

The Resilience, Adaptation and Well-Being Project



Organizational Climate Scale

OCS

OCS:

Organizational Climate Scale

Overview

The Organizational Climate Scale (OCS) was developed by Anne Thompson and Hamilton McCubbin (1989). It was developed to assess the problem solving and communication patterns of individuals in the workplace that are sensitive to organizational change.

Development of OCS

An Organizational Climate Scale consisting of 30 items was developed based on a sample of 800 employees of a Midwest insurance company. Factor analysis revealed two problem solving and two communication dimensions. Organizational problem solving was characterized by a Challenge dimension, defined as the organization's emphasis on working together to solve problems, planning, and defining difficulties as challenges. The Control dimension also characterizes problem solving with the organization's emphasis on an internal locus of control, having a shared belief that problem solving is within the employees' and the organization's control and abilities and not shaped by outside factors over which the organization exercises little or no influence.

Two communication dimensions emerged from the factor analysis with Varimax rotations to maximize independence. The first, the Conflictual Communication dimension, assesses the degree to which the organization, in its efforts to manage conflict and change, emphasizes confrontation, embarrassment, becoming strained, and ultimately making matters more incendiary. In contrast, the Supportive Communication dimension, the second of the two communication dimensions, underscores the degree to which the organization emphasizes respect, sensitivity, affirmation, listening, and seeking of positive conclusions in its approach to managing change and tensions.

Conceptual Organization

The Control dimension includes items 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17 and 19. The Challenge dimension includes items 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, and 20. The Conflictual Communication dimension includes items 21, 23, 25, 27, and 29. The Supportive Communication dimension includes items 22, 24, 26, 28, and 30.

Reliability

The overall internal reliability (Cronbach's alpha) for the Challenge dimension is .82. The alpha reliability for the Control dimension is .83. The alpha reliability of the Conflictual Communication dimension is .87 and the alpha reliability of the Supportive Communication dimension is .89.

Validity

Validity for the OCS was established through correlations with the Work Environment subscales of Work Pressure and Supervisor Support (H.I. McCubbin, A.I., Thompson, Kretzschmar, Smith, Snow, McEwen, Elver, & M.A. McCubbin, 1992; Moos, 1974), based on the premise that workplace problem solving and communication issues would be affected by the amount of support received from the supervisor and would affect the amount of work pressure employees feel. For both men and women, and for the two groups combined, significant correlations were found for all of the OCS subscales with both of the Work Environment subscales (Table 28.1).

Test-Retest Reliability

The test-retest reliabilities of the Organizational Climate Scale were obtained by administering the measure at three different time points each roughly one year apart. Although a full year is a long interval

between tests, the coefficients remained high, ranging from .49 to .68 and all were significant at the $p \sim .05$ level (Table 28.2).

Additional Validity Checks

No additional validity information is available at this time.

Scoring Procedures

Subscale scores are obtained by summing the number circled by the respondent (i.e., 0 = False, 1 = Mostly False, 2 = True, and 3 = Mostly True) for the items in each subscale. The list below will help you determine which items belong to each subscale. Items that require reversal (i.e., False = 3, Mostly False = 2, Mostly True = 1, and True = 0) before summing are marked with an asterisk in the right hand column. For ten of the items, 1, 8, 4, 5, 7, 9, 15, 17, 19, and 29, the values should be reversed before summing (i.e., False = 3, Mostly False = 2, Mostly True = 1, and True = 0). This will ensure that all items are weighted in the same positive direction for both the analysis and the interpretation of the results.

Subscale 1: Challenge	2, 4*, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20
Subscale 2: Control	1*, 3*, 5*, 7*, 9*, 11, 13, 15*, 17*, 19*
Subscale 3: Conflictual Communication	21, 23, 25, 27, 29*
Subscale 4: Supportive Communication	22, 24, 26, 28, 30

Norms and/or Comparative Data

The comparative data for OCS is available for men and women separately as well as for the two groups combined. Percentiles with standardized scores, means and standard deviations are presented in Tables 28.3 through 28.20.

