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ABSTRACT: This study investigated the organizational rationality of public, private, and multinational organizations in Turkey using a questionnaire developed based on the theories of German sociologist Max Weber. The questionnaire assessed the extent to which four dimensions of formal rationality: efficiency, predictability, calculability, and control, existed in the three types of organizations as perceived by the employees. Questionnaire data were collected from 237 respondents working in various sectors. In all four dimensions, multinational organizations were found to stay above Turkish organizations. Amongst Turkish organizations, private organizations scored higher than public organizations.
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INTRODUCTION

Today globalization forces leaders and managers of many developed countries to transfer their corporate activities to currently developing countries. However, the outcomes of such efforts are not always positive. In developing countries, there are huge culturally embedded differences in orientations towards work and management practices with respect to the developed ones. Many developing countries still travel between the opportunity spaces and shifting boundaries between religion and secularism, public and private, and global and local. And the question if rational operation (in the western sense) can be made possible using the labor forces of these countries still remains.

Whether certain non-western countries will ever be capable of establishing forms of organizations that are rational in the western sense is an old debate. The early “logic of industrialization” discussions (rooted in works of sociologists like Marx and Weber) were concerned about the cultural aspects and consequences of a very related process; modernization (Eisenstadt, 1973; Inkeles, 1975; Levy, 1966; Meyer et al., 1975; Yang, 1988). These discussions informed that there will inevitably be a progress toward modern forms organizing in all societies. However, they also issued warnings about the “cultural capabilities” of some non-western countries to respond to this process. Many scholars thought that the cultural burdens will show themselves through uneven development of rationality in developing economies.

\footnote{1This paper is a part of the Masters Thesis completed by the first author.}
\footnote{*Corresponding author. Tel.: +1 703 993 1725; Fax: +1 703 993 1706; E-mail: aolmez@gmu.edu.}
Based on a case, this study aims to contribute to this debate about whether western-style work and management practices can be made to work in culturally different non-western societies. We also briefly touch the question of whether the so-called impeding cultural factors are really as effective on the workings of such practices as we have always thought. By assessing the “organizational rationality” of Turkish public, private and multinational organizations, our study explores the current state of Turkey in executing western rational work and management practices, and draws links between this and Turkish cultural climate. To quantify (western-style) organizational rationality, we turn to the theories of German sociologist Max Weber and come up with a questionnaire that measures the four dimensions (efficiency, calculability, predictability and control) of what Weber calls “formal rationality” in the organizations of concern.

In an Islamic country like Turkey, with a national culture that leans towards relationship-orientation and collectivism rather than achievement-orientation and individualism, the authors of this study expected that strictly Turkish (Turkish owned) organizations would not put much emphasis on formal rationality (efficiency, calculability, predictability and control) as much as their multinational counterparts. We also expected that sluggish Turkish public organizations would be more loose in terms of sustaining formal rational operation than Turkish private organizations. In accordance with these, we hypothesized that 1) Multinational organizations in Turkey operate more rational than Turkish organizations and 2) Private organizations in Turkey operate more rational than public organizations. Based on the answers of 237 respondents working in various sectors in Turkey who answered our questionnaire, both of these hypotheses were proven to be true.

To present our findings, this paper is divided into three sections. Section 1 begins with a chronological overview of literature on what organizational rationality has meant to different scholars in the last century. After this, we highlight Max Weber’s views on organizational rationality, and the four dimensions (efficiency, predictability, calculability and control) underlying his concept of formal rationality, which form the basis of our Rationality Questionnaire. Section 2 details the method we utilized and results we obtained. A discussion of our findings is provided in Section 3.

ORGANIZATIONAL RATIONALITY

When literature is taken into account, one can easily see that dealing with organizational rationality is fishing in deep waters. Theories of organizational rationality have been under constant change, during the last century. The organizational rationality label is one with a lot of conceptual blur, and there have been many diverse directions taken under it from philosophy to management science and cognition. Here we are going to touch three of these directions (early classical theories, social-cognitive theories, information technology theories) before getting into Weber’s notion of formal rationality, which we equate with organizational rationality in this study.

