The experiments conducted at Hawthorne adequately impress the importance of the human aspects involved in organization (Mayo, 1933; Roethlisberger and Dickson, 1939; Cass and Zimmer 1975). They specifically emphasize the role of informal work group and the supervisory practices in shaping employees attitudes and performance. An earlier study with school teachers reveals that a host of factors including fatigue, monotony working conditions, supervision and achievement contribute to job satisfaction. The human relations movement in industry and organization was born during post World War II (Homans, 1950; Whyte, 1955; Halpin and Winner, 1957; Likert, 1961; Marrow, et al., 1967; and Fleshman, 1972). In the late fifties, the researchers turned to focus their attention on work itself (Herzberg et al., 1959; Ford, 1969). Recent studies tend to concentrate more on the reality of structured social relationship which typifies the perspective of a truly organizational psychology (Katz & Kahn, 1966; Pugh, 1969; Payne and Pugh, 1976).

The intimate relation between the individual, organizational climate and structure has been taken cognizant in theories of the organizations. It could be generally said that the inspiration of recognizing social context of management has been provided by the work of Lewin (1952).
and Lippitt et al., (1958). Organizations are much more than a collectivity of individuals and an organization is a complex social system (Stogdill, 1959; Katz and Kahn, 1966). Outputs in an organization are dependent upon human inputs of abilities, needs, values and expectations on social processes at the interpersonal, group and intergroup level (Weber, 1947; Argyris, 1952; Blake and Mouton, 1978; McGregor, 1969; Likert, 1961; 1967) and on the organization’s internal environment of technology (Trist and Banford, 1951) and structure (Burns and Stalker 1961, Lawrence and Lorsch, 1967b; Woodward, 1967).

Control systems in most organizations are closely tied to the reward system. Reward systems are required in an organization to make individuals to indulge in the behaviours needed by the organization that are frequently not readily in time with inclination of the people. The control system specifies the behaviour required of the employees and the reward system complements the control system by prescribing reward to those people who perform in the tasks in the manner desired by the organization. Behavioral scientists have agreed that control systems and reward systems are not unnecessary in an organization. Admittedly, with large size and specialization of function some sort of information and control system is needed for any organization. However, investigators have sought to identify motivational basis for
the operation of an organization's control as well as reward systems. Terminologies used by different organizational structure analysis and administration to denote specificity of role prescription which is crucial variable influencing climate of organization are well elucidated elsewhere (Hickson, 1977; Ganesan, 1985).

**Bureaucracy:**

Weber (1947) has adequately contributed literature describing various features of bureaucracy (Gerth and Mills, 1946; Weber, 1947; Merton, 1952). Bureaucracy involves a clear-cut division of integrated activities which are regarded as duties inherent in the office. A system of differentiated controls and sanctions is stated in the regulations.

The assignment of roles occurs on the basis of technical qualifications which are ascertained through formalized, impersonal procedures (e.g. examinations). Within the structure of hierarchically arranged authority, the activities of trained and salaried experts are governed by general, abstract, clearly defined rules which preclude the necessity for the issuance of specific instructions for each specific case. A few investigators report that the several dimensions of bureaucracy were not highly intercorrelated (Hall, 1963; Hall and Title, 1966; Miller, 1970). However, the hierarchical organizations of authority is regarded as conceptually central
It generally assumed that bureaucracy as a system based on the hierarchical organization of authority necessarily imposes tight discipline, leaving little room for initiative and primary effect of bureaucratization must be to suppress employees' individuality. The general belief in this regard has been failed to be confirmed in the work of Kohn (1976). The study by Kohn shows, to the contrary, bureaucratization is consistently, at least not strongly, associated with greater intellectual flexibility, higher valuation of self-direction, greater openness to new experience, and more personally responsible for moral standards. It is suggested that this may be a consequence of the occupational conditions attendant on bureaucratization - far greater job protections, somewhat higher levels of income, and substantially more complex work. It is further found that the job protections matter particularly for bureaucracy's psychological impact on blue-collar workers; substantive complexity, for its impact on white-collar workers.

