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CHAPTER 2

BASIC CONCEPTS

This chapter reviews major theoretical approaches to the nature of organizational climate, job satisfaction, and organizational role stress through the various studies undertaken by scholars relating to the problem of differential effects of these very important variables on executives.

There is considerable diversity of approach among researchers regarding the concept, dimensions, and measurement of organizational climate. Though there have been many studies over the last three decades, they have raised as many questions as they have answered; also the phenomenon of organizational climate invokes several other concepts within the large field of organizational studies and indeed appears to have intimate links with them in a comprehensive and systematic manner. It is inconceivable, for instance, for any definition of climate to be divorced from such other established concepts as structure, process, value, motivation, satisfaction, attitude, etc. The search for a more exact description of the variables concerned is the subject matter of this chapter.
ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE

Each organization differs from the other not only in structure but also in the attitudes and behavior they elicit in people, and these differences are related to psychological structures. As a matter of fact, individual personalities and their job requirement interact to produce a climate that can be significant to both the individual and the organization. By climate we mean those characteristics, which influence the behaviour of people in organizations. It is in effect what one reacts to the whole context of stimulation and confusion where one works. (Pestonjee 1982).

The reality of the impact environmental factors on behaviour was first discussed by Kurt Lewin in the mid-thirties who first referred to In Lewin's theory he said environmental factors on behaviour in the literature of industrial psychology. In describing the essential dynamics that links human behaviour to generalized environmental structures, he wrote:

To characterize properly the psychological field, one has to take into account such specific items as particular goals, stimuli, social relations, as well as more general characteristics of the field as the atmosphere or the amount of freedom. These characteristics of the field as a whole are as important in psychology as, for instance, the field of gravity for the explanation of events in classical physics. Psychological atmospheres are empirical realities and are scientifically describable facts. (Lewin, 1938).
A similarity to this is seen in writings of Kofka (1935) who distinguished between geographical environment, which constitutes physical and social environment, and the behavioural environment as perceived and reacted to by the subject. Kofka argued that behaviour could be more meaningfully understood if it was related to the behavioural environment.

For an understanding of the concept of climate it is necessary to consider some of the theories, which have touched concepts, related to the climate theory. Some of these demonstrate the possibility of integrating the climate theory into their own structure and still others present models similar in intent but different in focus. The theories can be divided into three categories:

1) Theory of Individual Behaviour
2) Management Theory
3) Organizational Theory

THEORY OF INDIVIDUAL BEHAVIOUR

Many psychologists who have addressed themselves to the study of individual behavior in organizations have classified environmental factors in pluralistic terms. Vroom (1964) in the conclusion of this comprehensive analysis of work and motivation states the following two propositions:

PROPOSITION 1: The valence of an outcome to a person is a monotonically increasing function of the algebraic sum of the products of
the valences of all other outcomes and his conception of its instrumentality for the attainment of these other outcomes.

**PROPOSITION 2:** The force on a person to perform an act is a monotonically increasing function of the algebraic sum of the products of the valence of all outcomes and the strength of his expectancies that the act will be followed by the attainment of these outcomes.

Vroom's model acknowledges the importance of situational variables, but does not provide a format by which such variables can be mapped and measured. Most other theories of individual behaviour also fail to provide a systematic and useful linkage between climate and behavioural concepts.

**MANAGEMENT THEORY**

Organizational psychologists interested in the management process have developed various terms to describe the indirect and subtle effects of management practices on the attitude and behaviour of subordinates. Several of these terms attempt to define the phenomenon identified as organizational climate.

Blake and Mouton (1960) in "The Managerial Grid" use the term "Organization Culture" stating "when a manager sees his responsibility as that of managing a culture rather than just managing people to get work out of them, the basic unit of development is no longer the individual considered separately and alone." However, they stop short of explaining what organizational culture implies for the people. And, most important, if
it is the manager’s responsibility to arrive at a total organizational perspective how can he carry out his responsibility without a linking concept that allows him to relate individual and organizational elements?

**ORGANIZATIONAL THEORY**

Organizational theorists interested in descriptive explanations of human behaviour in organizations have dealt indirectly with notions of organizational environments.

Classical organizations theories as represented in the writings of Fayol (1949) Koontz and O'Donnel (1955) and others, render such concepts unnecessary.

The cognitive or economic behaviour theories of organization such as those proposed by March and Simon, 1959 and Cyret and March, 1964 view organizations as systems for making decisions and deal in a tangent with climate.

The main group of organization theories has concentrated on the objective framework of organizations, the structure. Lorsch and Lawrence (1967) distinguish eight structural dimensions, which have been widely used to characterize the situational influence on motivated behaviour. These are:

1. Locus of formal authority
2. Time span of responsibility
3. Specificity of goals
4. Number of levels of hierarchy
5. Standardization of procedures
6. Quantity of formal rules
7. Span of control
8. Rule of specialization

The model proposed above and those proposed by Likert (1967) who said in his theory of management system about intervening variables are nothing but climate variables. He states:

*The intervening variables reflect the material state and the health of the organization e.g. the loyalties, attitudes, motivations, performance goal, and perceptions of all members and their collective capacity for effective interaction, communication, and decision-making. The structural variables were considered as causal variables and the end results such as productivity, costs, profits etc., as dependent variables.*

Climate is thus considered by Likert as linkage between structural attributes of an organization and its effectiveness.

Frederikson (1968) conducted an experiment to ascertain the impact of climate on performance of middle managers. He took climate variables like closeness of supervision, rules and regulations, etc. and demonstrated that (a) performance was more predictable for subjects as innovative climate, (b) performance was higher for subjects in consistent climate and (c) subjects in different climate adopted different methods to solve problems. This
demonstrated the important role climate plays in organizational behaviour.

Litwin and Stringer (1968) gave a comprehensive definition of climate and offered a model or organizational climate, which is considered to be a path breaking research in the climate field. According to them:

The term organization climate refers to a set of measurable properties or work environment, perceived directly or indirectly by the people who live and work in this environment and assumed to influence their motivation and behaviour.

According to them, organizational climate arouse certain motives in the people, like achievement, power, etc. and climate can be categorized as per the motives and can be measured in terms of certain dimensions responsible for arousing these motives.

Tagiuri (1968) stated that organizational climate refers to a quality of the members of the organization and can described in terms of values or the meanings of a particular set of characteristics of the environment. Thus the climate represents the organization as people seek it in a holistic and global sense.

Campbell, et.al. (1970) explains organizational climate as a set of attributes specific to a particular organization that may be induced from the way that organization deals with its members and its environment. For members within the organization, climate
takes the form of a set of attitudes and expectancies, which describe the organization in terms of both static and dynamic characteristics.

**Other Climate Type Theories**

The most promising of these is the interpersonal organization theory, proposed by Kahn and his associates (1964). They state: “It is the key assumption of this approach that the behaviour of any organizational performer is the product of motivational forces that derive in large part from the behaviour of members of his role set because they constantly bring influence to bear upon him, which serves to regulate his behaviour in accordance with the role expectations they hold for him.” There is not necessarily an incompatibility between the use of the climate framework and the role set theory. Both serve as useful explanatory concepts.

**Toward an Integrated Theory**

If the concept of organizational climate is to demonstrate real value in the understanding and explanation of behaviour in organizations, it must be integrated with the kinds of theories of organizational behaviour that have evolved and are in current use. These theories, as discussed, tend to emphasize such factors as management practices, decision-making processes technology, and formal organizational structure and social structure. These factors are largely objective features of an organization system. Relatively
little attention is given to the member's perceptions of and subjective responses to the organizational environment. Thus it has been difficult for these theories to utilize motivational concepts, many of which are based on subjective elements.

Pritchard and Karasick (1973) observed that both overall organization and its sub-units influenced the perception of organizational climate and that climate correlated with individual satisfaction and sub unit performance, but not individual performance. They also reported that some dimensions of organization climate moderated the individual's characteristics performance and satisfaction relationships. According to them, organizational climate is relatively enduring quality of an organization, which (quality) results from the behaviour and policies of members of organization, especially top management, which is perceived by members of the organization, which serves as a basis for interpreting the situation, and acts as source of pressure for directing activity.

