Toward a Classification of Job-related Behaviors in Organizations*

*Jay S. Kim***

I. Introduction

In 1958, March and Simon stated that organization members, as instru-
mental, attitudinal, and rational decision makers, confront two decisions of
critical importance: the decision to participate and the decision to produce.
Since that time, researchers in organizational behavior have concentrated their
effort on identifying the nature of the relationships between a variety of
organizational variables and absenteeism, turnover, and behavioral performance
of organizational members. Recently a number of organizational scientists have
suggested that researchers in organizational behavior have unduly restricted
the range of inquiry to a narrow set of job-related behaviors and outcomes
and, thereby, have committed an error of omission. Staw and Oldham (1978)
have called for "the refocusing of research away from the search for additional
determinants of individual performance, turnover and absenteeism, as now
practiced in organizational research" (p. 539). Additionally, Campbell and
Pritchard (1976) suggested the need to create a refined taxonomic foundation
for the analysis of job-related behaviors and outcomes.

Prior to the identification of relationships and the offering of subsequent

---

generalizations, the parameters and properties of dependent variables should be specified. The aim of this paper is to offer a conceptual framework from which a general classification of job-related behaviors is derived. An organizing logic of ends, means, and means-ends relations has been systematically applied to construct both the framework of classification and the classification itself. The use of this logic is grounded in the basic assumption that individuals in organizations and organizations themselves are best viewed as purposeful actors or systems in social setting (Ackoff and Emery, 1972). As purposeful actor, it is assumed, (1) individual has ends, (2) his/her behavior often involves the selection of means to the attainment of ends, (3) the pursuits of ends and the selection of means always occur within situations which influence the course of behavior, (4) the individual always makes certain assumptions concerning the nature of his/her ends and the possibility of their attainment, (5) indiviual behavior is influenced not only by the situation but by individual's knowledge of it, (6) individual has certain sentiment or affective dispositions which affect both his/her perception of situations and choice of ends, and (7) individual has certain norms and values which govern his/her selection of ends and ordering of them in some scheme of priorities (Cohen, 1968). Thus, individuals have capacity not only to select the means, means-ends relations, but to create and modify ends, means, means-ends relations in similar or different environmental settings (March and Simon, 1958).

The proposed classification orders job-related behaviors in terms of their compatibility with prescribed organizational ends as goals. Thus, a refined and elaborated perspective on organizational goal has been used as a basis for constructing this classification of job-related behaviors. Furthermore, this conceptual framework integrates the organizational goal perspective with recent theoretical and empirical research which elaborates the environmentally contingent, adaptive nature of individual and organizational behavior. The primary dimensions of these contingent factors are accommodated in this framework and syste-

matically related to this classification of job-related behaviors. Organizational mechanisms to manage the process of creation, selection, execution, evaluation, maintenance, and adaptation of ends, means, meands-ends relations are defined as "control". This concept of organizational control provides the organizing platform from which the proposed classification of job-related behaviors is derived.

II. Control as an Organizing Framework

All organizations are designed to generate output(s) valued by society but none is self-sufficient for this endeavor (Thomson, 1967). Even seemingly self-contained organizations require some transactions with their environment for survival. Problems arise because organizations are dependent for crucial resources on elements of environment which are not always dependable (Pfeffer and Salancik, 1978). The level of complexity and uncertainty faced by organizations in this environmental transaction, is primarily a function of the degree of environmental stability and diversity, which in turn, is a function of requisite numbers, quality differences, and the relations among the elements of external environment.

Faced with the uncertain demands posed by environmental complexity, organizations develop a repertoire of strategies for adaptation, interaction, and control. The resultant choice of strategy for interacting with environment poses constraints and contingencies for organization's ends, means, and means-ends relations (Thompson and McEwen, 1958). Given the demands of these conditioned ends, means, and means-ends relations, managerial action is essentially one of control.

Within this theoretical framework, control in organizations refers to the process of deciding and managing regarding ends, means, and means-ends relations. This process is distributed along locus of power (i.e., who gets power) and types of control act. The types of control act include:

1. act of initiation

2. act of making choice regarding process of problem solving

3. act of decision making

4. act of implementation

5. act of evaluation

6. act of resource allocation

The mixture of locus of power and type of control act generates a complex set of "control matrix," which defines "who gets power to do what control act." Organization maintains control function by developing control mechanisms. They include structure, leader behavior, and task.

A. Structure

According to this conceptualization, structure is the resultant state defining ends, means, and means-ends relations. The relatively stable control demands regarding "who gets power to do what control act" are typically imbedded into structure. The resultant state reflecting the composite numbers, the diversity of ends, means, and means-ends relations has been referred to complexity (i.e., functional departmentalization). Similarly, centralization as a dimension of structure refers to the composite, resultant state of locus of power which is defined by control act along the organizational hierarchy. Formalization refers to the resultant level of specification and codification in defining ends, means, and means-ends relations. As Kerr and Jermier (1978) pointed out, if organization faces unstable control demand which may not be effectively handled by stable structure, structure may no longer function as a substitute for leadership.