Instrument Utilization for Research

The OCS instrument is currently being tested within the Family Stress, Coping and Health Project and by other investigators. The few studies that have included this instrument have already been cited in the validity section of this chapter and are included in the references. Therefore, a summary table of related publications is not available at this time.

Notes

1. The availability of additional psychometrics and bibliographies of other users is limited at the date of publication due to the recent development of the instrument. Upon publication of this material, wider usage is expected, and as subsequent publications become available they will be added to our database. If you would like to inquire about more recent studies, please write to us at the Center for Excellence in Family Studies, Family Stress, Coping and Health Project, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1300 Linden Drive, Madison, WI 53706 or send email to manual@macc.wisc.edu. There will be a charge for these additional materials.
2. When referencing this instrument, the proper citation is: Thompson, A.I., & McCubbin, H.I. (1989). Organizational Climate Scale (OCS). In H.I. McCubbin, A.I. Thompson, & M.A. McCubbin (1996). *Family assessment: Resiliency, coping and adaptation-Inventories for research and practice*. (pp. 791-821). Madison: University of Wisconsin System

Table 28.1
Employees of a National Insurance Company Organizational Climate Scales Validity
(Correlation between Subscales and Work Environment Scales)

Scales	Overall Employees Work Pressure	Overall Employees Supervisor Support	Female Employees Work Pressure	Female Employees Supervisor Support	Male Employees Work Pressure	Male Employees Supervisor Support
Supportive Communication	-.15*	.45*	-.15*	.47*	-.12*	.41*
Conflictual Communication	.21*	-.47*	.23*	-.48*	.16*	-.47*
Overall Communication	-.20*	.50*	-.21*	.51*	-.15*	.49*
Control	-.28*	.59*	-.33*	.58*	-.14*	.62*
Challenge	-.19*	.51*	-.21*	.50*	-.14*	.53*
Overall Problem Solving	-.26*	.60*	-.29*	.59*	-.15*	.62*

Table 28.2
Employees of a National Insurance Company Organizational Climates Scales Test-Retest Reliabilities

Scales	Overall Employees Time 1 x Time 2 @ 1 year apart (N = 802)	Overall Employees Time 2 x Time 3 @ 1 year apart (N = 643)	Female Employees Time1 x Time 2 @ 1 year apart (N = 591)	Female Employees Time 2 x Time 3 @ 1 year apart (N = 451)	Male Employees Time 1 x Time 2 @ 1 year apart (N = 211)	Male Employees Time 2 x Time 3 @ 1 year apart (N = 192)
Supportive Communication	.50	.50	.49	.48	.54	.53
Conflictual Communication	.53	.55	.54	.53	.49	.59
Overall Communication	.55	.57	.55	.55	.55	.61

Scales	Overall Employees Time 1 x Time 2 @ 1 year apart (N = 785)	Overall Employees Time 2 x Time 3 @ 1 year apart (N = 638)	Female Employees Time1 x Time 2 @ 1 year apart (N = 574)	Female Employees Time 2 x Time 3 @ 1 year apart (N = 444)	Male Employees Time 1 x Time 2 @ 1 year apart (N = 210)	Male Employees Time 2 x Time 3 @ 1 year apart (N = 193)
Control	.56	.57	.55	.57	.61	.56
Challenge	.59	.59	.57	.57	.64	.64
Overall Problem Solving	.62	.63	.60	.62	.68	.66

Table 28.3
Employees of a National Insurance Company Organizational Communication Overall Employees
(N=1388)