Hellriegel and Solcicum (1974) referred to climate as a set of organization sub-system attributes that may be inferred from the way an organization or any of its subsystems deal with its members. For example, specific situational attributes such as unstructured role prescriptions, unclear reward contingencies, and non-directive leadership might be transformed into the set of
situational influences referred to as conflicting and ambiguous climate. These specific situational attributes result into specific climate characteristics, described as consideration, warmth, supports etc.

**An Organizational Behaviour System**

While agreeing in general with Litwin and Stringer’s (1968) conceptualization of O.C. Davis (1977) presents and O.B system through which the climate of each organization is achieved. The system is illustrated as Table C below:

**TABLE C**

**A MOTIVATION AND CLIMATE MODEL OF ORGANIZATION BEHAVIOUR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization System</th>
<th>Perceived Organizational environment</th>
<th>Aroused motivation</th>
<th>Emergent Behaviour</th>
<th>Consequences for organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Structure</td>
<td>Dimensions of O.C (or role set expectations)</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Interactions</td>
<td>Retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td><strong>Sentiments</strong></td>
<td>Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management assumptions and practices</td>
<td></td>
<td>FEAR</td>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making process</td>
<td></td>
<td>INTERACTION</td>
<td>Reputation (Image)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Litwin and Stringer, “Motivation and Organizational Climate”, 1968
MODELS OF ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOUR

Organizations differ in the quality of organizational behaviour that they develop. Different models of organizational behaviour that predominate in management thought in each organization substantially cause these differences. This means that the underlying model that prevails in an organization, management determines the climate in that firm. For this reason, model of organizational behaviour are significant. Three models of organizational models are shown in the Table D below:

**TABLE D: MODELS OF ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOUR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTOCRATIC</th>
<th>CUSTODIAL</th>
<th>SUPPORTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depend on Power</td>
<td>Economic Resources</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial Authority</td>
<td>Money</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obedience</td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Job Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependence on Boss</td>
<td>Dependence on Organization</td>
<td>Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsistence</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>High Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Passive Cooperation</td>
<td>Awakened Drives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Keith Davis, “Human Behaviour at Work”, 1977

**AUTOCRATIC MODEL**

In an Autocratic model environment the managerial orientation is formal official authority. Management assumes that it knows what is best and the employee’s obligation is to follow orders...
without question. Under autocratic conditions the employee orientation is obedience to a boss. The autocratic model is a useful way to accomplish work. Its principal weakness is its high human costs.

**CUSTODIAL MODEL**

A successful custodial approach depends on economic resources. If an organization does not have wealth to provide pensions and pay other benefits, it can’t follow a custodial approach. The resulting managerial orientation is towards money to pay the cost of benefits. Since employee’s physiological needs are reasonably met, the employee looks to second level security needs as motivating force. The employee becomes psychologically preoccupied with the maintenance factors of the job as described by Herzberg’s motivation maintenance model. The custodial model has flaws. Most employees do not produce anywhere near their capacities and as a result they are happy but most of them do not feel self-actualized.

**SUPPORTIVE MODEL**

Organizational behaviour was originally stated as the “The principle of supportive relationships” by Likert (1961) who said *The leadership and other processes of the organization must be such as to ensure that in all interactions and relationships with the organization each member will in the light of his background, values*
and expectations, view the experience as supportive and one which builds and maintains his sense of personal worth and importance."

Through leadership, management provides a climate to help employees grow and accomplish in the interest of the organization the things of which they are capable. Since performance is supported, the orientation is towards it. The employees respond to intrinsic motivators in their jobs. The psychological result is a feeling of participation and task involvement, because of satisfaction of higher order need.

**INFLUENCE OF EXTERNAL ENVIRONMENT ON CLIMATE**

Litwin and Stringer indicate external environment as influencing the background constraints. Perception theories are silent about external environment. This researcher knows from his personal experience in Indian industry that the external environment can dramatically influence the internal environment as well as perception of people about the organization. During early eighties, when Dr. Datta Samant emerged as a leading militant union leader in the country, employee perception of the management changed in many organizations and they resorted to pressure-tactics and agitation without justifiable reasons and on flimsy grounds.

Aftermath of the Bhopal tragedy saw the Government tightening laws governing industries making directors of companies
directly and personally liable and responsible for violating pollution control regulations, declaring it a criminal offence, punishable with imprisonment. Consequently, style of top management functioning has changed affecting the perception of employees about the organization.

**Dimensions of Organizational Climate**

As seen in the foregoing sections, organizational climate has been viewed in various ways by various researchers. What emerges from this is that different events, practices, and procedures contribute to the summary perception of climate. Each individual perceives the organization in many ways depending upon the context and the extent of information available about the organization. In this manner, there can be a great variety of dimensions of the organizational climate. A brief statement of dimensions, as propounded by major contributors are given below:

1. Kahn, et.al (1964)
   - Rule orientation
   - Nature of subordinates
   - Closeness of supervision, Universalism of the degree to which the individual should identify with the organization as a whole
   - Promotion of achievement orientation
2. Tagiuri (1968)

- Practices related to providing a sense of direction or purpose to their jobs, setting of objectives, planning and feedback
- Opportunities for exercising individual initiatives.
- Working with competitive and competent supervisor.
- Co-operative and pleasant people
- Being with profit minded and sales oriented company.

3. Schnedier and Bartlett (1968):

- Management support
- Management structure
- Concern of new employees
- Intra agency conflict
- Agent independence
- General satisfaction

4. Litwin and Stringer (1968)

- Structure
- Responsibility
- Reward
- Warmth
- Support
- Tolerativity
- Risk
- Standard
- Conflict
5. Campbell et al. (1970)

He attempted to synthesize various dimensions given in different studies and reported the following four factors.

- Individual memory
- Degree of structure imposed upon the position
- Reward orientation
- Consideration, warmth and support


- Freedom to set performance goals & performance based rewards.
- Emphasis on growth and development
- Willingness to train executives
- Opportunities to use new knowledge, experimentation and innovation
- Participation from various hierarchical levels in decision-making.
- Confidence and trust in competence and judgment of top management.
- Open communication and interpersonal trust.

7. Pritchad and Karasick (1973)

- Autonomy
- Conflict/cooperation
- Social relationships
Structure

Rewards

Performance based rewards

Status polarization

Flexibility and innovation

Decision centralization

Supportiveness

Achievement orientation of organization

8. Pareek (1979)

Orientation

Interpersonal relation

Supervision

Managing problems

Managing mistakes

Communication

Decision making

Trust

Reward Management

Risk taking

Management of change

This again shows varieties of ways different researchers looked at organizational climate and attempted to measure it. There have been a series of major studies over the last 45 years and more than 10 scales
have been developed. It is yet another indication about the popularity of the concept.

**CORRELATES OF ORGANIZATIONAL STRESS**

Some major research findings in this area are discussed below as organizational climate variables as we know take the central place in explaining many behavioural phenomena in the organization.

Payne and Mansfield (1973) reported that organization size had a correlation of .34 with each of sixteen dimensions of climate against 20 they had used.

Indireson (1973) studied multi-variety analysis of factors affecting job satisfaction where relationship between five organizational climate dimensions and three job satisfaction dimensions were examined and reported significant correlation between the jobs satisfaction factors and organizational climate variables.

Johnston (1974) and Schuler (1975) reported that climate perceptions have significant correlation with personality attributes.

Padki (1982) reported that climate has positive correlation with motivation and performance of organization members.

Burke (1978) examined the relationship of managers, description of organizational climate to their participation in informal helping and interaction at work. Organization climate was found to exert an influence on several aspects of informal helping process, as it existed in the work setting.
Kumar and Bohra (1979) found higher job satisfaction among employees who perceived the organizational climate as democratic than those who saw the same climate as autocratic.

Kaushik and Keshote (1982) studied 21 large Indian industrial organizations to determine whether ownership by different types of organizations has a significant effect on organizational climate or the environment that is created by interaction between organizational and personal variables. The study revealed that multinational companies have achievement and expert power climate whereas private and public sector companies have dependency and control type climates.

Padki and Gandhi (1981) examined the impact of organization climate on identification of work and organization in textile mills. The Litwin and Stringer scale of measurement was used. It was found that work-identification was predicted by the responsibility and risk factors of organizational climate.

Padki (1982) explored possible associations of various climate factors with an individual's psychological and behavioural outcomes and organizational effectiveness. She could find causal relationships between climate variables and macro-micro and psychological states of the member of the organizations, i.e. the states commonly associated with job attitudes, motivation, and organizational effectiveness.

