

## PERCEPTION OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE OF MANUFACTURING ENTERPRISES IN AMRITSAR : AN EMPIRICAL STUDY

Kuldeep Kaur<sup>1</sup> & Dr. Gurpreet Randhawa<sup>2</sup>

*Assessing the perception of organizational climate can be a good indicator of how individuals feel about their organizations. The present paper attempts to examine the perception of organizational climate of employees of manufacturing enterprises. The data was collected from 200 employees from 10 manufacturing enterprises situated in the Amritsar region in Punjab. Organizational climate questionnaire was designed using Likert type scale. The questionnaire cover various dimensions of organization climate such as working conditions, communication patterns, participation in decision-making, grievance handling, job clarity, professional and team spirit. Factor analysis and other suitable statistical techniques have been applied for analysis and the findings of the paper revealed how the individuals perceive organization climate based on various dimensions. The present study recommends that organizations should create an environment in which employees can thrive and be creative and productive. Further, the management should identify those vital areas which are sensitive to climate profile and behavioural aspects of organization. The paper raises the need for further research into the changing nature of employees' social experience within enterprises and suggests the important role of management of these enterprises in providing employees with a positive organizational climate.*

### INTRODUCTION

The term 'climate' generally refers to the prevailing weather conditions of a region such as temperature, humidity, sunshine, etc. averaged over a period of time. In a similar manner, organizational climate represents the prevailing environmental conditions of an organization as perceived by its employees related to cooperation, trust, support etc. and which affect the motivation and satisfaction of the employees. Organizational climate is

---

<sup>1</sup> Research Fellow, Department of Commerce and Business Management, Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar, Punjab. Email : kuldeepksidhu@gmail.com

<sup>2</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce and Business Management, Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar, Punjab. Email : drgrandhawa@gmail.com

an individual's description of the social setting or context of which a person is a part. It is a content-free concept denoting in a sense generic perception of the context in which an individual behaves and responds. It shows their personal identification with the organization (Simberova, 2007).

Organizational climate comprises shared perceptions about organizational norms, beliefs, values, practices, and procedures that can be observed at general or specific levels (Van Muijen, 1998; Guldenmund, 2000). The concept of organizational climate has its roots laid back in the late 1940s when Kurt Lewin introduced the idea of "social climates in the workplace". But it gains its momentum in 1970s with the research studies of Litwin and Stringer (1968), James & Jones (1974), Johannesson (1973) and Woodman & King (1978).

Various conceptualizations of the term 'organizational climate' were proposed by different authors and one of the earliest and most widely accepted definition of organisational climate is that of Forehand and Gilmer (1964) who explained organisational climate as a set of characteristics that describes an organisation, distinguishes it from other organisations, is relatively enduring over time and can influence the behaviour of people in it. According to Owens (1998), "Organizational climate is the study of perceptions that individuals have of various aspects of the environments in the organizations". Moran and Volkwein (1992) has defined organizational climate as a prevailing characteristic of an organization which discriminate it from other organizations: (a) "embodies members' collective perceptions about their organization with respect to such dimensions as autonomy, trust, cohesiveness, support, recognition, innovation and fairness, (b) is produced by members' interaction, (c) serves as a basis for interpreting the situation, (d) reflects the prevalent norms, values and attitudes of the organizations culture, and (e) acts as a source of influence for shaping behaviour". Research has demonstrated that organizational climate perceptions provide an important mediating link between organizational characteristics and consequential work outcomes such as employee attitudes, motivation, and psychological well-being (Parker, 1999).

Researchers argue that there are many types of work climates, such as a climate for service, climate for safety compliance, climate for innovation, climate of trust, etc. (Peterson, 2002). In this regard, Burton et al (2004) specified four types of climatic profiles based upon their degree of trust, conflict, morale, equity of rewards, resistance

to change, leader credibility and scape-goating. These profiles include : 1) Group climate : It is based on internal focus with high trust and morale. It is what one feels to work in a group; 2) Developmental climate : It is characterized as creative, entrepreneurial and dynamic place to work where people take risks. Readiness for change and meeting new challenges are extremely important in this case; 3) Rational goal climate : It is also an externally oriented climate to succeed, but morale and trust are lower as innovations are restricted towards rational goals and 4) Internal process climate : It is formalized and structured place to work with well set procedures to be followed. It is more mechanical and has a high resistance to change.

Table 1 displays how these four profiles of organizational climate score on the above mentioned seven characteristics.