Raw Scores	Standard Scores	Cumulative Percentiles
0-4	-3.7	.1
5	-3.5	.4
6	-3.3	.6
7	-3.1	.9
8	-2.8	1.1
9	-2.6	1.6
10	-2.4	2.2
11	-2.2	3.5
12	-2.0	5.2
13	-1.7	6.3
14	-1.5	8.1
15	-1.3	10.2
16	-1.1	12.8
17	-0.9	17.8
18	-0.6	25.7
19	-0.4	35.2
20	-0.2	48.8
21	0.0	58.6
22	+0.3	66.3
23	+0.5	72.2
24	+0.7	78.5
25	+0.9	83.3
26	+1.1	88.5
27	+1.4	92.7
28	+1.6	95.7
29	+1.8	98.2
30	+2.0	100.0

Mean = 20.856

SD = 4.529

Range = 26

Kurtosis = .571

Skewness = -.408

Mode = 20.0

Table 28.4
Employees of a National Insurance Company Supportive Communication Overall Employees
(N=1391)

Raw Scores	Standard Scores	Cumulative Percentiles
0	-4.4	.1
1	-4.0	.2
2	-3.6	.5
3	-3.1	.9
4	-2.7	1.7
5	-2.3	3.5
6	-1.9	6.2
7	-1.4	9.1
8	-1.0	14.0
9	-0.6	28.3
10	-0.2	57.6
11	+0.2	70.4
12	+0.7	81.1
13	+1.1	88.9
14	+1.5	95.3
15	+1.9	100.0

Mean = 10.423

SD = 2.370

Range = 15

Kurtosis = 1.036

Skewness = -.428

Mode = 10.00

Table 28.5
Employees of a National Insurance Company Conflictual Communication Overall Employees
(N=1398)

Raw Scores	Standard Scores	Cumulative Percentiles
0	-1.8	5.6
1	-1.4	12.5
2	-1.0	21.1
3	-0.6	33.8
4	-0.2	48.4
5	+0.2	67.2
6	+0.6	79.9
7	+1.0	88.2
8	+1.3	92.8
9	+1.7	96.3
10	+2.1	98.3
11	+2.5	99.2
12	+2.9	99.8
13	+3.3	99.9
14	+3.7	99.9
15	+4.1	100.0

Mean = 4.572

SD = 2.544

Range = 15

Kurtosis = .154

Skewness = .354

Mode = 5.00

Table 28.6
Employees of a National Insurance Company Organizational Communication Female Employees
(N=931)

Raw Scores	Standard Scores	Cumulative Percentiles
0-4	-3.6	.1
5	-3.4	.4
6-7	-2.9	1.0
8	-2.7	1.2
9	-2.6	1.7
10	-2.3	2.4
11	-2.1	4.1
12	-1.9	6.1
13	-1.6	7.3
14	-1.4	9.3
16	-1.2	11.7
16	-1.0	14.8
17	-0.8	20.0
18	-0.6	28.0
19	-0.4	36.9
20	-0.1	60.3
21	-0.1	60.4
22	+0.3	68.4
23	+0.5	73.5
24	+0.7	78.7
25	+0.9	83.6
26	+1.1	88.3
27	+1.4	92.5
28	+1.6	95.4
29	+1.8	97.9
30	+2.0	100.0

Mean = 20.657

SD = 4.667

Range = 26

Kurtosis = .386

Skewness = -.351

Mode = 20.0

Table 28.7
Employees of a National Insurance Company Supportive Communication Female
Employees (N=934)

Raw Scores	Standard Scores	Cumulative Percentiles
0-1	-3.9	.2
2	-3.5	.4
3	-3.0	1.0
4	-2.6	1.9
5	-2.2	3.7
6	-1.8	6.7
7	-1.4	9.9
8	-1.0	15.2
9	-0.6	29.3
10	-0.2	58.4
11	+0.3	70.6
12	+0.7	80.8
13	+1.1	88.1
14	+1.5	94.6
15	+1.9	100.0

Mean = 10.391

SD = 2.432

Range = 14

Kurtosis = .779

Skewness = -.375

Mode = 10.00

Table 28.8
Employees of a National Insurance Company Conflictual Communication Female Employees
(N=939)