Bajaj (1982) reported positive correlation of prevailing organizational environment with feelings of alienation.
Sen (1981) in his study on bank employees found that the climate of control was related to role stress. Such a climate has negative correlation with job satisfaction, role efficacy, and effective role behaviour.

Surti (1982) studied the role stress in women in eight different occupations and found that participating and consultative organizations climate was negatively correlated with role stress.

Pestonjee and Singh (1982) studied a sample of 101 employees of an electricity company and found that achievement, expert influence, and extension climate has positive correlation with job satisfaction.

Khanna (1985) investigated the relationship between organizational climate and organizational role stress in a chemical industry and reported significant correlation between climate variables and organizational role stress variables.

Singh (1987) studying different job categories in the computer industry reported that organizational climate variables moderated the relationship between role stress and job satisfaction.

Sharma (1987) investigated the effects of organizational climate on job satisfaction, sense of perception, alienation and role stress in private sector and public sector pharmaceutical industry and reported that the private sector and the public sector varied significantly on the dominate climates, and there was a significant correlation between the climate variables and role stress variables.
Rajendran (1987) reported significant correlation between organizational climate and job satisfaction in a public sector industry in Tamil Nadu.

Kedarnath (1988) studied effects of organizational climate on job involvement among banking personnel, and reported that expert influence, achievement, affiliation, and dependency climate enhance job involvement and extension and control deteriorate it.

Thus we can say seeing the various studies done on climate in India and abroad, one can conclude that climate variables influence wide varieties of behavioural phenomena in the organization.

**PERCEPTUAL MEASUREMENT ORGANIZATIONAL ATTRIBUTE APPROACH**

This approach views organizational climate as a set of perceptual variables, which are still seen as organizational main effects. According to Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler and Weick (1970), O.C. is a ‘set of attributes specific to a particular organization that may be induced from the way the organization deals with its members within the organization, climate takes the form of a set of attitudes and expectations which describe the organization in terms of both static characteristics such as degree of autonomy and behaviour outcome and contingencies.’ In an attempt to elaborate on the above definition Campbell and Beaty (1971) further defined the concept as “a summary variable intended to represent perceptual filtering, structuring and description of numerous stimuli
impinging on him form the domain we so casually refer to as the situation."

Implicit to these definitions is the view that (1) organizational climate is a perceptual measure that describes the organization and is different from attitudinal, evaluative and need satisfaction variables (2) perceptions of organizational climate are thought as “an article of faith to influence the valences attached to certain outcomes, the instrumentalities of these outcomes, and explanations for various strategies to achieve these outcomes. Further, organizational climate is a situational determined psychological process in which organizational climate variables are either considered to be causative or moderators to performance and attitudinal outcomes, the point of moderation being either between objective situational characteristics or process and behaviour, or between individual characteristics and behaviour.

Pritchard and Karasick (1973) using a portion of organizational climate questionnaire to study the climate perception of 76 managers from two organizations observed that perceptions of organizational climate were influenced by both the overall organization and its sub-units and that climate scores correlated with individual satisfaction and sub-unit performance, but not individual satisfaction. They also found that some dimension of organizational climate moderated the individual characteristics – performance and satisfaction relationships. To Pritchard and Karasick (1973) organizational climate appears as a “relatively
enduring quality of an organization's internal environment distinguishing it from and policies of organizations a) which results from the behaviour and policies and members of organizations especially top management; b) which is perceived by members of the organization; c) which serves as a basis for interpreting the situation; and d) acts as a source of pressure for directing activity."

In their review of 1970, Campbell and others have identified the following four dimensions/factors of organizational climate:

1. Individual autonomy – based on factors of individual responsibility, independence, rules, orientation, and opportunities for existing individual initiative.

2. The degree of structure imposed upon the position – based on factors of structure, managerial structure and closeness of supervision.

3. Reward orientation – based on factors of reward, general satisfaction, promotion, achievement orientation, and being profit minded and sales oriented.

4. Consideration, warmth and support – based on factors of managerial support, nurturance of subordinates and warmth and support.

In short, according to James and Jones (1974) perceptual measurement – organizational attribute approach has raised a
number of conceptual as well as empirical problems, which require attention.

1. If the perceived organizational climate is to be used to measure an organizational attribute, the researchers in this field should also address themselves to the problem of accuracy of perception, which requires multiple sources of situational measurement of validation purposes.

2. The requirement of purely perceptual measurement doesn't permit a differentiation between such diverse but importantly different situations as (a) inconsistent or capricious leader behaviour, (b) leader behaviour adopted to individual needs, (c) differences in perception caused by perceivers having different opportunities to observe leader behaviour (d) differences in perception related only to individual characteristics, and (e) instrument error.

3. Questions included in the measurement devices of climate under this approach seems to measure variables related to different levels of explanation such as organizational sub-system, or group context (e.g. goals), certain aspects of structure (e.g. formalization), process (e.g. leadership), systems values and norms (e.g. personality), and role characteristics. However, within similar situation, individual differences in perceptions (e.g. lack of consensus) regarding
these variables would appear to represent not climate but other sources of variance which may not be situational in nature.

4. If organizational climate is seen as encompassing some situational variables such as leadership autonomy and formalization, but not other situational variables as size, shape, and span of control, the differentiation is not at all clear.

5. It is also possible that the perceptual measurement – organizational attribute approach may include a logical inconsistency for it proposes to measure organizational attribute which has been shown to vary across levels of explanation (e.g. total system, sub-system, and group, or from a related standpoint, causal and process variable) on the one hand, while on the other hand, it is considered a psychological process which operates at a level of explanation different than objective organizational characteristics and organizational process.

As a matter of fact, organizational attributes represent stimulus conditions (Forehard and Gilmer, 1964) while perceptually measured organizational climate represents a set of responses to organizational characteristics of responses, namely, individual differences, which may or may not be congruent with stimulus...
conditions. Thus, it seems inconsistent that the same set of organizational stimuli and simultaneously will be representative of the response oriented psychological process level of explanation.

THE PERCEPTUAL MEASUREMENT INDIVIDUAL ATTRIBUTE APPROACH

Schneider and Bartlett (1968, 1970) and Schneider and Huall (1972) view organizational climate as perceptual as well as an individual attribute. Climate in this approach is viewed as summary or global perception held by individuals about their organizational environment.

The summary perceptions reflect on interaction between personal and organizational characteristics in which the individual by forming climate perceptions, "acts as an information processor using input from (a) the objective events in the characteristics of the organization, and (b) characteristics of the individual (e.g. value, needs) of the perceiver". Thus climate took the form of 'situation specific values', which reflected "those aspects of the situation to which individuals attach importance". Climate in this approach is considered as an "intervening variable" because it is caused by discrete experiences, both organizational and individual, which, in turn, causes latter behaviour.

The conceptualization of organizational climate in this approach is similar to perceptual measurement of organizational attribute approach in many respects. For example, in both the approaches climate is seen as summary perception or intervening variable based upon interaction between individual approaches as well. Further, if the measurement and
conceptualization are not tied together carefully, "assessing climate as a perceptual self report measure may result in the replication of work attitude literature." (Johannesson 1973).

From the above criticisms, however, one should not gather that the idea of perceptual intervening variable is in question, but it shows that perceived intervening variables have already been identified and a new term such as climate is not needed. Even when climate is regarded as an individual attribute, it is recommended that a new designation such as "psychological climate" be employed. A major advantage in using the two terms, namely O.C. and psychological climate is the additional clarity permitted in both the definition and measurement of climate (James and Jones 1974).

In the recent years, the term "psychological climate" is being extensively used. According to Jones et.al (1979) psychological climate (a) refers to the individual's cognitively based description of the situation, (b) involves a psychological processing of specific perception into more abstract depiction of the psychologically meaningful influences in the situational characteristics that have relatively direct and immediate ties to the individual experience, and (d) is multi-dimensional with a central core of dimensions that apply across a variety of situations.