**Table 1: Profiles of the Four Types of Organizational Climate**

S. No.	Profiles	Group	Developmental	Rational goal	Internal process
	Characteristics				
1	Trust	High	Medium/High	Low	Low
2	Morale	Medium/High	Medium/High	Medium	Low
3	Rewards equitability	High	Medium/High	Low	Low
4	Leader credibility	High	High	Low/Medium	Low
5	Conflict	Low	Low	High	High
6	Scapegoating	Low	Low/Medium	High	High
7	Resistance to change	Medium/High	Low	Medium/High	Medium/High

Source: Adapted from Fritzsck (2009)

## MANUFACTURING ENTERPRISES

Manufacturing industry is considered as the engine of economic growth of a nation. It includes all activities starting from product design and development till the conversion of raw material into finished products. Manufacturing enterprises are generally characterized by their unique feature of labour intensiveness. In India it employs 30% of non-agricultural workforce and contributes one-fourth of total GDP (Ravi and Trivedi, 2003). These enterprises provide gainful employment, create the products required to maintain and improve the standard of living and generate the wealth required for future development. Studies have indicated that the productivity of the manufacturing industry

in India is approximately 1/5th of the productivity in the manufacturing industry of United States of America. It is about 1/2 as compared to the productivity levels in South Korea as well as Taiwan<sup>1</sup>. To enhance productivity and compete in today's globalized and competitive business world these enterprises should aim to create vision to generate all types of wealth (i.e. material, natural, intellectual and cultural) by encouraging and supporting appropriate manufacturing activities that respect nature and maintain a balance among various resources. All, this can be achieved only through a mission to identify, train, deploy, motivate and retain their valuable human resources.

As far as Amritsar (Punjab) is considered, the manufacturing enterprises are mostly engaged in the production of various goods namely panel pins, paper-cutting, engineering goods, textile machinery, wood and machine screws, printing and machinery, electric fans, chemicals and the textiles including woollen, silken, cotton, etc. The city of Amritsar is famous for the manufacturing of fine pashmina shawls, thick serge, silk goods and carpets. After 1950s, despite being on the sensitive international border, the city saw a huge expansion in the industrial sector with many new industries coming up and the old ones expanding at a faster rate.

### *Need of Study*

Organizational climate plays a vital role in organization success and notwithstanding its crucial significance; organizations may never realize the full potential of employees. Moreover, employee work attitudes and behaviours are inevitably influenced by the individual's own perceptions of the work environment as well as by their shared perceptions with co-workers of the same working environment. Therefore, assessing the perception of organizational climate can be a good indicator of how individuals feel about their organizations. The psychological research has also revealed that if individuals perceive their organizational climate as of distrust, lack of communication, personal antipathies, limited individual autonomy, and unclear goals, the organizational effectiveness will be inhibited (Amabile, 1988). In spite of widespread interests in the phenomena of organizational climate and success stories of manufacturing enterprises, limited research studies have been conducted in India and particularly in state of Punjab. Thus, the present study attempts to bridge this gap in the existing research.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.economywatch.com/world-industries/manufacturing/india.html>

### ***Objectives of the Study***

1. To examine the perception of organizational climate of employees of manufacturing enterprises.
2. To identify various dimensions which constitute organizational climate of manufacturing enterprises.

## **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

### ***Sample***

The present study examined the perceived organizational climate by the employees of manufacturing enterprises of Amritsar. A total of 10 manufacturing enterprises of Amritsar District were selected on the basis convenience. These enterprises are engaged in the production of textiles, paper, plastics, pharmaceutical products, food products, and soaps & detergents. The sample consisted of at least 10% of the employees from each enterprise constituting a total of 200 respondents. Convenient sampling was used to collect the data. Average age of respondents lies between 25 to 35 years. The number of male participants (n=147) was higher that of females (n=53). The majority of respondents had a higher secondary education and more than 68% of the employees had an experience of more than 2 years in same organization.