The early theories of organizational rationality (e.g., Weber’s Theory of Bureaucracy, Taylor’s Scientific Management Theory, or Fayol’s Administrative Theory) were focused on formalization and goal orientation, which they took to be the most important two factors that eliminated non-rationality in organizations (Scott, 1987). The influence of the softer human factors on organizational rationality was not studied. People were simply taken as “parts” in a machine which is under continuous inspection and manipulation (Dixon, 2001). However, the single-sided view of the machine bureaucratic organization in time fell short for certain purposes, and eventually, extended by more open theories of organizations.

After researchers’ loss of interest in examining organizations as self-contained, rational machines, and a new trend of curiosity was triggered about the role of environment and social behavior that
is non-rational. The assumption of control over organizational processes, which formed the basis of
the machine bureaucratic perspective, was challenged and discredited under these systemic behavioral
theories. The organizational information processing capabilities and the reality of “optimal” selection
amongst alternative goals (in the individual, group and organizational level), have also been compromised
(Simon, 1964).

These later open-system theories differed from earlier theories of organizational rationality by focusing
more on the political and social subsystems, rather than the functional. Open-system theories consid-
ered individual and organizational level interactions to allow and foster a considerable role for power,
bargaining, negotiation, and compromise with the organization (Dow, 1988; Lachman, 1989; Levitt and
Nass, 1989). These theories preferred analyzing the interaction of individuals and groups, each with
limited cognitive capabilities, competing goals, and varying levels of informal power to search for the
foundations of organizational non-rationality (Cohen, March and Olsen, 1972; and March and Olsen,
1976).

Recently, another significant direction has been brought to the organizational rationality research.
The newer theories now inspect the propagation of increasingly advanced information technologies in
organizations, raising the importance of a previously not that much talked about organizational subsystem,
the informational subsystem. This stream of research aims to analyze the effects of advanced information
technologies on information related processes of organizations and to predict whether and to what extent
the traditional type of organizational rationality can be achieved using advanced information technologies
(Huber, 1990; Davis, 2000; Dixon 2001).

Formal Rationality

Despite the re-evaluations of the concept of organizational rationality in the last century, to a large
crowd, a rational organization is one whose behavior is basically shaped with formalization and goal
orientation. While interpretations based on information processing capabilities of individuals (typified
by Simon) have been productive (Boudon, 2003), the broader classical forms and theories (like Weber’s
formal rationality) which take a more functional view is more central to what we require from this study.
For our concern, the larger part of assessing organizational rationality (and organizational effectiveness
also) passes through assessing how formal rational an organization functions.

In a very restricted sense, Weberian formal rationality largely means that individuals are not left
to their own devices/solutions in searching for the best means of attaining a given objective. When an
organization is of concern formal rationality is about 1) Continuity and systematization in standardization
of work attitudes; 2) A systematic approach to training so that employees are not left with their own
solutions performing their jobs; 3) Research and inspection for finding better ways of performing tasks
and for identifying deterioration from the methods planned; 4) Calculation of both goals and outcomes for
objectivity and ease of analysis; and 5) Planning of operations and commitments for avoiding problems
during the operation (George, 1972).

According to Ritzer (1995) there are four dimensions of Weberian formal rationality: efficiency,
predictability, calculability, and control. Ritzer finds these four intertwined dimensions lying at the heart
of the success of the rationality model. Ritzer asserts that formal rationality, or McDonaldization as he
calls, which may easily and ideally be observed in the operation of the famous fast-food restaurant, is
controlling almost all spheres of our lives today. We used these four dimensions to design our Rationality
Questionnaire.

First, according to Ritzer (1995:9), formal rationality (McDonaldization) offers efficiency; “the opti-
mum method for getting from one point to another.” For the consumers, formal rational organizations
offer the best available way to satisfy their needs. Consumers obtain what they need more quickly and easily. Workers, in formal rational (McDonaldized) systems, function more efficiently. They are trained to work so by managers who watch them over closely to make sure that they do the things in the right manner.

Efficiency is widely about purifying each activity in an organization and achieving cooperation, communication, and coordination to optimize overall performance. We observe the indicators of efficiency everywhere in the contemporary world. Credit cards, fax machines, word processing softwares, kitchen robots, microwave ovens, and internet shopping are there for us to accomplish our activities faster and with less effort. It is crucial to note that Weber’s and his followers’ efficiency is not only about economizing or elimination of the unwanted. At the core of efficiency lies the commitment to seek for the next step in improvement.