Raw Scores	Standard Scores	Cumulative Percentiles
0	-1.8	5.5
1	-1.4	11.8
2	-1.1	19.3
3	-0.7	30.8
4	-0.3	46.2
5	+0.1	65.4
6	+0.5	78.0
7	+0.9	85.7
8	+1.3	91.4
9	+1.6	95.6
10	+2.0	98.0
11	+2.4	99.0
12	+2.8	99.8
13	+3.2	99.9
14-15	+3.6	100.0

Mean = 4.736

SD = 2.594

Range = 14

Kurtosis = .022

Skewness = .311

Mode = 5.00

Table 28.9
Employees of a National Insurance Company Organizational Communication Male Employees
(N=380)

Raw Scores	Standard Scores	Cumulative Percentiles
0-5	-3.9	.3
6	-3.6	.8
7-9	-2.9	1.3
10	-2.7	1.6
11	-2.5	2.1
12	-2.2	3.2
13	-2.0	3.9
14	-1.7	5.8
15	-1.5	6.8
16	-1.3	8.7
17	-1.0	13.7
18	-0.8	21.1
19	-0.5	31.8
20	-0.3	45.8
21	-0.1	53.9
22	+0.2	61.6
23	+0.4	70.0
24	+0.7	78.2
25	+0.9	83.2
26	+1.1	89.2
27	+1.4	93.2
28	+1.6	96.8
29	+1.8	98.7
30	+2.1	100.0

Mean = 21.268

SD = 4.183

Range = 25

Kurtosis = 1.038

Skewness = -.487

Mode = 20.0

Table 28.10
Employees of a National Insurance Company Supportive Communication Male Employees
(N=380)

Raw Scores	Standard Scores	Cumulative Percentiles
0-2	-3.8	.5
3-4	-2.9	1.3
5	-2.5	3.2
6	-2.0	5.0
7	-1.6	7.9
8	-1.1	12.1
9	-0.7	26.3
10	-0.2	56.1
11	+0.2	69.5
12	+0.7	81.1
13	+1.1	91.3
14	+1.6	96.3
15	+2.0	100.0

Mean = 10.489

SD = 2.228

Range = 13

Kurtosis = 1.100

Skewness = -.446

Mode = 10.00

Table 28.11
Employees of a National Insurance Company Conflictual Communication Male Employees
(N=381)

Raw Scores	Standard Scores	Cumulative Percentiles
0	-1.8	5.2
1	-1.4	13.4
2	-0.9	24.4
3	-0.5	10.2
4	-0.1	53.5
5	+0.3	71.4
6	+0.7	84.3
7	+1.2	94.0
8	+1.6	95.8
9	+2.0	97.6
10	+2.4	99.0
11	+2.8	99.5
12	+3.3	99.7
13-15	+4.5	100.0

Mean = 4.226
SD = 2.381
Range = 15
Kurtosis = .765
Skewness = .473
Mode = 5.00

Table 28.12
Employees of a National Insurance Company Organizational Problem Solving Overall Employees
(N=1346)

Raw Scores	Standard Scores	Cumulative Percentiles
0-7	-4.6	.1
8-10	-4.1	.1
11-14	-3.6	.2
15	-3.5	.3
16-19	-2.9	.6
20	-2.8	.7
21	-2.6	1.0
22	-2.5	1.3
23	-2.4	1.7
24	-2.2	2.1
25	-2.1	2.7
26	-1.9	3.5
27	-1.8	4.9
28	-1.7	5.8
29	-1.5	7.8
30	-1.4	9.0
31	-1.3	11.2
32	-1.1	13.3
33	-1.0	16.4
34	-0.8	20.0
35	-0.7	24.1
36	-0.6	28.3
37	-0.4	34.2
38	-0.3	40.0
39	-0.2	45.9

Table 28.12 (continued)
Employees of a National Insurance Company Organizational Problem Solving Overall Employees
(N=1346)