"Perhaps the most important and frequently encountered assumption is that the dimensions of psychological climate represents more than mere descriptions of work environment conditions" (Jones and
Differential Effects of Organizational Climate and Size on Job Satisfaction and Role Stress

James, 1979) e.g. climate is a set of macro perceptions derived from micro perceptions of specific events, conditions and experiences, with the psychological process of abstraction and concept formation. "To the extent that the individual plays an active role as a cognitive processor, psychological climate scores will reflect the individual characteristics involved in the process of perception and concept formation as well as the characteristics involved in the process of the situation being perceived" (Mahoney 1977). This fact is established through a number of studies which show that climate perceptions reflect differences in personality attributes, cognitive style, ability, and adaptability (Johnston 1974, Kerr and Schriesham 1974, Schuler 1975, Donny 1965), alienation from cultural norms (Blood and Hulin 1967), need strength as well as age, sex, race, and intelligence.

From the above-mentioned factors it is apparent why climate research received so much attention. However, a number of reviews on climate research have shown that there is a lack of consensus among researchers about the conceptualization and measurement of climate construct (e.g. Hellriegel & Slocum 1974, James & Jones 1974). The etiology of climate is not well understood and in this connection Schneider & Reiders (1983) have reviewed the literature and indicated that two major thoughts or approaches were prevailing 1) Structural approach to the etiology of climate, 2) Selection, Attraction, Attritions
(SAA) approach to the etiology of climate. They have proposed symbolic interactions as a new approach to the etiology of climate.

According to some structural specialists like Payne & Pugh 1976 et.al, individual’s perceptions of organizational events are influenced by the organizational setting or structure (e.g. organizational size, number of levels, in hierarchy, etc.) The attribution of meaning to the organizational events is primarily determined by the objective factors present in the organization. Philosophically, the approach adheres to the belief of absoluteness in reality, i.e., reality is conceived as a concrete structure and its entity is maintained irrespective of the presence or absence of the perceiver. The approach is conforming to the objectivist approach to social science where human beings are believed to be responders to reality. Two major criticisms have been cited against the structuralists as follows:

1. The climate and structural variables did not show systematic empirical relationship; and

2. Conceptually the approach fails to accommodate the reality of multiple climates (e.g., work group climates) within the same organizations.

The SAA approach advocates that individuals are attracted to organizations, which according to their perception have potentialities to satisfy their needs. The personalities, which are misfit or persons who find difficulty in implementing their self-concept eventually, quit the organizations. As a result, according to SAA approach,
organizations achieve relatively homogenous membership and similar members attach similar meaning to organizational events. In other words, the primary source for meaning attribution to organizational events is within Individual. The approach has an implicit assumption that to a great extent the reality is projection of human imagination. The SAA approach also suffers from its inappropriate appreciation of multiple climates within same organization.

The symbolic interactions approach assumes the reality is partly a social construction. It denies the role of human beings solely as either responder or projector. The human beings play an active role (rather than passive responder) in the process of perception; rather the meaning (perception) arises from the interactions between the perceiver and the perceived. The approach states climate arises due to interactions between people, events, and structures. The newcomer adapts through process of socialization and also tends to change the existing climate through the process pf personalization. The symbolic interactions view held that selective interactions over a period of time could form meaningful social units; therefore, it is possible to have several climates in owner organizations.

**JOB SATISFACTION**

One of the surest signs of the deteriorating conditions in organizations is low job satisfaction. In its more sinister forms, it looks behind wildcat strikes, slow-down, absenteeism and employee turnover. It
also may be a part of grievances, low productivity, disciplinary problems and other organizational difficulties.

Hoppock has defined the term job satisfaction variously, since the publishing of the book ‘Job Satisfaction’ in 1935. Bullock (1952) defines job satisfaction as “An attitude that results from a balancing and summation of many likes and dislikes experienced in connection with the job.”

These evaluations may rest largely upon one’s own success and failure in the achievement of personal objectives and upon the perceived contribution of the job and company towards these ends.” Handside and Speak (1964) says it is a “dynamic process of balancing one thing against another” and to Robert (1966) it stands for “outward or inner manifestations, which give individual a sense of enjoyment or punishment in the performance of his work.”

For Smith, Kendall and Hulin (1969) “Job satisfaction is affective response to the facets of the situation - associated with a perceived difference between what is expected and what is experienced.” Based on the concept of need satisfaction, Morse (1953) suggests that the amount of satisfaction experienced by the individual is the function of

a) How much his needs are fulfilled by being in a particular situation,

b) How much his needs remain unfulfilled.
This is very close to the opinion expressed by Smith et.al. (1969), Locke (1969) who suggested, “It is a pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job as achieving or facilitating the achievement of one’s values.” Job satisfaction can also be viewed as “Physical affective state, which arises in the individual as a function of the perceived characteristics of the job in his selection of his frame of reference.” (Sinha and Agarwal 1971). “Job satisfaction covers the satisfaction derived from being engaged in a piece of work, or in every pursuit of a higher order.

In fact, satisfaction is generated through the individual’s perception of how well his job on the whole is satisfying to the various needs (Sinha 1974). So, in short, one can say that job satisfaction is a result of various attitudes, which the employees possess regarding the job related factors and towards life in general. It is important to note, however, that job satisfaction is an effective or evaluative state in contrast to non-evaluative construct. (Wall, 1973). This distinction is further emphasized by James & Jones (1974), Locke (1976), Payne & Pugh (1976), Lafollette & Sims (1975) and Schneider & Snyder (1975), who have also emphasized the distinction between job satisfaction and climate. However, Hellriegel and Slocum (1973) have suggested the existence of a dynamic inter-relationship between job satisfaction and climate.

Moreover, there is also difference between job satisfaction, morale and mere attitudes. This is partly because similar measures are used for assessing job satisfaction and others. AS Blum (1956) has also put it,
“authors and experimenters have measured employees, reactions and have labeled them sometimes job satisfaction, sometimes morale and at other times merely attitude.”

Quite frequently in the literature on industrial psychology, the expression job satisfaction is used for individual attitudes toward specific aspects of total work situation. Both job satisfaction and job attitudes refer to affective orientation on the part of individual towards work roles, which they are occupying, yet the two terms are different. According to Vroom, if job satisfaction is considered as valence of a work role to its occupant there could be different values associated to different properties of work role. In a narrow sense, no doubt, attitudes to these factors of job may be related to job satisfaction, but the latter is not co-extensive with the employee’s attitudes and the two should be kept distinct. The complex of attitude, which is referred to, as a job satisfaction is in fact, “a general attitude which is the result of many specific attitudes in three areas, namely, specific job factors, individual characteristics and groups relationship outside the job”. Therefore, job satisfaction should not be mixed up with employee attitude towards specific job factors. The latter forms an important contributory influence on job satisfaction; so, the attitude called job satisfaction is to be taken in a collective sense and employee attitude in a distributive sense.

Just as job satisfaction is not to be confused with employee attitudes to specific job factors, it would be erroneous to treat it as
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identical with industrial morale. In many instances, they have been used interchangeably like by Kornhauser and Guion. Job satisfaction is an important contributory factor to industrial morale. Morale has been found to be closely related to the satisfaction that the employee derive from wages, nature of work, supervision promotion, handling of grievances and other factors that surround the work. In fact, Smith and Western (1951) have characterized morale as an attitude of satisfaction.

Strictly speaking, job satisfaction refers to the general attitudes possessed by individual workers towards his job and life in general. It is essentially an individual phenomenon and is reflected in various attitudes he possesses. On the other hand, industrial morale as Blum puts it, is a by-product of a group and is generated by a group. It has been defined as the possession of feeling, on the part of the employee, of being accepted by and belonging to a group of employees through adherence to common goals and confidence in the desirability of these goals, (Mann & Pelz 1945), Kretch Crutchfield (1948), Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman. While others who think them to be different as two concepts are Blum (1968), Sinha (1972), Bose (1955), Harrell (1964), Vroom (1961), Anastasi (1964) and Pestonjee (1967) etc.

Job satisfaction has also been distinguished from job involvement (Lodahl & Kejner, 1965). As a matter of fact, a person who is involved in his job is one who takes it seriously, for whom important values are at a stake in the job, whose moods and feelings are significantly affected by
his job experiences, and who is mentally preoccupied with his job. Thus a
person who is highly involved in his job is more likely to feel extremely
satisfied or extremely dissatisfied depending upon the degree of success
or failure in his job, while an uninvolved person could have less emotional
reaction to the same or analogous job experience. French, Kornhauser
and Marrow (1946) complied a list of on-the-job and off-the-job factors,
which were found by various investigators as underlying causes of
satisfaction and dissatisfaction of workers. These were as follows:

1) **Factors in the individual:** Ability, health, age, temperament,
desires and expectations, neurotic tendencies, unconscious
conflicts etc.