B. Leader Behavior

The critical function of leader is to make a choice on actors and types of control act for given set of activities which are not easily self-directed by structure. If leader engages in control behavior on activities which can be essentially self-directed, the subordinates may be dissatisfied (House, 1971). Leader also engages in behaviors which evoke feeling and affect, maintains interpersonal and transactional relations, and creates climate of warmth for the

members of organization. This conceptualization of eader behavior is similar
to "initiating structure" and "consideration" suggested by the leadership studies
at the Ohio State University and is in line with the assumptions of human
action explicated by Cohen (1968).

C. Task

Task, a set of activities for producing organizational outputs, can also be
defined in terms of ends, means, means-ends relations. The task in which
organization's preplanning capabilities are high on ends, means, and means-ends
relations is called routine task. Conversely, the task in which organization's
preplanning capabilities are low on ends, means, and means-ends relations is
called non-routine task. Organization's preplanning capabilities are primarily
influenced by a combined effect of repetitiveness (a quantitative attribute) and
analyzability (a qualitative attribute) (Perrow, 1970).

Resources are the means which specify the level and amount of real and/or
potential capability such as equipment, machine, raw material, energy, etc., to
meet task demands. Technology is a mean reflecting the choice of resources
and "how to" of resources in the means-ends transformation. When task is
routine, technology can be embedded into resources. Thus, technology and
resources tend to covary (i.e., robotics). When task is non-routine, on the
other hand, technology tends to be independent of resources. The task demands
mediated by technology and resources for accomplishing organizational ends
define the nature of job demands faced by organizational members.

III. Job Demands and a Classification of Job-related Behavior

Job is a composite of task demands including a set of role expectations
coming from all relevant parts of organization as specified by control matrix.
The nature of job demands is routinized or discretionary. The job demands
in which instrumental behaviors for meeting the demands are highly developed
(i.e., a tightly coupled means and ends) refer to routinized job demands.

These job demands require routinized behavior responses of the job incumbent
for achieving efficiency and instrumental rationality. The job demands in which
instrumental knowledge for meeting the demands are not fully developed (i.e.,
loosely coupled means and ends) refer to discretionary job demands. These job
demands require the job incumbent's exercise of discretion for making inten-
tional choice of behavior appropriate for meeting job demands (Thompson,
1967). Thus, discretionary job demands are those aspects of a job about which
job incumbent must exercise judgements regarding "when", "how" and "what"
need to be done.

Individual's intentional choice of instrumental behavior in dealing with a
given job demands is the underlying basis for developing a classification of job-
related behavior in organization. Thus, the job-related behaviors in organization
can fall into the following four categories:

1. Routinized responses for routinized job demands

2. Discretionary responses for discretionary job demands

3. Routinized responses for discretionary job demands

4. Discretionary responses for routinized job demands

In addition, since each of these types can be either end-compatible or end-
incompatible from the job demand perspective, the job-related behavior in orga-
nization is classified into eight different types as shown in Figure 1.

Type I reflects both the presence of predictable job demands and individual's

Job Demand—Behavior Response Interaction	Goal-Compatibility	
	Compatible	Incompatible
I . Matched:		
A. Routinized Job Demand—Routinized Behavior Response	TYPE I	TYPE V
B. Discretionary Job Demand— Discretionary Behavior Responses	TYPE II	TYPE VI
II . Mismatched:		
A. Routinized Job Demand—Discretionary Behavior Response	TYPE III	TYPE VII
B. Discretionary Job Demand—Routinized Behavior Response	TYPE IV	TYPE VIII

〈Fig 1〉 **A Classification of Job-related Behaviors**

appropriate choice of behavior as prescribed in the job demands. This is an organizational job situation in which reliable and dependable behavior, such as reliable attendance, consistency in meeting quality and quantity standards, etc., are valued and rewarded. Type II reflects the job situation in which organization's reliance on the job incumbent's exercise of discretion is appropriately responded by the job incumbent for the positive results. On the other hand, Type V and Type VI may indicate that the prescribed behavior responses are not appropriate for meeting job demands as anticipated. This unanticipated consequences may stem from the occurrence of change(s) in task and job demands which have not been properly monitored and/or communicated to the job incumbent in terms of behavioral responses, or the job incumbents engage in "ritualistic" behaviors to meet "letter", but not "spirit", of job demands. For routinized job demands, instrumental actions become the major targets for control. On the other hand, for discretionary job demands, output becomes major target for control (Ouchi & McGuire, 1975).