### ***Measuring Instrument***

The organizational climate was measured using twenty one items adapted from Patterson et al's (2004) Organizational Climate Measure. The questionnaire is divided into 2 parts. Part A was designed to elicit the demographic profile of the respondents and part B consisted of 21 statements based on climate characteristics of an organization concerning perception and observations about the organization in which they were working. Statistical analysis of the data was performed with the statistical package SPSS 19. The statements were quantified on a five point scale using Likert type technique. The respondents were asked to tick mark the appropriate score on a five point continuum (from 1 = strongly agree to 5 = strongly disagree). Two statements were negatively worded; so the scores of these items were reversed. The reliability of the instrument was determined by using Cronbach's alpha which is found to be 0.805 which is fairly good to proceed for analysis.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The descriptive statistics is shown in Table 2. The mean values closer to 1 indicate the agreement towards the statement and the mean values nearer to 5 indicate disagreement with the respective statement. It has been found that most of the respondents agree with the statement that the decisions are made at the top level ( $\mu=1.43$ ) with management seeking less involvement of employees ( $\mu=3.73$ ) and only few influential people are trusted ( $\mu=1.86$ ) in these organizations. Thus it can be concluded that trust climate of these organizations is low. Moreover, the respondents also showed that the management did not encourage open communication ( $\mu=1.29$ ) and acceptability of new ideas ( $\mu=3.58$ ) is also low. Thus, it shows low developmental climate in these organizations.

**Table 2: Descriptive Statistics**

Statements	Mean	S.D.
Decisions are made at the top level and communicated downwards.	1.43	.498
Management seeks involvement of employees when making important decisions.	3.73	.975
There is a lot of group spirit and team work.	2.85	.737
Management care about the interests of its employees.	3.15	.837
I feel my job is challenging and interesting.	3.35	.804
Work is well organized and progress systematically from week to week.	1.88	.405
I am clear about my job responsibilities.	2.51	.641
The problems and grievances of the employees are handled properly.	3.07	.859
Company tries to be fair in its action towards employees.	3.02	.933
Only a few influential people are trusted here.	1.86	.718
Employees have to follow well set rules and procedures.	1.55	.623
There is so much to do here as a result the people are always busy.	1.40	.493
Knowledge and expertise are recognized and rewarded here.	2.83	.797
My seniors respect me as an employee and support me whenever needed.	2.76	.616
Open communication is encouraged here.	3.29	.907
New ideas are readily accepted here.	3.58	.667
Quality is taken very seriously here.	2.44	.765
My working area has adequate first aid and safety equipments.	2.77	.612
My work area is clean and comfortable.	3.13	.727
My company provide adequate welfare facilities such as drinking water, lunch rooms, canteen facility etc.	2.89	.595
I am satisfied with the climate of my organization.	3.73	.645

Further, table 2 reveals that the work is well organized ( $\mu=1.88$ ). In these organizations and their employees follows well set rules ( $\mu=1.55$ ). It means that organizations considered in the present study follow internal process climate. Furthermore, the study found a lower level of team work and group climate ( $\mu=2.85$ ). This may be due to the fact that most of the organizations considered for present study are non-union organizations. In the last, the study observed a low overall satisfaction of respondents with the organization climate ( $\mu=3.73$ ).

The multivariate statistical technique of Factor Analysis has been used to determine the factors influencing the organizational climate of manufacturing enterprises. For measuring the sample adequacy KMO test has been applied. Table 3 shows the values of KMO test and Bartlett' test of sphericity.

**Table 3: KMO and Bartlett's Test**

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy		0.821
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	1780.833
	Df	210
	Sig.	0.000

The value of KMO test (0.821 which is greater than 0.5) shows fairly adequate sample. The appropriateness of the factor analysis is examined in terms of presence of correlations among the variables. For this purpose, Bartlett's test of sphericity conducted which indicates strength of the relationship among variables. The observed significance level (.000) and the values of approx. Chi-Square (1780.833) showed that variables are correlated and hence, it is good to proceed for factor analysis for the data.

The set of statements have been subjected to factor extraction using principal component method as the objective here is to determine the minimum number of factors that determine the maximum number of variance in the data.

**Table 4: Initial Eigen values and percentage of variance of different variables**

Component	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Component	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	6.284	29.923	29.923	12	.520	2.477	86.223
2	2.662	12.678	42.602	13	.471	2.241	88.464
3	1.562	7.439	50.041	14	.441	2.100	90.565
4	1.285	6.121	56.162	15	.375	1.788	92.352
5	1.225	5.832	61.993	16	.360	1.713	94.066
6	1.046	4.980	66.973	17	.300	1.430	95.495
7	.957	4.556	71.530	18	.283	1.347	96.842
8	.706	3.361	74.890	19	.257	1.223	98.065
9	.644	3.067	77.957	20	.219	1.042	99.107
10	.638	3.038	80.995	21	.187	.893	100.000
11	.578	2.751	83.746				

Table 4 shows the initial factor solutions which are unrotated factor solutions extracted in order of their importance. It is clear that first few factors explain relatively large amount of variance whereas subsequent factors explain only small amount of variance.