Raw Scores	Standard Scores	Cumulative Percentiles
40	0.0	51.0
41	+0.1	56.7
42	+0.3	62.6
43	+0.4	67.3
44	+0.5	72.6
45	+0.7	77.2
46	+0.8	80.6
47	+0.9	85.1
48	+1.1	87.9
49	+1.2	90.7
50	+1.4	92.4
51	+1.5	94.1
52	+1.6	96.1
53	+1.8	97.4
54	+1.9	98.1
55	+2.0	98.7
56	+2.2	99.2
57	+2.3	99.6
58	+2.5	99.6
59-60	+2.6	100.0

Mean = 40.166

SD = 7.270

Range = 53

Kurtosis = .513

Skewness = -.289

Mode = 39.0

Table 28.13
Employees of a National Insurance Company Control Overall Employees
(N=1363)

Raw Scores	Standard Scores	Cumulative Percentiles
0-4	-3.8	.1
5-6	-3.3	.4
7	-3.1	.7
8	-2.8	1.0
9	-2.6	1.7
10	-2.3	2.4
11	-2.1	3.2
12	-1.8	5.1
13	-1.6	7.8
14	-1.3	11.7
15	-1.0	16.1
16	-.8	23.1
17	-0.5	31.3
18	-0.3	42.4
19	0.0	53.3
20	+0.2	63.1
21	+0.5	73.6
22	+0.7	81.1
23	+1.0	87.5
24	+1.2	91.9
25	+1.5	95.6
26	+1.7	97.5
27	+2.0	98.5
28	+2.3	99.6
29	+2.5	99.8
30	+2.8	100.0

Mean = 19.115

SD = 3.941

Range = 26

Kurtosis = .488

Skewness = -.308

Mode = 18.0

Table 28.14
Employees of a National Insurance Company Challenge Overall Employees
(N=1378)

Raw Scores	Standard Scores	Cumulative Percentiles
0-3	-4.5	.1
4-5	-4.0	.3
6	-3.8	.4
7-9	-3.0	.5
10	-2.8	.7
11	-2.5	.8
12	-2.3	1.6
13	-2.0	3.3
14	-1.8	5.3
15	-1.5	8.3
16	-1.3	11.8
17	-1.0	17.3
18	-0.8	24.1
19	-0.5	33.1
20	-0.3	44.0
21	0.0	54.9
22	+0.2	65.2
23	+0.5	74.0
24	+0.7	81.2
25	+1.0	87.1
26	+1.3	91.1
27	+1.5	94.6
28	+1.8	97.2
29	+2.0	98.6
30	+2.3	100.0

Mean = 21.033

SD = 3.972

Range = 27

Kurtosis = .658

Skewness = -.282

Mode = 20.0

Table 28.15
Employees of a National Insurance Company Organizational Problem Solving Female Employees
(N=899)

Raw Scores	Standard Scores	Cumulative Percentiles
0-7	-4.5	.1
8-10	-4.1	.2
11-14	-3.5	.3
15-19	-2.8	.4
20	-2.7	.7
21	-2.6	1.1
22	-2.4	1.4
23	-2.3	1.7
24	-2.1	2.2
25	-2.0	2.9
26	-1.9	3.8
27	-1.7	5.1
28	-1.6	6.5
29	-1.5	8.8
30	-1.3	9.9
31	-1.2	12.7
32	-1.1	14.6
33	-0.9	18.0
34	-0.8	21.9
35	-0.6	26.3
36	-0.5	30.7
37	-0.4	37.0
38	-0.2	43.5
39	-0.1	49.4

Table 28.15 (Continued)
Employees of a National Insurance Company Organizational Problem Solving Female Employees
(N=899)

Raw Scores	Standard Scores	Cumulative Percentiles
40	0.0	54.7
41	+0.2	60.3
42	+0.3	65.2
43	+0.5	69.7
44	+0.6	75.1
45	+0.7	79.5
46	+0.9	82.4
47	+1.0	87.2
48	+1.1	89.5
49	+1.3	91.7
50	+1.4	93.4
51	+1.6	94.7
52	+1.7	96.2
53	+1.8	97.4
54	+2.0	98.1
55	+2.1	98.7
56	+2.2	99.1
57	+2.4	99.4
58	+2.5	99.6
59	+2.7	99.8
60	+2.8	100.0

