

## **JOB – INNOVATION AS A MODE OF ADJUSTMENT**

**KUMAR GAURAV**

Research Scholler,

Deptt. of Psychology

B.R.A.Bihar University, Muzaffarpur

### **INTRODUCTION..-**

According to van Maanen and Schein (1979), mode of adjustment is the degree to which the managers change the work role as a means of adjusting. Jones (1986) also later on accepted this view of mode of adjustment. The literature on transitions and organizational socialization has drawn attention to there types of possible outcomes. (1) Affective states and their consequent coping response in those treatment that show transitions as sources of stress (Brett, 1980 a; Frese, 1982); (2) identity changes in which new values, skill and dispositions emerge as outcome, of the search for new personal meanings to match new situational demands (Stress, 1959, Brim, 1966; Hill, 1971); and (3) behavioral outcomes; adaptations to new settings that either re-enforce or transform elements of the organization culture (Van Maanen, 1976; Schein, 1978; Van Maanen and Schein, 1979). The possible interdependence of these outcomes has yet to be explored and sufficiently recognized. These outcomes specially, the last two, are related to Nicholson's (1984) first principle of the theory of work role transitions. This principle is that the process of adjustment poses for the person the fundamental alternatives of adopting to meet environmental requirements or manipulating the environment to meet personal requirements.

### **Self-Change Mode of Adjustment**

On the one hand, a person's adjustment to role transition can be considered as a kind of personal development i.e. self-change, in which change is absorbed though the persona altering his or her frame of reference values, or other identity related attributes (Strauss, 1959). According to the nature of new demands, personal development can vary in its centrality to the person's identity, a range encompassing changes in self-concept, values, skills, and life styles. Every existing organization has their own culture, norms and

unique work environment. Therefore, it is not easy to overcome all these for a new hire. Nicholson (1984) proposed that new hire could also adjust in their work- setting by changing aspect of themselves. They might change in their appearance, interaction with other or their general behavior to adjust themselves better and effectively in their jobs. Nicholson argued that self-change be as prevalent as job-change as a mode of adjustment. Self-change could rang from changes in individuals' dress, habits and interpersonal style to overall change in personality in order to fit into the new organization.

Jones (1986) custodial orientation (Self-change) as a continuum with conformity to established roles and procedures.

### **Job- Innovation Mode of Adjustment**

On the other hand, a person's adjustment strategy can be proactive; when the person tries to change role requirement so that they better match his needs, abilities and identity. This strategy labeled as role development, varies according to the person. The person may initiate changes in task objective, methods, materials, scheduling and in the interpersonal relationships integral to role performance.

Defined as job-innovation in the present study, adjustment through this mode reflects redefining the role (task-objective) altering the procedure, and changing the mission of the role. Van Maanen and Schein (1979) were some of the first to argue that individuals could make adjustment to their new jobs by changing aspects of their jobs, something they referred to as role-innovation, Jones (1986) accepted this mode of adjustment as innovation in defining and enacting established roles and procedures. West (1987) used the term developers for those whose new jobs were very different from their previous jobs, but who nevertheless reported high levels of role-innovation.

These above mentioned two kind of adjustment strategies personal development (i.e. self-change) and role development (i.e. job-innovation) can be considered to be independent (Nicholson, 1984). According to Nicholson's work role transitions theory, personal development entails oneself to fit role, while role development entails adapting the role to fit oneself.

### **Design and Methodology**

The purpose of the research was to develop and test a conceptual framework for the relationship between the mode of adjustment i.e. self-change or job innovation and factors from three categories i.e. individual job, and organizations affect this relationship for the new hires in private sector organizations. This charter discusses in detail, the outline of the design and methodology used to carry out the study.

### **DESIGN:**

Since it was a co-relational study, an ex post facto multivariate co-relational design was used to carry out the result. Independent variables were divided into three categories. These were individual were taken i.e. self-change type (SCT) and job innovation to conduct the study. The measures were taken on both dependent and independent variables separately.

### **SAMPLE:**

Since it was a multivariate design study, a large sample was needed. A randomly selected sample of 300 new hires was taken from production based private sector organizations. All the subjects were belonging to middle management hierarchy i.e., managers, deputy managers, assistant managers, executives etc. The term 'new hire' refers to an employee working in an organization for not more than six months. The average of age of the three hundred participant was 31.3 years. And the mean number of days of experiences was 86.69. The size of organization was checked out that it should be neither too small nor very big. The total number of employees in the organization selected was from a minimum at subjects' site of work was from 100 to 1000. All the organizations were production based from Delhi, Haryana, and Uttar Pradesh states of India.

### **VARIABLES AND TOOLS:**

The general questionnaire for this study was obtained from existing measures of specific variables whose psychometric properties regarding validity and reliability have already been established in the literature. Therefore, it was safe to use

existing scales and measures as nearly all of the variables of concern in this study are not new constructs but are new in their relationship to an emerging theoretical framework.

Following tools were used in the present study.

### **Self-Change Mode of Adjustment**

While adjusting through this mode of adjustment the newcomer accepts the prescribed limits of a role in an organization. Self-change was measured with a scale developed by Nicholson and West (1987) simple, by asking the subjects whether adjusting to their present job had change then in any way. This change was measured on four-dimensions: Values-what is important to me in life; Attitudes-the thing I like and dislike; Career goals-my plans about my future; Personality-what sort of person I am. Scores on the five-point scale measuring change ranging from 'Not At All' to 'A Great deal' were summed across response dimensions to give an overall score of perceptions of personal-change. The scale exhibits high reliability ( $\alpha=0.82$ ).