Latent root criterion has been used to decide the number of factors to be extracted. The eigen values are calculated for each variable that represents the amount of variance accounted for by a factor and eigen values greater than 1 are considered significant. Table 5 displays six factors showing eigen value greater than 1. Factor 1 explains maximum variance of (29.923%) in the data and remaining factors successively explain smaller portion of variance.

**Table 5: Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings**

Factor	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	6.284	29.923	29.923
2	2.662	12.678	42.602
3	1.562	7.439	50.041
4	1.285	6.121	56.162
5	1.225	5.832	61.993
6	1.046	4.980	66.973



The factors are then subjected to varimax rotation. Rotation has an effect of optimizing the factor structure and the relative importance of six factors is equalized. The rotated sum of squared loading has been shown in table 6. Before rotation, factor 1 accounted for considerably more variance than remaining five, however after extraction it accounts for only 18.344%. Similarly, the variance has been optimized for other factors. The six factors accounts for the total of 66.973% of variance.

**Table 6: Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings**

Factor	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	3.852	18.344	18.344
2	2.997	14.273	32.617
3	2.448	11.658	44.276
4	1.951	9.290	53.566
5	1.560	7.430	60.996
6	1.255	5.977	66.973

The rotated component matrix as shown in table 7 represents the correlation of each variable for the factor.

**Table 7: Rotated Component Matrix**

S. No.	Statements	Component					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
1	Decisions are made at the top level and communicated downwards	.219	<b>.745</b>	.237	.172	.199	-.027
2	Encourage employee involvement	.034	<b>.701</b>	.203	.219	-.028	-.052
3	Group spirit and team work	<b>.567</b>	.047	.439	.097	.224	-.175
4	Management care about the interests of its employees	<b>.538</b>	-.072	.574	.170	-.055	-.026
5	Job is challenging and interesting	.057	.142	<b>.751</b>	-.040	.144	.201
6	Well organized work and progress systematically	.370	-.013	<b>.591</b>	-.295	-.075	-.233
7	Clear responsibilities	-.002	-.081	<b>.757</b>	.137	-.120	.120
8	The problems and grievances handled properly	.098	.151	.363	.164	<b>.676</b>	.289

9	Company tries to be fair in its action towards employees	.476	.162	.085	-.060	<b>.608</b>	.103
10	Only a few influential people are trusted here	.083	<b>.825</b>	.010	-.038	-.232	.008
11	Employees have to follow well set rules and procedures	-.262	-.613	.027	-.130	-.138	<b>.546</b>
12	Increased work load	.181	.133	-.494	.018	-.079	<b>.665</b>
13	Knowledge and expertise are recognized and rewarded here	.213	-.120	.102	.000	.093	<b>.847</b>
14	My senior respect me as an employee and support me whenever needed	<b>.696</b>	.063	.218	.149	.257	-.018
15	Open communication	<b>.645</b>	.148	.282	.133	.101	.149
16	New ideas are readily accepted here	<b>.563</b>	.255	.352	.177	-.314	.206
17	Quality is taken very seriously here.	.011	-.009	.043	.239	<b>.626</b>	.033
18	Adequate first aid and safety equipments	.161	.392	-.153	<b>.602</b>	.062	-.075
19	Work area is clean and comfortable	.274	.319	.118	<b>.646</b>	.251	-.099
20	Adequate welfare facilities	.100	-.086	.092	<b>.743</b>	.186	-.036
21	I am satisfied from the organization	.312	.388	.354	<b>.700</b>	.003	.081

Extraction Method : Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method : Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

### Six factors identified from Rotated Component Matrix are labelled as follows:

Factor 1 shows 18.344% of variance and deals with statements such as group spirit and team work (.567), management cares about the interests of its employees (.538), respect and support from seniors (.696), open communication (.645) and acceptance of new ideas (.563). Therefore this factor was labelled as *Facilitation and Support*.

Factor 2 consists of statements such as decision making at top level (.745), encouraging employee involvement (.701), and only few people are trusted here (.825). So it was named as *Employee Participation*.

Factor 3 indicates high scores on the statements such as job is challenging and interesting (.751), well organized work (.591), clear responsibilities (.757). This also includes the overall satisfaction from the organization climate (.700). So it was labelled

as *Job Standards*.