Mean = 39.667
SD = 7.291
Range = 53
Kurtosis = .624
Skewness = -.235
Mode = 38.0

Table 28.16
Employees of a National Insurance Company Control Female Employees
(N=912)

Raw Scores	Standard Scores	Cumulative Percentiles
0-4	-8.7	.2
5-6	-8.2	.5
7	-2.9	1.0
8	-2.7	1.8
9	-2.4	2.2
10	-2.2	2.9
11	-1.9	3.9
12	-1.7	6.0
18	-1.4	8.9
14	-1.2	13.6
15	-0.9	18.1
16	-0.7	25.8
17	-0.4	35.6
18	-0.2	47.6
19	+0.1	57.8
20	+0.3	67.0
21	+0.6	76.6
22	+0.8	82.9
23	+1.1	88.6
24	+1.3	93.5
25	+1.6	96.5
26	+1.8	97.9
27	+2.1	98.8
28	+2.8	99.5
29	+2.6	99.7
30	+2.8	100.0

Mean = 18.734

SD = 3.994

Range = 26

Kurtosis = .567

Skewness = -.292

Mode = 18.0

Table 28.17
Employees of a National Insurance Company Challenge Female Employees
(N=924)

Raw Scores	Standard Scores	Cumulative Percentiles
0-3	-4.5	.1
4-5	-4.0	.2
6	-3.8	.3
7-10	-2.8	.5
11	-2.5	.8
12	-2.2	1.3
13	-2.0	3.2
14	-1.7	5.5
15	-1.5	8.7
16	-1.2	12.3
17	-1.0	18.6
18	·0.7	25.6
19	-0.5	34.6
20	-0.2	45.8
21	0.0	57.0
22	+0.3	66.7
23	+0.5	76.0
24	+0.8	82.4
25	+1.0	87.4
26	+1.3	91.1
27	+1.5	94.6
28	+1.8	97.2
29	+2.0	98.5
30	+2.3	100.0

Mean = 20.904

SD = 3.958

Range = 27.00

Kurtosis = .468

Skewness = -.166

Mode = 21:0

Table 28.18 (Continued)
Employees of a National Insurance Company Organizational Problem Solving Male Employees
(N=371)

Raw Scores	Standard Scores	Cumulative Percentiles
0-19	-3.2	.5
20-23	-2.6	1.3
24-25	-2.4	2.2
26	-2.2	2.4
27	-2.1	4.3
28-29	-1.8	5.4
30	-1.6	7.0
31	-1.5	8.4
32	-1.3	10.5
33	-1.2	13.2
34	-1.1	15.9
35	-0.9	19.1
36	-0.8	22.6
37	-0.6	27.5
38	-0.5	32.3
39	-0.3	38.8
40	-0.2	42.9
41	0.0	48.5
42	+0.1	56.3
43	+0.3	61.2
44	+0.4	66.8
45	+0.5	72.0
46	+0.7	76.5
47	+0.8	81.1
48	+1.0	84.9
49	+1.1	89.5
50	+1.3	91.1
51	+1.4	93.8
52	+1.6	96.5
53	+1.7	97.8
54	+1.9	98.7
55	+2.0	99.5
56	+2.1	99.7
57-60	+2.3	100.0

Mean = 41.243

SD = 6.893

Range = 38

Kurtosis = .087

Skewness = -.389

Mode = 42.0

Table 28.19
Employees of a National Insurance Company Control Male Employees
(N=374)