2) **Factors in life away from work:** Home conditions, recreating,
consumer problems, labour union activates and the like.

3) **Factors in Employment relations:** Wages and earnings,
transfer, lay-off and hiring procedures, kind of work performed,
supervision, training, conditions of work, opportunities for
advancement, social relations, etc.

Worthy (1950) has listed the following six components of job satisfaction.

1) Company in general
2) The local organization
3) Local management
4) Immediate supervision
5) Co-workers
6) Working conditions
On the basis of inter correlations between ten factors Gove and Kerr (1951) conclude that ‘wages’ and liking for association appears to be major components of job satisfaction. Herzberg and his associates (1957) in their review of job attitude research have identified ten major factors constituting job satisfaction with nearly 150 specific aspects. These are:

1) Intrinsic aspect of job
2) Supervision
3) Working conditions
4) Wages
5) Opportunity for advancement
6) Security
7) Company and management
8) Social aspects of job
9) Communication
10) Benefits

Viewing job satisfaction as summation of the employees feeling in four important areas, namely, job, management, personal adjustment, and social relations, following factors were identified as constituents of job satisfaction. (Pestonjee 1973):

1) **Job**: This includes nature of work, fellow workers, hours of work, and opportunities on the job.

2) **Management**: Supervisory treatment, participation, rewards, punishment, praises and blames, etc.
3) **Personal Adjustment:** Emotionality, health, home and liking conditions, etc.

4) **Social Relations:** Neighbors, friends and associates, attitude towards people in community, etc.

The first two factors are called on-the-job factors while the latter two are known as off-the-job factors. There is only limited agreement on the issue as to what makes a person satisfied or dissatisfied. This is a highly controversial issue and yet to be fully resolved. Although all the major theories have shown some promise in providing explanation to the nature and process of job satisfaction, they are limited in their value in the sense that none of them is capable of explaining all or at least most of the issues pertaining to the concept. Some confine themselves to only a particular methodology (e.g., Herzberg's two-factor theory) whereas other is difficult and unyielding to empirical validation (e.g., Maslow's need hierarchy theory). Some others still need further explanation. (i.e. VIE model of Vroom).

It was suggested by Morse (1953) that the amount of satisfaction a worker derives from his job or occupation, depend upon how much his needs are fulfilled by being in particular situation, i.e., how much his need tension is reduced and how much remains unfulfilled. Katzell (1964) has also emphasized the difference between what the worker gets and what he wants. However, he differs from Morse in the sense that he assumes satisfaction as multiplicative function of the variables concerned.
than a subtractive one as proposed by Morse. Brophy (1959) views satisfaction in terms of discrepancies, which exist either between the worker's ideal role and his real role. So it involves an evaluation of the environment from a viewpoint external to the individual rather than from his own phenomenon aggregate of individual positions as a single position; it focuses on people in general with broadly defined positions and expectations made of them rather than upon a single person, and his interaction with environment.

In 1943, Maslow proposed his "Theory of human motives" which he further elaborated in the coming years (Maslow 1954, 1970). According to him man has five basic needs –

1) Physiological needs
2) Safety needs
3) Belongingness and love needs
4) Esteem needs
5) Self-actualization needs

In addition, he has also proposed another category of needs like order and aesthetic needs, which, however, he never elaborated. According to his basic theoretical propositions these needs are arranged in a hierarchical order based on their dominance. The individual has to fulfill first the most pre potent ones and until they are satisfied no attempts are made for satisfying the less potent needs. However, he never emphasized that the more pre potent needs must be fully satisfied before
the less pre potent ones are fulfilled, rather he suggested that the more pre potent one will relatively be more fulfilled than the less pre potent ones. He has also recognized the importance of individual differences.

However, Maslow's theory has many weak points, the greatest being that its assumptions are difficult to verify empirically. As a matter of fact, it is easy to cite findings as being consistent with the theory but rare to make direct tests of it using longitudinal data source (Locke 1976). Attempts made by Hall and Naugaim (1968) and Lawler and Sutle (1972) to test the theory directly using longitudinal data failed to support it. Locke (1976) has criticized Maslow on following grounds:

- The concept of self-esteem is all pervasive since it has not been empirically validated as in the case of physiological and other motives.
- The lumping together of so many diverse factors such as freedom from physical harm to economic security. Physical harm is directly linked with life threatening but economic security is not.
- The term self-actualization has no coherent meaning and can mean different things to different people.
- According to Maslow, there is a near perfect correspondence between needs and values. However, this is not the case, while needs, by definition, are innate and universal, values are acquired in the course of development.
Contrary to Maslow's claim that the need can "disappear permanently" (1954) – they simply cannot since they are part of an organism's nature so they can be fulfilled or frustrated.

Maslow seems confused about what his theory is – for example, at one place he has said that it is a theory of action (1954) – i.e., more pre potent needs will always be more fulfilled or satisfied than the less pre potent ones. Somewhere else he claims that the theory postulates – one felt desires to act (1954) and these felt desires may not be expressed in action. Both these views have different implications for prediction and explanation of actions and attitudes.

Maslow admits that behaviour tends to be determined by several or all of the basic needs simultaneously rather than by one of occurring in a fixed hierarchical order.

STUDIES ON JOB SATISFACTION (ABROAD)

HOPPOCK

He can be named as the pioneer of the study on job satisfaction. He carried out studies regarding effects of human relations on job satisfaction.

The conclusions of his study are as under:

1. A person reacts when he faces adverse circumstances.

2. A person adjusts himself with his colleagues as per the facilities available to him.
3. A person identifies himself with his designation or status in the society.

4. Type of job should be as per personal abilities, education, training and aptitude.

5. Job security nourishes him to have honesty and job satisfaction.

SUPER (1939)

According to him, job satisfaction is cyclical changing with age in a manner in accord with Buhler's studies. He noted that from 20 to 24 years satisfaction was remarkable, from 25 to 34 years dissatisfaction was found to some extent and satisfaction with a temporary decrease at 45 to 54 years.

KOPLAN (1948)

In his view "salary is by no means as important for satisfaction as generally believed."

WALKER AND GUEST

They interviewed the workers in an automobile plant and on the basis of which stated that "isolated workers disliked their job and gave social isolation as the principal reason".

MORSE

In a study of 635 white-collar workers (1953), he found that 53% of men and 35% of women were dissatisfied with their job. So he concluded that women are more satisfied with their job than men.
GORDAN (1955)

He has observed that "the worker's self esteem and moral (job satisfaction) was almost singly associated with need fulfillment."

ROSS AND ZENDER (1957)

In their investigation to study employee turnover, it was found that non-fulfillment of the personal needs in a particular job has a very great influence on the employee turnover. "A worker, whose personnel needs are being satisfied on the job are more likely to remain on the job than those whose needs are not being satisfied".

HERZBERG (1957)

In his investigation pointed out the relation between morale and age thus: ' morale is high when people start their first job, it goes down during the next few years and remains at relatively lower level. When workers are in their late 20's or early 30's morale tends to rise. This rise continues through the remainder of the working careers in most cases.

ZALENIK (1958)

He stated that, on the whole, women tended to express greater satisfaction than men.

VROOM

He observed that there is considerable evidence that the satisfaction of subordinates is positively associated with degree to which they are permitted an opportunity in making decisions. He also mentions there is fairly clear cut evidence that people who are satisfied with their
job tend to report that they have greater opportunity to influence the decisions which have effects on them.

EWEN (1967)

He describes job descriptive index, as it is an objective checklist which measures satisfaction with five aspects of job: the work itself, the supervisor, the co-worker, pay, and promotions. All JDI scales have reliability of 0.80 or higher.

STUDIES ON JOB SATISFACTION (IN INDIA)

A number of studies have been undertaken on job satisfaction in India as well. Following are some important studies.

Y.F.PATEL

He carried out research on attitude (job satisfaction) of teachers of secondary schools in Gujarat and prepared a tool for measurement of attitude. The purpose of the study was (1) to prepare a tool for the study of attitude towards job among secondary school teachers of Gujarat and to study its effectiveness; and (2) to study various parameters of attitude towards job among secondary teachers of Gujarat. It was concluded that:

(1) After a test and retest the reliability scale was found to be 0.875.