Secondly, formal rationality offers calculability, “an emphasis on the quantitative aspects of products and services offered.” (Ritzer, 1995:9) Customers of formal rational organizations like to calculate how much time it will take to be served, and make their plans accordingly. Workers in formal rational organizations (e.g. McDonalds) do things like emphasizing on how quickly tasks can be accomplished (e.g., seeking to serve a hamburger, shake, and french-fries in 50 seconds) as well as on precise measurement to rationalize operation (e.g., cooking in McDonalds: 350 degrees for 4 minutes).

Calculability rules in various spheres of life. In today’s modern world, even people are reduced into numbers through standardized performance appraisals, test scores, and social security ids. Acceptance rate of the schools, ratings of the TV stations, ranking of academic journals, and test scores of students are all examples to the spread of the calculability phenomenon. Calculability in the organizational context is about the continuing spread of quantification, measurement and calculation through an organization. It shows itself in the quantification of products, processes and even of people in and around the organization.

Thirdly, formal rationality offers predictability, “the assurance that the products and services will be the same over time and in all locales.” Formal rationality offers no surprises and there is a great comfort in knowing this fact. Consumers know exactly what they will get. Workers are aware of what they are expected to do. Interactions between workers and customers are highly predictable.

As pointed by Ritzer (1995), predictability is largely about minimizing the occurrence of the unwanted and unexpected. We expect TV programs to precisely follow the TV guides, require planes to arrive right on time, and even sometimes want the movies to end as we expect (!). Predictability mostly pertains formalization in the organizational context. Standardization, planning, and training all relate to increasing predictability in an organization. A certain degree of routinization in activities including social relations is an end result of this kind of formalization in the form of affectively neutral behavior (Bennis, 1992), or formal equality of treatment (Pugh, 1971).

Control, the fourth component of formal rationality, is exerted over the people who enter the world of formal rationality through “the substitution of nonhuman for human technology” (Ritzer, 1995:9). Nonhuman technology (e.g., the automatic french-fry machine, the assembly line, the procedures of doing a certain task) controls people with the goal of minimizing uncertainty that may be created by their unexpected behavior. In the McDonaldization example that Ritzer gives fast food restaurant customers are controlled with lines, limited menus, few options and seats to make them eat and leave quickly. Fast food restaurant workers are controlled to a high degree, usually more directly than customers.

Control is there with us in the modern world, outside the fast-food restaurant as well. License plate recognition systems to detect traffic crimes, retina scanners which let only the authorized people to pass through the doors, optical scanners for reading price tags in supermarkets are all there to reduce human error. Control is generally about taking the initiative from people in a way to reduce unexpected behavior.
in organizations. Not only mechanization, but also preferring to have rules and standards instead of trusting people’s initiatives, or restricting the flexibility that is prone to unwanted performance is also about the control concept.

THE STUDY: ORGANIZATIONAL RATIONALITY IN PUBLIC, PRIVATE AND MULTINATIONAL FIRMS IN TURKEY

Participants

The original sample of our study was composed of 274 professional and managerial people working in public (i.e., government, military, education), private, or multinational organizations in Turkey. Most of the respondents were MBA students taking courses in major universities of the country. Most of the organizations the respondents worked for had their operations in Istanbul, Ankara, and a few in Izmir, the commercial, governmental, and industrial centers of Turkey. Participants were reached through personal contact and they filled out the questionnaire outside working hours. Of the 274 participants receiving the questionnaire, 243 (89 percent) returned it. After eliminating questionnaires with incomplete data, 237 people (with a mean age of 27 years) who provided usable data constituted the final sample of the study. Of the 237, 142 were working in public sector, 41 in private sector, and 48 in multinational organizations. Six questionnaires contained no organization type (public, private, multinational) information.

Participants in the final sample were occupying positions in a wide range of areas including construction, banking, hardware/software production and/or sales, production of packaged goods (i.e., medicine and food), production of durable goods (i.e., automobile and home appliances), consultancy, higher education, insurance, entertainment, and defense. Eighty seven percent of the respondents had a Bachelors degree and 13 percent had a higher degree (i.e., Masters or Ph.D.), and 95 percent of the participants reported being able to speak at least one foreign language. Seventy five percent of people in the sample were holding non-managerial positions and the rest were holding middle, upper-middle, or top-level managerial positions. The average time spent for the participants in the organizations they currently work for was 4.5 years. Concerning the organizations in which the respondents of the study were working, 76 percent had more than 100 employees.