Maturity - Immaturity Orientation:

Argyris (1957) contends that the human personality progress along a continuum from immaturity as an infant to maturity as an adult and the personalities of the employees in an organization has a bearing on analysis of organizational behaviour. The seven characteristic dimensions of the immaturity

Argyris (1957) argues that his model does not imply that all persons reach or strive for all the dimensions on the mature end of the continuum. The dimensions described represent only one aspect of the total personality and the individual's perception, self-concept and adaptation and adjustment are also to be reckoned in understanding the personality of an employee. The dimensions it is held continually change in degree from the infant to the adult end of the continuum. It is difficult to predict specific behaviour from this model since it is only a construct. The model however may be regarded to provide a method of describing and measuring the growth of any individual in the culture.

The dimensions, Argyris (1957) cautions, are based upon latent characteristics of the personality which may be quite different from the observable behaviour and this should be distinctly remembered in analysis of personality of the employees in organizations. The personalities of organizational employees can be generally described by the mature end of the continuum. Hence, the formal organization should allow for
activity rather than passivity, independence, rather than dependency, long-rather than short-time perspective, occupation of a position higher than that of peers, and expression of deep, important abilities. In practice, often the mature organizational participant becomes frustrated, anxious, and in conflict with the modern formal organization. Thus there exists a basic incongruence between the needs of the mature personality and the nature of the formal organization. This incongruency is an important aspect in the conceptualization of person-organizational interaction and bears upon conflict and stress in an organization.

Managerial Grid:

Blake and Mouton (1978) have stressed that the conventional polarization managers tend to make a distinction between a concern for people and a concern for production and hold that the second is counter productive. The managerial Grid tends to represent the managerial styles based on concern for human beings and concern for production. Least concern for production and Extreme concern for person orientation stands for extreme concern for cheerful and harmonious work force at the expense of production. Extreme concern for production and least concern for person orientation stands for autocratic, authoritarian bossism.
Theory X - Theory Y:

McGregor (1960, 1967) has explicitly described the beliefs of different styles of management about human nature and motivation. He has contrasted two theories, viz. Theory X and Theory Y which could represent two extreme forms of thinking in this regard. Theory X assumes work is inherently distasteful to most people. Theory X further assumes that most people are not ambitious and have little desire for responsibility, and prefer to be directed. Accordingly, the theory X assumes that most people have little capacity for creativity in solving organizational problems and motivation occurs only at the physiological and safety levels. The theory X advocates that most people must be closely controlled and often corrected to achieve organizational objectives.

Theory Y on the other hand, assumes that work is as natural as play, if the conditions are favourable. Hence, it holds that self-control is indespensible in achieving organizational goals. Theory Y believes that the capacity for creativity in solving organizational problems is widely distributed in the population and motivation occurs at the social, esteem and self-actualisation levels as well as physiological and security levels. Accordingly, theory-Y contends that people can be self-directed and creative at work if properly motivated.
"Theory X and Theory Y are not managerial strategies:
They are underlying beliefs about the nature of man that
influence managers to adapt one strategy rather than another.
In fact, depending upon other characteristics of the manager's
view on reality and upon the particular situation in which
he finds himself, a manager who holds the beliefs that I called
Theory X could adapt a considerable array of strategies, some
of which would be typically called 'hard', and some which
would be called 'soft'. The same is true with respect to
Theory Y" (McGregor, 1967).

Theory Z:

Ouchi (1981) has stated theory Z characterising
Japanese organizations. Theory Z emphasises the necessity
of involvement of the worker, and the trust and subtlety.
Intimacy, effective coordination long term employment often
for a life time is found in Z organisation and the long term
relation tends from the intricate nature of the business.
Z organization provides adequate scope for employees to gain
experience across functions and offices in the organization.
The modern instruments of organizations like update information,
accounting, planning and management systems are moderated
to suit the organization's culture and are subordinated to
other factors of 'fit' to the organization in decision making.
Consensual, participative decision making is emphasised in
the Z organizations. However, the ultimate responsibility for
decision is resting on one individual.
Wholistic orientation, in the broad concern for the welfare of subordinates and of co-workers as a natural part of a working relationship, typifies Z organization. This gives rise to trust and commitment. Because of trust, each person has scope to apply discretion and work autonomously without close supervision in Z organization.