(2) He also observed that lady teachers possess higher positive attitude towards the job and revealed effects of gender towards job satisfaction.
B.M.SINHA

He conducted a survey on problems of teachers in Bihar University, their attitude, and causes. He selected 100 teachers of Science Colleges and 100 from the arts college from 5 universities. For the purpose of data collection he selected personal interview method. The purpose of the study consisted of problems of teachers; their attitudes and examining the parameters related to such attitudes. Problems of the study included job satisfaction; teachers' attitude towards their profession and the related parameters.

GANGULI

He carried out a study to establish correlation between age and number of years of experience in job. In his study, he concluded with "it seems that in India employee's just above 30 years are least satisfied, whereas those below 25 years are or above 40 years are substantially more satisfied. Similarly newly appointed workers with less than 3 years of service have maximum satisfaction."

B.S.R.ANJANEYULU

He carried out a study in 1968 of job satisfaction among the secondary schools of Andhra Pradesh and its effects on education of students. The study examined the factors, which cause dissatisfaction among teachers and remedial measures as well as the impact of job satisfaction on the students.
SALUJA

She studied the causes of dissatisfaction among HSC teachers in Delhi, which covered reasons of dissatisfaction. It was found that social response, pay scale and conduct of administration are sources of dissatisfaction of teachers.

TRIVEDI

He studied the conflict areas for different personality types in various social situations. The samples were drawn from clerical, banking, academic, and technical occupation to investigate the job attitude of the employees. T-test was applied to compare the groups. It was found that there is significant difference between government clerks and college teachers; and Government clerks seem to be more disturbed and dissatisfied with their job condition than the college teachers.

K.U.LAVINGIA

He undertook a study of job satisfaction among school teachers in Gujarat studied the aspects effecting the job satisfaction such as gender, age, experience in job, educational qualification, marital status. The problem of study comprised: (a) is there any significant difference in job satisfaction among primary and secondary teachers? (b) which type of effects is noticed on job satisfaction by parameters like sex, age educational and marital status? (c) how different factors effect on satisfaction or dissatisfaction? (d) whether there is any significant difference among teachers of Urban and Rural area. It was found that (i) lady teachers of secondary and primary schools have more satisfaction
than male teachers; (ii) teachers in group of 20 to 24 years have more job satisfaction; (iii) unmarried teachers have more satisfaction than married teachers; (iv) primary teachers as a group are more satisfied than secondary teachers; (v) top and bottom groups of primary teachers correspond in having colleagues has the highest source of satisfaction and emoluments as the weakest satisfier in the group; (vi) the strongest satisfied in the top group of secondary teachers is the principal and weakest satisfier is the society. While in the bottom group the strongest satisfier is the colleague and the weakest satisfier is the emolument; (vii) analysis of the data on the basis of marital status reveals that the unmarried teachers in both the groups of secondary and primary are more satisfied than their counter parts; and (viii) there does not seem to be any relationship between academic qualification and job satisfaction among the secondary teachers group. However among the primary teachers those who are Sr. P.T.C. are more satisfied than those who are untrained.

SIZE OF THE ESTABLISHMENT

Idson, and Todd L (1990) have said the establishment size and Job satisfaction have relationship as to the degree of flexibility is concerned. The extent to which establishment size differences in workers satisfaction with their jobs can be accounted for by differences in their work environment. The data were drawn from a merged file of the 1977 Quality of Employment Survey (QES) cross section and the 1977 Quality of
Employment show that larger establishment structure work in a more formal, regimented fashion. Higher wages paid in larger establishments act to increase job satisfaction, in the absence of control for the nature of the work environment; employees are less satisfied with their jobs in larger establishments. While research has linked large organizational size to bureaucratic administrative structures and less cohesive relationships between organization members, it has not established the effect of size on member attitudes. Harari, Oren, Crawford, Kent (1983) in their study titled Organizational Size and Member attitudes have tried to determine if the relationship between organizational size and member attitudes is moderated by organizational subunit type and size, and by member status within the organizational hierarchy. The role of size as a variable in studies of organizational structure is critically reviewed on the basis of an analysis of 80 empirical studies carried out between 1950 and 1974. Size has generally been defined in terms too global to permit its relation to organizational structure to be understood adequately. The role of various aspects of size may well vary as a function of organizational type. A distinction should be made between manufacturing and service organizations, which may help to reduce the organizational size and structure. Finally, it is necessary to conceptualize organization in a way that leads one to ask more dynamic questions. Movement in the direction of a Fuller and theoretically richer view of size as a variable in the study
of organizations will lead to a more dynamic theoretical and empirical orientation in the field.

**ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE STRESS**

Stress is one of the most researched subjects in the recent times. The number of publications on the topic is known to have already exceeded more than 1,00,000 mark. Despite this, even today, there are confusions and lack of consensus regarding its definition.

Stress is word derived from Latin and was used popularly in the 17th century to mean ‘hardship, straits, adversity or affliction.’ During late 18th century its use evolved to denote force, pressure, strain or strong effort with reference primarily to a person or to a person’s organs or mental powers (Hinckle 1973). This section, will first review the various concepts in stress, and then look into the research done in the areas of role stress and present research findings on effects of stress on the individual and the organization.

**CONCEPT OF STRESS**

The concept of stress is not a new one, but it is only since the beginning of the 20th century that the social and biological science have begin investigating the effects of stress on the physical and mental health (well-being) of people. In 1910, for example, Sir William Osler assumed a causal relationship between hard work, stress and strain with his patients suffering from ‘angina-P’. It was not, however, until the midcle of 1930’s and 1940’s with the work of Hans Selye that these types of
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phenomena were scientifically investigated as individual manifestation of a single coordinated stress syndrome. Thus, Hans Selye (1946) was one of the first scholars to explain the process of stress-related illness with his General Adaptations Syndrome (GAS). GAS was one of the first indications that the body's adaptability was finite, as under constant stress exhaustion always resulted. GAS consisted of three stages encountered by an individual in stressful situations.

It is generally agreed that the term comes to the social science from the material science (Pestonjee, 1992). In engineering, stress is linked to the force a material is subjected to. A piece of material in static condition, when subjected to an external force, will remain in equilibrium, only when the internal force of reaction is equal to the external force. This internal force of reaction, expressed as a force per unit area, is termed stress (Warnock, 1964). According to Selye's model when an organism is subjected to stress the general physiological responses take place in three stages.

1. **Alarm Reaction:** This is an initial 'shock phase' when resistance is lowered, immediately followed by a counter shock phase; in which the defense mechanism become active. The defense mechanism is associated with adrenaline discharge, increased heart rate, muscle tone, gastrointestinal ulceration, etc.

2. **Stage of Resistance:** Maximum adaptation takes place during this stage. Resistance increases, signs of alarm reacting
disappear, and the organism tries to return to equilibrium. However, if the cause of stress continues or the defense does not work, the individual will move on to the third stage.

3. **Exhaustion**: During this stage, adaptation energy is exhausted. Signs of alarm reaction reappear, resistance level declines and the organism collapses.

From this, Selye concluded than stress was the unspecific response of the body to any demand made upon it.

This initial stimulus–response model of stress has been criticized on many counts like: it was based on researches on infra-human subjects, all stress producing stimuli may not have non-specific response, intra-psychic and social factors of stress have not been considered and measurement of reactions in humans is much more complex than in infra-human subjects (Pestonjee, 1992). However, the fact remains that this was a path-breaking research and gave stimulus to a huge number of research work on stress in subsequent years. Different researchers looked at stress from different angles and various models have been offered. Even today research is continuing and new ideas are coming in. This suggests that stress is a complex subject of study.

Following is a review of major contributions made to the concept of stress:

Alexander (1950) defined stress in terms of quality of stimulus and individuals response to it.
Wolff (1950) explains stress as a state of human organism.

Bosowitz, Persky, Korochin & Grinker (1955) defined stress as stimuli, which are more likely to produce anxiety, a conscious and reportable experience of intense dread and foreboding.

Mechanic (1962) described stress as discomforting response of persons in a particular situation.

Lazarus (1966) suggests a more comprehensive definition of stress as a generic term for the whole area of problems that include the stimuli producing stress reactions, reactions themselves, and the various intervening processes. This concept of stress covers physiological, sociological, and psychological stress.

Levitt (1967) described stress as anxiety manifested as a reaction of taxing circumstances.