Measures

The Rationality Questionnaire was developed by the first author on the basis of available literature (e.g., Georgopoulos and Mann, 1962; Hage and Aiken, 1968 and 1969; Inkson, Pugh and Hickson, 1970). The questionnaire included 50 items assessing the four dimensions of formal rationality proposed by Ritzer (1995) within an organizational context (efficiency, calculability, predictability, and control). The respondents were asked to respond to statements concerning their organizations using a 6-point Likert type scale, 1 = definitely false, 2 = false, 3 = more false than true, 4 = more true than false, 5 = true, and 6 = definitely true (e.g., “People seem like they have learned how to live with the flawed operation in the organization that I work for”, “What is expected from personnel is explicitly stated, in the organization that I work for”, “Whether the tasks are undertaken in accordance with planned operation is continuously measured, in the organization that I work for”). A complete list of refined questionnaire items can be found in Appendix). In addition to the Rationality Questionnaire, respondents were also asked to provide personal and demographic information, as well as information about their organizations. Respondents are not asked the name of the organization they work for.
After all data is collected, a principal component analysis with varimax rotation was conducted to see whether the expected grouping of the questionnaire items would take place. As expected, the scree plot suggested existence of four factors. When number of factors was forced into four, majority of the items were clustered under the expected four factors (i.e., efficiency, predictability, calculability, and control), explaining 47 percent of total variance. There were seven cross loading items. Majority of the crossloading items were shared by efficiency and predictability dimensions (e.g., “Interdepartmental coordination is very well designed in the organization that I work for” and “People seem like they have learned how to live with the flawed operation in the organization that I work for”). Since the number of participants per item (i.e., 4.7) was not very favorable of obtaining a stable factor solution, the cross loading items were included under the predetermined dimension/factor, which usually happened to be the factor on which the item had a higher loading.

Seven items were deleted based on the alpha-if-item-deleted statistics. As a result, we used 12 items to assess efficiency orientation (e.g., “I think that tasks are not carried out well enough, in the organization that I work for”), 11 items to assess calculability orientation (e.g., “How satisfied the customers are with the presented product/service is consistently measured, in the organization that I work for”), 13 items to assess predictability orientation (e.g., “When the jobs will finish can be predicted with a high accuracy, in the organization that I work for”), and 7 items to assess control orientation (e.g., “It is easy to do inappropriate things without supervisors’ consent, in the organization that I work for”). The internal consistency reliability estimates of the four scales came out to be acceptable (0.91 for efficiency, 0.89 for calculability, 0.87 for predictability, and 0.72 for control). The average efficiency, calculability, predictability, and control scores were computed by totaling the scores on items under each dimension and dividing it by the number of items under that dimension. Means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations of the four formal rationality dimensions for the whole sample are presented in Table 1.

### Results

Based on 237 usable responses, it was found that only organizational type (whether an organization is of type public, private or multinational) had a significant effect on the four formal rationality dimensions. As expected multinational organizations were found to be more formal rational than Turkish public and private organizations. Turkish private organizations were found to be more formal rational than Turkish public organizations.

The overall effect of organizational type on the formal rationality dimensions are examined through a series of between-subject analysis of covariances (ANCOVAs) analysis. Before conducting the ANCOVAs, in order to identify the covariate(s), a regression approach was used. That is, all potential covariates (i.e., age of respondent, total job experience, education level, position/level, organizational size, sector…).
Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Organizational Type (Means)</th>
<th>$F(2,197)$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Public 3.06, Private 3.46, Multinat. 3.77</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculability</td>
<td>Public 2.72, Private 2.97, Multinat. 3.53</td>
<td>13.61</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictability</td>
<td>Public 2.62, Private 3.25, Multinat. 3.91</td>
<td>24.91</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Public 2.83, Private 3.26, Multinat. 3.62</td>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Means are adjusted for organizational position level of the person.

-service/production- and age of organization) were entered as a block to explain variance in each of the dependent variables employed (i.e., efficiency, calculability, predictability, and control). Only position was consistently found to be a significant predictor of the DVs (at $p < 0.05$) (respondents occupying higher positions in an organization scored their organization to be highly formal rational) and hence used as the covariate in the ANCOVAs. Means and the ANCOVA results are presented in Table 2. Results of the ANCOVAs reveal that there is a significant effect of organizational type on all four dependent variables with relatively high $\eta^2$ values.

