delhi : Prentice-Hall of India, 203-245.
- Steers, R. M., & Braunstein, D. N. (1976). A behaviorally-based measure of manifest needs in work settings. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 9(2), 251-266.
- Vaill, P. B. (1989). *Managing as a performing art: New ideas for a world of chaotic change.* Jossey-Bass.