Back and Boddononff (1967) recognized that the term stress is normally used vaguely to express a class of feelings that one cannot precisely describe, like pressure, anxiety, frustration, etc. He thought of stress composing of a threat, called stressor, and a response, which consists of a measurable alteration of the physiology and or the behaviour of an individual.

Applye and Trumbull (1967) were of the view that stress is probably best conceived as a state of the total organism under extenuating circumstances rather than an event in the environment. According to them, varieties of environmental conditions are capable of producing
stress state and different individuals respond to the same conditions in different ways.

McGrath (1976) defined stress in terms of interaction of person and environment. When an environmental situation is perceived as presenting a demand which threatens to exceed the personal capabilities and resources for meeting it, under conditions where he expects a substantial differential in the rewards and costs from meeting the demand versus not meeting it, he experiences stress. He proposed five main themes as a result of review of socio-psychological factors in stress: the cognitive appraisal theme, the experience theme, the negative experience theme, the inverted - U theme, and the social interaction theme.

French, Rodgers and Cobb (1974) looked at stress as person-environment misfit. Two kinds of fits have been identified: one fit of a person’s skills and abilities with the requirements of the job. The second is the fit of the need of the person – to what extent the job can meet it.

Margolis (1974) defined stress as a condition at work interacting with worker characteristics to disrupt psychosocial or physiological homeostasis.

Caplan (1975) described stress as any characteristic of the job environment, which poses a threat to the individual. This is in line with the definition given by French, Rodgers and Cobb (1974) mentioned earlier.
Harrison (1976) tested the theory of person environment misfit and concluded that increasing environmental demands beyond a person's abilities will produce increasing stresses, and deficiency will also produce stress. That means, he hinted at an optimum level of stress vis-à-vis the environmental demands.

Cooper and Marshall (1976) defined job related stress as negative environmental factors or stress associated with a particular job.

Beehr and Newmann (1978) defined job related stress as a condition wherein job related factors interact with the worker to change (disrupt/ enhance) his/her psychological condition such that the persons (mind and/or body) are force to deviate from normal functioning.

Dunnette (1976) postulates that stress involves an interaction of person and environment. His arguments go similar to those of McGrath (1976) described earlier.

Baum, Singer and Baum' (1981) described stress in terms of stimulus and suggested two categories of stress based on stimulus: stress caused by intrusive, physical and universally threatening situations and stress caused by conditions culturally determined, less universal and more psychological in nature.

Mikhail (1981) defines stress as a state, which arises from an actual or perceived demand capacity imbalance in the organ's vital adjustment actions, and which is partially manifested by non-specific
response. This definition seems to have summarized all the major ideas presented by different research scholars.

Asthana (1983) defines stress the method viewpoint of phenomenological psychology. According to him, or consciousness of existing situation means we are physically responding to it and same times this response is the feeling of stress – an internal act and not a causal reaction in the physiological sense. Feelings are affirmation of our attitudes towards situations and the experience of stress is one such affirmation experienced as a restriction of our existence.

Cox (1987) defines stress as a psychological state derived from the person's appraisal of their ability to cope with demands that are on them. He links coping ability as a part of the definition of stress.

Palsane et al. (1993) In a very recent writing on concept of stress in Indian traditions, he draws parallel of Western concept of stress with Eastern thought developed 2000 years ago. The Indian concept, however, is different in the strategy of coping; it takes a holistic view of problems faced by man and suggests control of mind as the strategy of coping. This idea is supported by philosophical thoughts and ideas on physical exercises like yoga and asanas, etc., which are finding popularity in Western World these days.

From the foregoing, it can be seen that different scholars defined stress in different ways at different times. The primary reason of this is that the term is used variously by scholars of different disciplines like
engineering, physics, psychology, physiology, and psycho physiology (Agarwala, Malhan, and Singh, 1979). It was in 1975, Mason, after reviewing literature on stress, reported that stress has been variously referred to

a) Stimulus or an external force acting on the organism,
b) Response (changes in the physiological functions)
c) Interaction (interactions between an external force and resistance opposed to it, as in biology).
d) More comprehensive combinations of the above factors.

Questions therefore arise: Can there be a universal definition of Stress? Is it necessary? According to Pestonjee (1992) there can be three approaches to definition of stress: stimulus oriented approach, response oriented interpretation, and psychodynamic approach. One can adopt a definition suiting best to the purposes of one's analytical needs.

ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE STRESS

The sources of stress can be broadly identified in three sectors of life. These are (1) job and organizations, (2) the social sector, and (3) intra-psychic sector. The job and the organizations refers to the totality of the work environment, including the external environment in which the organizations operate, the internal environment of the organizations, the content of the job, the interface of the job with the other job, etc. The social sector refers to the social and cultural context of an individual's life. This may include economic status, religious belief, language,
The intra psychic sector encompasses those things, which are intimate and personal, like temperament, values, capabilities, personal goals, health, etc. Stress can originate from any of these sectors and combination thereof (Pestonjee, 1992).

The organizational role stress (ORS) primarily originates from the job and the organizations sector. There have been extensive study in this area during the decade of seventy's and eighty's as this area is rightly identified as important for study on three counts. Firstly, in developed and developing countries, majority of the people are employed in work organizations. They spend their working life for one organization or other, linking their achievements, aspirations, quality of life, etc. to the organizations and their roles in them. Secondly, due to external factors, like social, economic, political and technical, the organizations change rapidly, effecting the internal environment of organizations and the roles associated with them, making them more and more complex. This leads to organizations and roles becoming the most potent sources of stress people associated with them have to experience. Lastly, the impact of stresses are devastating on the people, threatening at times their very survival.

Katz and Kahn (1966) defined organization as a system of roles, Pareek (1976) defined role as the position occupied by a person, as defined by the expectations of significant persons including the role
occupant himself. Therefore, by definition, stress is inevitable in roles in the organizations. Researchers over the decades focused their attention on causal factors of stress, stress manifestations, moderators of the stress-strain relationship, types of stress experienced by diverse work populations and various coping strategies adopted by organizational activities to cope with stress.

Kahn et.al (1964), working on organizational stress identified two major sources of role based stresses in an organization, namely, role conflict and role ambiguity. Role conflict, according to them, means competing response tendencies within and individual stemming from the requirements of different roles, which he occupies. They identified several types of role conflicts e.g. intra-sender role conflict, inter-sender role conflict, person-role conflict, inter-role conflict, etc. They defined role ambiguity as the lack of clarity of role expectations and the degree of uncertainty regarding the role performance.

Kahn and Quinn (1970) working on the nature of role stresses, classified them under three headings: 1) Expectation generated stress which include role ambiguity and role conflict, 2) Expectation resource discrepancies in which they include role overload, responsibility - authority mismatch, etc. and 3) role and personality interface.

French and Caplan (1973), writing on organizational stress and individual strain indicated that role conflict, role overload and role ambiguity are the general type of roles stress. These arguments ran
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approximately parallel with Kahn et.al. (1964) and Kahn & Quinn (1970) mentioned earlier.

Pareek (1976) classified role stress under two main categories: Role space conflicts and role set conflicts. The role space refers to the system of various roles the individual performs like a son, father, manager etc. Role set is the system of various roles in which his role is focal e.g. in an organization, his role can be an engineer in a set of roles like worker, clerk, manager, director, etc. Pareek covered five types of stress in role space conflicts, namely: Self-role distance, Intra role conflict, Role stagnation, Inter role distance, and Role bounded ness. In role set conflict, he included another five: Role Ambiguity, Role Overload, Role Isolation, Role Erosion and Role Inadequacy.

Marshal & Cooper (1979.) Writing on sources of occupational stress, he suggested the following sources of role stress:

- Intrinsic to job: Poor physical condition, workload, time pressure, and physical danger.
- Role in Organization: Role Ambiguity, role conflict, and responsibility for people.
- Career development: Over promotion, under promotion, lack of security, thwarted ambition.
- Relationship at work: Poor relationship at work, difficulties in delegating responsibility.
Organizations structure and climate: Little or no participation in decision making process, no sense of belonging, lack of effective consultation, poor communications, restrictions on behaviour, office politics etc.

Siegel (1992) reported that the power of role sender is positively associated with the distress of role conflict, but the importance of the role sender was negatively correlated. He stressed on the leader behaviour in analysis of role stress in organizations.