Raw Scores	Standard Scores	Cumulative Percentiles
0-7	-3.5	.3
8-9	-3.0	.8
10	-2.7	1.3
11	-2.4	1.6
12	-2.2	2.9
13	-1.9	5.3
14	-1.6	7.5
15	-1.3	11.5
16	-1.1	17.1
17	-0.8	21.9
18	-0.5	31.0
19	-0.2	44.1
20	0.0	54.8
21	+0.3	67.1
22	+0.6	76.7
23	+0.8	85.6
24	+1.1	89.3
25	+1.4	94.7
26	+1.7	97.1
27	+1.9	98.4
28-30	+2.2	100.0

Mean = 19.906

SD = 3.646

Range = 21

Kurtosis = .346

Skewness = -.347

Mode = 19.0

Table 28.20
Employees of a National Insurance Company Challenge Male Employees
(N-378)

Raw Scores	Standard Scores	Cumulative Percentiles
0-5	-4.3	.3
6-9	-3.2	.5
10-12	-2.4	1.6
13	-2.2	3.2
14	-1.9	4.5
15	-1.7	7.7
16	-1.4	10.6
17	-1.1	14.6
18	-0.9	20.6
19	-0.6	29.4
20	-0.4	39.4
21	-0.1	49.2
22	+0.2	61.1
23	+0.4	69.6
24	+0.7	79.1
25	+0.9	86.8
26	+1.2	92.1
27	+1.5	95.2
28	+1.7	97.9
29	+2.0	99.2
30	+2.2	100.0

Mean = 21.357

SD = 3.845

Range = 25

Kurtosis = .544

Skewness = -.421

Mode = 22.0

OCS

ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE SCALES ©

English Version



OCS
ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE SCALES®
 Anne I. Thompson Hamilton I. McCubbin

Directions

Please read each statement below and decide to what degree each describes your workplace.

	False	Mostly False	Mostly True	True
1. Trouble we experience is caused by the decisions we make	0	1	2	3
2. People make an extra effort to understand the organization's purpose and goals	0	1	2	3
3. It is not wise to plan ahead and hope because things don't turn out anyway	0	1	2	3
4. My work seems dull and meaningless	0	1	2	3
5. Most of the unhappy things that happen to us are due to things beyond our control	0	1	2	3
6. We believe that things will work out for the better if we work together	0	1	2	3
7. Our work and efforts are not appreciated no matter how hard we try and work	0	1	2	3
8. When our organization tries to solve problems we try new and exciting ways	0	1	2	3
9. Our work situation is determined by factors over which we have little influence	0	1	2	3
10. We work together to solve problems	0	1	2	3
11. In the long run, the bad things that happen to us are balanced by the good things that happen	0	1	2	3
12. We encourage each other to try new things and experiences	0	1	2	3
13. Success is determined by the decisions we make	0	1	2	3
14. We trust that policies and changes are really in everyone's best interest	0	1	2	3
15. It is better to keep things the same rather than to make changes	0	1	2	3
16. We have a sense of being strong even when we face big problems	0	1	2	3
17. Top management makes all the decisions, we just react	0	1	2	3

	False	Mostly False	Mostly True	True
18. We are dedicated to do the best job possible	0	1	2	3
19. We will experience a major disruption if we have another problem or change	0	1	2	3
20. New challenges improve morale	0	1	2	3
<i>When we struggle with problems or conflicts in our workplace, I would describe the way we work in the following way:</i>				
21. We confront and embarrass each other in meetings	0	1	2	3
22. We are respectful of each others' feelings	0	1	2	3
23. We are not open and honest with each other	0	1	2	3
24. We work hard to be sure colleagues/co-workers are not offended or hurt emotionally	0	1	2	3
25. We walk away from disagreements and heated discussions feeling frustrated	0	1	2	3
26. We affirm each others opinions and viewpoints, even when we may disagree	0	1	2	3
27. We make matters more difficult by getting emotionally upset and stirring up old problems	0	1	2	3
28. We take the time to hear what each other has to say or feel	0	1	2	3
29. We work to be calm and talk things through	0	1	2	3
30. We get upset, but we try to end our differences on a positive note	0	1	2	3