Factor 4 indicates that companies provide adequate first aid and safety equipments (.605), clean and comfortable place to work (.646) and adequate welfare facilities (.743). So it was named as *Welfare Facilities*.

Factor 5 includes items having high scores on the statements such as depicting problems and grievances handling (.676), fair action towards employees (.608). Therefore, factor was named as *Grievance Handling*.

Factor 6 includes the statements like heavy work load as people were always busy in doing their work (.665). Further the workers have to follow well set rules and procedures (.546) and recognition of knowledge expertise (.847). Therefore this factor was labelled as *Work Environment*.

Validity of the exploratory factor analysis was checked by using convergent validity and discriminant validity. The convergent validity means that the variables within a single factor are highly correlated. This is evident by the factor loadings. Generally, the smaller the sample size, the higher the required loading. The factor loadings of variables on each factor was found to be greater than 0.5, so it can be concluded that the results of factor analysis fulfill convergent validity. Discriminant validity refers to the extent to which factors are distinct and uncorrelated. In this case, the rule is that variables should relate more strongly to their own factor than to another factor. This was determined by examining the factor correlation matrix, as shown in table 8. The results revealed that the correlations between factors are very low and hence fulfill the condition of discriminant validity.

**Table 8. Factor Correlation Matrix**

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6
Factor 1	1.000	.071	.060	.011	.031	.034
Factor 2	.071	1.000	-.014	-.009	-.001	-.092
Factor 3	.060	-.014	1.000	.052	-.049	.001
Factor 4	.011	-.009	.052	1.000	.014	.065
Factor 5	.031	-.001	-.049	.014	1.000	.052
Factor 6	.034	-.092	.001	.065	.052	1.000

## CONCLUSIONS

In the present study an attempt has been made to examine how the employees of the manufacturing enterprises perceive their organizational climate and to determine the various dimensions of organizational climate in these manufacturing enterprises. The descriptive statistics revealed that the companies follow internal process climate. However, previous research has identified that when employees encountered rules and procedures that they perceived as meaningless and burdensome, it may result in increased job stress (Hong and Kaur, 2008). Likewise, findings of the present study also revealed lower trust climate and low group climate and the management of these manufacturing enterprises did not encourage open communication. This may result in negative consequences as earlier studies had indicated that the respondent who has a positive feeling about communication within the organization also has positive feelings regarding the organization's psychological environment and vice-versa (Muchinsky, 1977). Further it has been found in the present study that lower innovation and creativity climate is there in these organizations and this sort of climate risks the way the tasks have been performed in these organizations (Oldham and Cummings, 1996).

In nutshell, it is evident from the results that on the whole facilitation and support, employee participation, job standards, welfare facilities, grievance handling and work environment were found as major factors which constitute the organizational climate of manufacturing enterprises in Amritsar. Regarding the overall satisfaction of employees with the organization very few employees were satisfied from their organization climate.

## SUGGESTIONS

Manufacturing enterprises provide a particular type of climate due to the nature of their work, rules, regulations, compensation, communication patterns, working conditions, etc. The employees who work in it have different values and need patterns. To fulfil such need patterns the management can do a great deal in creating a positive work climate. The present research suggests that these organizations must encourage employee participation in decision making, and enhance open communication. This will result in increased creativity and innovation in decision making, decision commitment and encouragement. Along with this they should also develop a suitable grievance procedure to handle employee complaints properly and timely. This will definitely result in reduced deviant workplace behaviours. Further the employer should provide adequate

workload to the employees for increased work satisfaction and high productivity. The enterprises should strengthen the safety of the employees and provide them better welfare facilities. Management often has a tendency to think that such boosting up of the organizational climate needs extra costs. This need not be true as dimensions such as open communication, involving the workers in decision making, respect and support from seniors, etc., need only behavioural inputs from the management rather than of any financial inputs. This indicates that improvement of organizational environment would result in less variation in employee perceptions and enhance productivity.

### ***Limitations of Study***

Every study, no matter how well it is conducted, has some limitations. Following are the limitations of the present study :-

1. There is no widely accepted set of organizational climate dimensions. Moreover, studies seldom make use of the same dimensions, which makes it difficult to compare results from one study to another.
2. Since the present study was conducted in only ten manufacturing enterprises in Amritsar, it cannot therefore be generalized to other manufacturing enterprises or to other areas.
3. The sampling technique used is convenient so there are chances of biasness. Further the sample size taken is small and may not be sufficient to predict the results with absolute accuracy and hence finding cannot be generalized.
4. Owing to the fact that the questionnaire used in this study was developed specifically for this research, no previous reliability and validity data were available. So it was impossible to compare the findings of this study with other organizational climate studies.