The scale has been shown in 'Appendix-D' Questionnaire Section 6(6.1).

### **Job-Innovation Mode of Adjustment**

When an individual attempts to alter procedures for performing a role, or the purpose of the role itself or both, it is referred to as job-innovation mode of adjustment. Job innovation was measured by a 6-item, seven-point Likert-format scale developed by West (1987a). The instructions for the scale state: 'Please indicate in what ways you do your job differently from the person who did the job before you. Although you may not have a clear idea of this, try to give your impression of how you approach your job compared with how other people had other people done it or are doing it currently'. These items include, 'Setting work target/ objective'. And 'Deciding the methods used to achieve work target/objectives, 'Deciding the order and Initiating new procedures' etc. The Scale had a high reliability ( $\alpha=0.82$ ).

The scale has been shown in 'Appendix-D Questionnaire Section 6.(6.1).

The second objective of the investigation was to study the correlation between the mode of adjustment a self-change or job-innovation at work eight job discretion, job

novelty, growth opportunity at work, material rewards at work. Predictability of work, job tenure in days, levels existing below the subject.

To make it convenient the correlation required to be discussed for second objective were segregated from the 'Total 1.1'. Table 1.3 exhibits the stored correlations between eight job factors with two modes of adjustment.

**Table 1.1**

**Sorted inter-correlations of Eight Job Factors**

**Two with Modes of Adjustment.**

**Significance (P<.05).**

**Decimal points omitted.**

<b>Variables Mode of Adjustment</b>	<b>JD</b>	<b>JGO</b>	<b>JN</b>	<b>MR</b>	<b>PW</b>	<b>JT</b>	<b>LST</b>	<b>LSB</b>
Self-change Type	049	014	147*	055	065	-012	020`	-033
Job- Innovation Type	1000	-095	067	-148*	-163*	-042	-014	-51

JD = Job discretion

JGO = Growth opportunity at work

JN = Job novelty

MR = Material rewards at work

PW = Predictability of work

JT = Job tenure (in day)

LST = Levels between subjects and top person in the organization

LSB = Levels below subjects in the organization

The variable job discretion did not significantly correlate to any of the mode of adjustment i.e. Self-change of job-innovation. Discretion refer to one's latitude to alter task related characteristics (e.g. methods, timing etc.) in the individual's previous work experience.

The result of the very few earlier studies were contradictory. Ashford and Saks (1995) observed a significant correlation between discretion and job-innovation mode of adjustment. Whereas, Black and Ashford (1995) did not find any significant correlation between job discretion and self-change or job-innovation mode of adjustment. Theoretically, it seems that job-innovation mode of adjustment should be positively correlated to the discretion. As more the freedom to alter the job at work place, more the possibility of altering it and less the possibility to change the self. But it has not proved. In other words the job-innovation mode of adjustment seems to be more a function of the individual's own attitude and perception of the need to change the job. However, the observed results are consistent with Blank and Ashford (1995). Thus, in the Indian context, job discretion is not related to either of the mode of adjustment j.e. self-change or job-innovation.

For the variable growth opportunities at work place, there was no significant correlation found with respect to the mode of adjustment i.e. self-change/or job-innovation. In the study, growth opportunity at work (work characteristic) was defined in terms of opportunity for advancement, for creativity, for increasing and skill etc. It was expected that high amount of growth opportunity would allow individual to develop his/her role i.e. job-innovation according to his requirement to better make the role fit for him/herself and a decrease in the same variable would lead to self-change, as a mode of adjustment. Thus, the correlation between growth opportunities and job-innovation will be positive whereas the correlation between growth opportunities and self-change will be negative. But the same has not proved. In a pervious research, west (1987) had studied the same and had found no significant correlation between perceived growth opportunity and job-innovation mode of adjustment (CDS-2). But he did not examine the impact of growth of opportunities at work on self-change mode of adjustment. Nicholson (1994), theory of work role transitions had incorporated novelty as a predictor of personal development i.e. self-change.

**REFERENCE**

Allen, N.J. and Meyer, J.P. (1990)	Organizational socialization tactics: A longitudinal analysis of links to newcomer's commitment and role orientation. <u>Academy of Management Journal</u> , 33; 847-858.
Argyris, C. (1958).	Some problems in conceptualizing organizational Climate: A case study of a bank <u>Administrative Science Quarterly</u> , 2;501-520
Bandura, A. (1977).	Self-efficacy. Toward a unifying theory of behavioral Change. <u>Psychological Review</u> , 84 191-215.
Bandura, A (1982).	The Self-efficacy Towards a unifying theory behavioral <u>American Psychologist</u> , 33;344-358
Bandura, A., and Cervone, D. (1983)	Self-evaluative and self-efficacy mechanisms governing the motivational effects of goal systems. <u>Journal of personality, and Social Psychology</u> , 45; 1017-1028.
Barne, L. (1960).	Organization system and Engineering Groups. Boston; Harvard University
Black, J.S. and Ashford, S.J., (1995)	Fitting in or making job fit: Factors affecting mode of adjustment for new hires. <u>Human relation</u> , 48 (4);
Brett, J.M. (1980a)	The effect of job transfer on employees and their families. In Cary L. Cooper and Roy Payne (Eds.), <u>Current Concerns in Occupational Stress</u> , 99-136, England Wiley.
Brett. J.M. and werbel, J.D. (1980)	The effects of job transfer on employees and their families. Washington. D.C.: <u>Employee Relocation Council</u> .