Hypothesis 1. Multinational organizations in Turkey operate more rational than Turkish organizations.

In testing Hypothesis 1, planned contrast tests comparing public and private Turkish organizations to multinational organizations were conducted for all four dependent variables. The comparisons reveal the expected split between the Turkish and multinational organizations on efficiency, $t = 3.48, p < 0.001$; calculability, $t = 5.12, p < 0.001$; predictability, $t = 6.30, p < 0.001$; and control, $t = 3.85, p < 0.001$.

In all of the four dimensions multinational organizations scored higher than both Turkish private and public organizations. The largest difference between the Turkish organizations of both type and the multinational organizations was on predictability dimension followed by the difference on the calculability dimension.

Hypothesis 2. Private organizations in Turkey operate more rational than public organizations.

Similarly, in testing Hypothesis 2, for each of the four formal rationality dimensions planned contrast tests comparing private and public sector Turkish organizations with each other were conducted. Results provided support for the hypothesis. That is, private sector Turkish organizations were found to be having higher scores on efficiency, $t = 2.94, p < 0.01$; calculability, $t = 2.07, p < 0.05$; predictability, $t = 4.46, p < 0.001$; and control, $t = 3.11, p < 0.01$ than the public sector organizations in Turkey.

In all of the four dimensions Turkish private organizations scored higher than Turkish public organizations. The largest difference between Turkish private and public organizations is on predictability dimension followed by the difference on the control dimension. Turkish public organizations were found to severely lack both the formalism and the control mechanisms to ensure rational operation.

Figure 1 shows the comparisons of the average scores of the three types of organizations.

DISCUSSION

As expected, our study revealed significant differences between Turkish and multinational organizations, and relatively weaker differences between public and private Turkish organizations on the four dimensions of formal rationality. More specifically, results suggested that compared to both public and private Turkish organizations, multinational organizations operating in Turkey were characterized more by efficiency, calculability, predictability, and control. Also, although organizations operating in the
private sector failed to be as formal rational as their foreign counterparts, they ranked higher on all four
dimensions of formal rationality than Turkish public sector organizations.

The largest difference between the Turkish organizations of both type and the multinational organ-
izations was on predictability dimension followed by the difference on the calculability dimension. Predictability, which is about formalization and standardization of work processes, and calculability, which is about measurement and assessment of these processes, seem to nourish each other more than
they do the other two aspects of formal rationality. Relatively high correlation (.89) between the di-
mensions of predictability and calculability also lends some support for the idea that they are closely
associated constructs. The lower predictability and calculability scores of Turkish owned organizations
indicates that Turkish managers and leaders do not put enough emphasis on standardization and assess-
ment as much as their foreign counterparts do. Pointing to a potential improvement area, this finding
constitutes an important tip for Turkish leaders and managers, and foreign investors who want to work
with them.

Cross-cultural studies have suggested that Turkish culture is a collectivist one with a relatively high
power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and feminine values (Hofstede, 1980). When accompanied by a
relationship orientation, that overrides the achievement orientation, collectivism can have a great deal of
influence on the extent to which work and management practices are formal rational in a given context.
Especially effective assessment becomes problematic in such settings. Results of our study pointed to
this fact in public and private organizations. Still results also indicate that western-style rational work
and management practices can be made to work in Turkey. Multinational organizations seem to be quite
successful at this although they use Turkish managers and workers mostly. Understanding the social
balances in Turkish society, and modifying western management systems to suit the cultural needs might
promise more leeway in this direction.

When the findings of this study is generalized to other developing countries, the results support the idea
that there is an important facet of strategic organizational planning that relates to culture and leadership.
As Sage (1995) states, improving decision-making efficiency and effectiveness in organizations can only
be achieved if we understand human and organizational decision-making and allow this understanding
in the design of such organizations. For leaders and managers who intend to do business in new
settings, exploration of national attitudes towards work and management become crucial to design
capable organizations.