### **REFERENCES**

- Amabile, Teresa.** 1988. "A Model of Creativity and Innovation in Organizations". In B. M. Staw and L.L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behaviour*, 10, 123-167. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Burton, Richard M., Lauridsen, Jergen & Obel, Borge.** 2004. "The Impact of Organization Climate and Strategic Fit on Firm Performance". *Human Resource Management*, 43(1), 67-82.
- Forehand, G.A., & Gilmer, B.** 1964. "Environmental Variations in Studies of Organizational Behavior". *Psychological Bulletin*, 62(6), 361-382.
- Fritzsch, Ludwig.** 2009. "Effective HR Systems: The Impact of Organizational Climate and Organizational Strategy on Strategic Behavior". A Report submitted to University of Twente. Retrieved from [www.essay.utwente.nl/59352/](http://www.essay.utwente.nl/59352/) on 2 July 2011.

- Guldenmund, F.W.** 2000. "The Nature of Safety Culture: A Review of Theory and Research". *Safety Science*, 34, 215-257.
- Hong, L.C. & Kaur, Sharan.** 2008. "A Relationship Between Organization Climate, Employee Personality and Intention to Leave". *International Review of Business Research Papers*, 4(3), 1-10.
- James, L.R., & Jones, A.P.** 1974. "Organizational Climate: A Review of Theory and Research". *Psychological Bulletin*, 81(12), 1096-1112.
- Johannesson, R.E.** 1973. "Some Problems in the Measurement of Organizational Climate". *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 10, 118-144.
- Litwin, G. H. and Stringer, R. A.** 1968. "Motivation and Organizational Climate". Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School, Division of Research Retrieved from <http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=1043431> on 7 July, 2011.
- Moran, E. T. and Volkwein, J. F.** 1992. "The Cultural Approach to the Formation of Organizational Climate". *Human Relations*, 45, 19-47.
- Muchinsky, Paul M.** 1977. "Organizational Communication: Relationships to Organizational Climate and Job Satisfaction." *The Academy of Management Journal*, 20(4). pp. 592-607
- Oldham, Gregg R. and Anne Cummings.** 1996. "Employee Creativity: Personal and Contextual Factors". *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(3), 607-635.
- Owens, R. G.** 1998. "Organizational Behavior in Education", (6th ed.). Prentice Hall, Allyn and Bacon, Boston, USA. p. 161-170.
- Parker, CP.** 1999. "A Test of Alternative Hierarchical Model of Psychological Climate: Pcg, Satisfaction or Common Method Variance? *Organizational Research Methods*, 2, 257-274.
- Peterson, Dane K.** 2002. "Deviant Workplace Behavior and The Organization's Ethical Climate". *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 17(1), 47-61.
- Patterson, M. G., West, M. A., Shackleton, V. J., Lawthom, R., Maittis, S., Dawson, J. F., et al.** 2004. "Development and Validation of Organizational Climate Measure". A Report submitted to Aston Business School, Aston University, Birmingham, pp: 1-44 retrieved from [citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.198.6738.pdf](http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.198.6738.pdf) on 18 April 2012.
- Rav, B. and Trivedi, Pushpa.** 2003. "The Past, Present and Future of Indian Manufacturing Industry". A Report submitted to Indian Institute of Technology, Mumbai, Retrieved from <http://www.me.iitb.ac.in/~bravi/lab/mfgIndia/mfgIndia.pdf> on dated 28 Nov. 2011
- Simberova, Z.** 2007. "Factors of organizational climate influencing learning in companies. Education-line". Leeds: University of Leeds, Retrieved from <http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/166479.doc> dated 27 Dec. 2011.
- Woodman, R.W., & King, D.C.** 1978. "Organizational Climate: Science of folklore?" *Academy of Management Review*, 3(4), 816-826.
- Van Muijen, J.J.** 1998. "Organizational Culture". In P.J.D. Drenth, H. Thierry, & C. De Wolff (Eds), *Handbook of Work and Organizational Psychology* (2nd ed.) Hove, UK: Psychology Press, 125.