In the foregoing major contributions made by researchers to role stress were briefly reviewed. We give below brief descriptions of some major concepts in this area:

**Role stagnation:** As an individual grows, he expects that his role also grows in dimensions of coverage and responsibility. If this does not happen, the individual will feel a stress, which is referred to as Role Stagnation.

Role stagnation can take place due to many reasons. If the organization where an individual works does not grow, it cannot normally offer him growth. He can have growth if he changes the organization. At times, changing to a new organization may not be possible as it might require changing the location, which may not be feasible. The new role may require new skills to be learned and the individual may lack the capability or resources to acquire these skills. In such a situation, the individual will experience role stagnation.
Another situation when one can have the experience of role stagnation is that one has reached the end of capability to take on new roles. This normally happens at the middle age. Initially, when this happens, the individual tends to rationalize by finding fault with the organization. With time, when he realizes that, he has reached his end of growth, he experiences the stress of role stagnation, which he suffers in silent isolation.

Marshal & Cooper (1979) reported such stresses among executives in America. Pareek (1983) says that such stress is quite prevalent in India also. The crisis that an individual undergoes at the middle age has been described by Levinson (1973) and Constandee (1972) and latter referred to it as the male menopause.

From the organization perspective, McMurray (1973) argues for not promoting to a higher position, if there is doubt that the employee is not promotable. In a syndrome, he labels ‘the executive neurosis’ he describes the over-promoted manager as grossly overworking to keep down a top job, and, at the same time, hide his insecurity and points to the consequences of this for his work performance and the Company.

It is forecast that role isolation will be a very commonly experienced role stress in the first decade of present Century. With rapid changes in organization structures, hierarchies collapsing and organizations becoming smaller, knowledge- and skill-based, and specialized, more and more people will find themselves redundant, and will have to prepare
themselves to take different roles somewhere else in the society (Handy 1989).

**Role Ambiguity:** Role Ambiguity is a conflict experienced by a role occupant when he finds that he is not clear about the various expectations people have from his role. This can happen because he does not have the requisite information or does not understand the role fully.

Kahn and Quinn (1970) have suggested that role ambiguity may be in relation to the activities, responsibilities, personal styles, and norms. They have suggested that four different kinds of roles are likely to experience ambiguity: roles new to the organization, roles in expanding or contracting organizations, roles in organizations exposed to frequent changes in demand, and roles on probation.

French and Caplan (1973) found role ambiguity significantly related to job satisfaction. Margolis, Kores, and Quinn (1974) also found a number of significant relationships between symptoms of physical and mental health with role ambiguity, like depressed mood, lowered self-esteem, life dissatisfaction and job dissatisfaction.

**Role Overload:** The term has been popularized by Kahn et.al (1964). When an individual feels that there are too many expectations from his role, he has the stress of role overload. Most executives suffer from this stress.

Kahn and Quinn (1970) has stated that Role Overload can be reduced if there be a mechanism of role integration in the organization, or
the role occupant is empowered or variations of expectations from the role are controlled.

**Role Isolation:** Man is a social being. In his work setting, he expects, that his role is linked with significant others. When he finds this is not true, he suffers role isolation. Pareek (1983) relates role isolation with role-role distance, the main criteria of which is frequency and ease of interaction. When the desired and existing linkages leave a big gap, the role occupants have role isolation.

Marshal and Cooper (1979). These researchers have suggested one main source of managerial stress is connected with relationships at work. French and Caplan (1973) define poor relations as those, which include low trust, low supportiveness and low interest in listening to and trying to deal with problems that confront the organizational member. Studies by Kahn (1964) and French and Caplan (1970) came rightly to the same conclusion that mistrust of persons one worked with was positively related to high role ambiguity which lead to inadequate communications between people and to psychological strain in the form of low job satisfaction and to feelings of job related threat to ones well being.

Pareek (1983) developed and standardized a scale for measurement of organizational role stress. As mentioned earlier, he identified 10 different role stresses, including the four described in some details in proceeding paragraph. The six types of stresses, not discussed are:
In the foregoing sections it is shown that many researchers indicated varieties of sources of stresses. These can be summarized into seven groups (Pestonjee 1992)

1. Intrinsic to job:
   - Boredom
   - Physical working condition
   - Time pressure and deadline
   - High work load
   - Information overload
   - Technical problem.

2. Organizational Role
   - Role conflict
   - Role ambiguity
   - Responsibility for people
   - Territorial boundaries

3. Career Development:
   - Under promotion
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- Over promotion
- Lack of job security
- Thwarted ambitions

4. Relationships at work:
   - Poor relation with subordinates and boss
   - Threats from below

5. Organizational Structure and Climate:
   - Lack of participation
   - Bureaucratic pettiness.
   - Pressure towards conformity
   - Lack of responsiveness.

6. Extra Organizational Sources:
   - Midlife crisis
   - Family crisis
   - Communicating
   - Financial difficulties

7. The individual:
   - Lack of meaning in the job
   - Excessive concern for work
   - Level of individuality
   - Tolerance for ambiguity
   - Type A-behaviour

Many of these sources find place in the organizational climate. Therefore, it stands to reason that organizational climate will correlate
significantly with the role stress. Many empirical researchers have found such significant correlations. Sharma (1987) reported significant correlations of organizational role stress with various climate variables in pharmaceutical industry.

Similarly Khanna (1985) reported significant correlation of organization role stress with motivational climate in chemical industry. Kedarnath (1988) working among banking personnel found role stress to be significantly correlated with the organizational climate.

Sen (1981) found significant correlation of role stress with organizational climate in the banking industry. Frew (1987) also reported significant correlation of stress with perceived organizational characteristics and personality measures.

One of the objectives of the present study is to investigate the existence of similar relationship between climate variables and organizational role stress in the managers working in the engineering industry.

**EFFECTS OF ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE STRESS**

Pestonjee (1983) described how stress works on an individual. Under normal circumstances, an individual, receiving stress from three sources (Job & Organizational, Social and Intra psychic as described earlier) remains in balance till the stress tolerance limit exceeds the perceived stress. When job and organizational load increases individual tries to adapt by extra effort, excessive concern about the task, worries
and anxieties about the task, and in this process, his behaviour undergoes a slight alteration. When the job and organizational load increases further, they become unmanageable and start interacting with inter-psychic loads. At this stage, stress related diseases emerge, as the individual operates beyond the stress tolerance limit. If unchecked at this stage, the situation may culminate into the last stage wherein complete disintegration of personality takes place.

Paine (1982) described the effects of stress on individuals in his *Burn-out Stress Syndrome (BOSS)*. BOSS is a debilitating psychological condition brought about by unrelieved work stress. According to Lee and Ashforth (1993), emotional exhaustion through roles stress is the reason for BOSS. According to Veningloe & Spradely (1981) burnout takes place in four stages:

- Honeymoon
- Fuel shortage
- Chronic symptoms crisis
- And hitting the wall

The consequences are: depletion of energy reserves, lowered resistance to illness, increased dissatisfaction and pessimism and increased inefficiency at work.

Impact of stress on individual is not always negative. Klausner (1968) suggested that success in business, sports, politics, depend on stress seeking tendencies. Bernard (1968) proposed two types of stress:
DISTRESS (unpleasant stress) and EUSTRESS (pleasant stress). According to Pareek (1983) stress is a necessary factor in the success of people in organizations: but if stress goes beyond the individual's tolerance limit, it may be harmful. Beehr et.al (1986) also speaks of positive role of stress in success. Pestonjee and Singh (1987) confirm this is an empirical study of managers and system analyst in a set of private sector and public sector organizations.

Mathew (1985) speculated on the correlation of stress and creative work. Pestonjee (1992) argues on this issue and suggests the types of role stress that may be associated with creative activities.

There is a need of further research in this area. Other effects of stress on individuals have been established through researches.


Pestonjee and Singh (1982) reported that the relation between role ambiguity and job satisfaction differs between individuals with external and internal locus of control.

Parsuram and Alutto (1981) reported that both contextual and role related variables independently contributed to variation in job attitudes and behaviour.

Srivastava and Parmer (1977) reported negative relationship between role stress and job satisfactions. Similar relation was reported by


Bhatnagar and Bose (1985), Sharma (1987) reported significant correlation between alienation and role stress.

Fig. 4 below shows various sources of role stress and their effects on the organization and the individual:

---

**Fig. 4**