The present study has a number of limitations that need to be discussed. An important limitation is
the unequal number of participants representing the three types of organizations (142 in private, 41 in
public, and 48 multinational). Although the statistics employed (i.e., ANCOVAs and planned contrasts) are found to be robust to the violations of the assumptions underlying the analyses, results of the study need to be replicated. Another limitation concerns the Rationality Questionnaire employed. This study represents the first large-scale administration of the Rationality Questionnaire. Although reliabilities of the four formal rationality dimensions were satisfactory, both construct and criterion-related validity evidence for the questionnaire need to be established.
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**Appendix**

*Rationality Questionnaire Items*

The following table lists the Rationality Questionnaire items. During the survey respondents were asked to score each of the following items using a 6 point Likert-type scale (1 = definitely false, 2 = false, 3 = more false than true, 4 = more true than false, 5 = true, and 6 = definitely true). Unlike below, these items were presented to the respondents in a mixed fashion, without the names of the theoretical dimensions they intend to measure.

**Efficiency**

1. I think that the tasks are not carried out well enough, in the organization that I work for.
2. Task related inefficiencies are reduced to a minimum, in the organization that I work for.
3. Including labor, no type of resource is wasted, in the organization that I work for.
4. Tasks are handled harmoniously towards a common objective, in the organization that I work for.
5. Interdepartmental coordination is very well designed, in the organization that I work for.
6. When different people come together to work on a single task, things generally go wrong, in the organization that I work for.
7. While some are assigned little work, others are assigned workloads that they can not handle, in the organization that I work for.
8. Communication break-downs and erroneous communication are frequently experienced, in the organization that I work for.
9. Problems are generally ignored, in the organization that I work for.
10. Initiative to solve problems begin at the very instance that the problems are detected, in the organization that I work for.
11. There is a continuous struggle to serve increasingly better product/service, in the organization that I work for.
12. People seem like they have learned how to live with the flawed operation, in the organization that I work for.
Calculability
1. How satisfied the customers are with the presented product/service is consistently measured, in the organization that I work for.
2. Whether predetermined goals are reached or not is continuously measured, in the organization that I work for.
3. The extent to which processes run efficiently is continuously measured, in the organization that I work for.
4. How satisfied the personnel are with their jobs is continuously measured, in the organization that I work for.
5. How successful the superiors are in supervising the subordinates is continuously measured, in the organization that I work for.
6. The extent to which the personnel fulfill what is expected from them is continuously measured, in the organization that I work for.
7. Whether the tasks are undertaken in accordance with planned operation is continuously measured, in the organization that I work for.
8. Statistics about faults that occur during operation are consistently collected, in the organization that I work for.
9. Measurable quantitative organizational goals are not defined, in the organization that I work for.
10. Judgment and decision making is supported with numbers, in the organization that I work for.
11. Decision making is rather intuitive than scientific, in the organization that I work for.

Predictability
1. What high job performance means is documented, in the organization that I work for.
2. For every job, qualities that must be possessed by the performer of that job is documented, in the organization that I work for.
3. The way to perform a job is documented almost for all jobs, in the organization that I work for.
4. There is a manual of procedures, that is available to everyone, in the organization that I work for.
5. What is expected from personnel is explicitly stated, in the organization that I work for.
6. Who is responsible from which job is explicitly clear, in the organization that I work for.
7. When the jobs will finish can be predicted with a high accuracy, in the organization that I work for.
8. Unplanned delays and errors are not experienced frequently, in the organization that I work for.
9. Things that can not be forecasted beforehand do not occur frequently, in the organization that I work for.
10. For those who show high performance, the career paths are clearly defined, in the organization that I work for.
11. A great deal of time is lost because of the errors made, in the organization that I work for.
12. People in the same status benefit equally from present opportunities, in the organization that I work for.
13. Whom you know is more important than how successful you are, in the organization that I work for.
Control
1. It is easy to do inappropriate things without your supervisors’ consent, in the organization that I work for.
2. The ones who do not obey the rules are wedged with a very high probability, in the organization that I work for.
3. Personnel’s success in performing their tasks is not left to chance, in the organization that I work for.
4. People determine how to perform their jobs by themselves, in the organization that I work for.
5. Success depends on initiatives of persons who perform tasks, in the organization that I work for.
6. The way a task is handled is fixed regardless of who performs it, in the organization that I work for.
7. Operations depend more on established systems than on people, in the organization that I work for.
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