Type III through VIII reflects the situations in which job demands are not matched with behavior responses. This mismatch can come about due to either the presence of inappropriate job demands(similar to Type V and VI) or individual's inappropriate choice of behavior response. However, in the cases of Type III and Type IV, individuals engage in adaptive, spontaneous, and/or innovative behaviors which are effective (Type III) and efficient (Type IV) for goal accomplishment. On the other hand, Type VII and Type VIII reflect the job incumbent's unwarranted deviations from the prescribed behavioral responses which are dysfunctional or even illegitimate. These two types are similar to, what Thompson (1967) called, "deviant discretion" and "evasion of discretion".

IV. Unresolved Issues

Given the above classification of work-related behavior, a number of issues are remained to be addressed in the future.

1. What are the factors which govern the individual's choice among alternative behavioral responses, given the job demands ?

2. How should the work-related behavior be defined and identified ?

3. What should be the procedure by which these work-related behaviors be evaluated ?

4. What are the patterns of behavior which are designed to modify the job demands and the behavioral responses ?

5. How should these behaviors be rewarded at individual, group, and organizational level ?

6. What would be the patterns of conflict which emerges from evaluating and rewarding/punishing the job-related behaviors ?

7. What would the role of individual's knowledge of job situation, affective dispositions, norms, and value in the choice of job-related behaviors ?

8. What would be the impact of changes in structure, technology, and task on the evaluation and the rewarding of job-related behaviors ?

The answers to the above questions will provide the partial understanding on the nature of dynamic processes for managing the job-related behaviors in organization.

〈國 文 要 約〉

1958년 마아치(March)와 사이몬(Simon)이 연구를 시작한 이래로 여러가지 組織變數들과 缺勤, 離職, 成果 등의 變數들과의 關係에 대해서 많은 연구가 이루어져 왔다. 그러나 이들 연구는 그 범위가 制限되어서 不適當하게 누락된 變數들이 많으며 方法論도 엉성하다는 批判을 받고 있다. 따라서 보다 정교한 理論的 基礎가 요구되고 있으며, 이 論文의 目的도 이러한 職務關係行爲의 分類를 위한 體系를 제시하는 데 있다. 이 分類體系는 조직의 목표에 대한 올바른 理解를 기초로 하고 있으며, 동시에 조직의 諸過程을 調整하는 組織메카니즘으로서의 '統制(control)'라는 개념을 그 始發點으로 하고 있다.

모든 조직은 環境과 교류하며 이에 依存하고 있다. 따라서 組織이 직면하는 문제들의 複雜性과 不確實性의 정도는 一次的으로 環境의 安定性과 多樣性의 함수라 볼 수 있다. 조직은 환경에 對應하여 이를 통제하려는 목적에서 戰略(strategy)을 수립하게 되는데 이것은 조직의 目標, 手段 및 兩者의 관계에 영향을 미치게 된다. 이러한 戰略의 核心은 '統制'이며 이는 결국 조직의 목표, 수단 및 兩者의 관계를 決定하고 管理하는 過程이라 볼 수 있다.

統制過程은 權力의 位置(locus of power)와 統制의 形態(type of control)에 입각하여 統制매트릭스(control matrix)로 分類할 수 있으며 이는 다음과 같다.

① 率先行爲

② 問題解決過程에 관한 選擇行爲

③ 意思決定行爲

④ 適用行爲

⑤ 評價行爲

⑥ 資源配分行爲

이상의 統制機能은 組織化의 基本原理라 할 수 있으며, 구체적으로는 組織構造, 리이더의 行爲 및 課業이라는 3者에 의해 구현되고 있다.

職務는 組織內의 관련된 部門에서 생기는 役割期待를 포함한 課業要求의 複合體이다. 이 職務要求는 성격상 定型的인 業務와 自由裁量的 業務로 구별할 수 있으며, 이는 다시 주어진 직무에 대하여 個人이 선택하는 手段的인 行爲(反應)에 의하여 다음과 같이 4개의 범주로 나뉜다.

① 定型的인 業務에 대한 定型的인 反應

② 自由裁量的인 業務에 대한 自由裁量的인 反應

③ 自由裁量的인 業務에 대한 定型的인 反應

④ 定型的인 業務에 대한 自由裁量的인 反應

여기서 각각의 경우에 대하여 다시 目的適合한 경우와 그렇지 못한 경우를 組合하여 職務關聯行爲를 8가지 類型으로 분류할 수 있다. 이때 定型的인 職務要求에 대해서는 手段的인 個人의 行動이, 自由裁量的인 職務要求에 대해서는 行動의 結果가 統制의 주요대상이 된다.

이제까지의 논의는 組織內의 職務關聯行爲를 체계적으로 분류하여 組織變數와 기타 成果變數間의 관련성을 연구하는 데 기여하고자 시도되었으나, 아직은 많은 改善의 여지를 남기고 있는 형편이다.