Hierarchical modes of control exists in Z-organization and they do not entirely rely upon goal-congruence among employees for order. Symbolic means are used to promote an attitude of egalitarianism and mutual trust. Commitment, loyalty and motivation are facilitated by encouraging a wholistic relativism between employees and self-direction replaces hierarchical direction to a large extent in Z-organization. Clans arise in Z-organizational culture, and in contrast to market or bureaucracy clans foster close interchange between work and social life. The Z-organisation places emphasis on staff skills, styles and subordinate goals and the organizational structure that emphasise innovation. The Z-organization counter balances its strong thrust towards decentralization by centralising a few key functions. The centralization versus decentralization is an unresolvable conflict, and that great organizations must have both well stressed in Z-organisations. The Z-organization cultivates and maintains an entrepreneural furvers among its divisions and also exercises control over the planning process, team
spirit, training, recruitment and other disciplines. The Z-organizations emphasize the code of values and beliefs that a lifetime organizational experience shapes one's character indelibly. They emphasize the performance and encourage to spot talent and potential within the ranks and put the right man in the right place. Prizes and positive reinforcement including monetary and group rewards are used in the organization to achieve its goals. The Z-organization identify itself with individuals.

The Human Organizations:

Likert (1961, 1967) has identified system characteristics of organizations into four types based on a comparison of the principles and practices of supervisors and managers who are achieving the best results with their counterparts who do not produce results. The characteristics that distinguish highest producing managers from that of the managers of mediocracy and low producing units are succinctly described by Likert as follows:

A preponderance of favourable attitudes on the part of each member of the organization, toward all other members, supervisors, the work, the organization, toward all aspects of the job reflecting a high level of mutual confidence and trust throughout the organization. Identification with the organization and its objectives and high sense
of involvement in achieving them, rather than complacency. Higher goals of performance and dissatisfaction whenever achievement falls short of the goals set. Achieving highly motivated cooperative orientation toward the organization and its objective by harnessing effectively all the major motivational forces. Less reliance is placed on the economic motive of buying a man's time and using control and authority as the organizing and coordinating principle of the organization. Using the ego motives which represent the desire to achieve and maintain a sense of personal worth and importance, security motives, curiosity, creativity and the desire for new experiences, and the economic motives fully and in such a way that they function in a cumulative and reinforcing manner and yield favourable attitudes. Achieving high levels of reciprocal influence and total coordinated influence in the organization, efficient and effective communication, leadership facilitating a highly effective social system for interaction and mutual influence. Using measurements of organizational performance primarily for self-guidance rather than for super imposed control. Adapting participation and involvement in decisions as a habitual part of the leadership processes.

Characteristics similar to the ones described above have been found to also characterise supervisors whose pattern of leadership yields consistent favourable
attitudes. Both managers and supervisors who achieve results more often think employees as 'human beings rather than just as persons to get the work done', simply, as 'human beings' rather than as 'cogs in a machine'.

Subordinates react favourably to experiences which they feel are supportive and contribute to their sense of importance and personal worth and unfavourably to experiences which are threatening and decrease or minimize their sense of dignity and personal worth. Likert (1967) holds that this pattern of reaction appears to be universal and seems to be the basis for the general principle used by the high-producing managers in developing their highly motivated, cooperative organizations. The high producing managers recognize that the motivational forces acting in each member of an organization are most likely to be cumulative and reinforcing when the interactions between each individual and the others in the organization are of such a character that they convey to the individual a feeling of support and recognition for his importance and worth as a person and strive to have the interactions between the members of their organization of such a character that each member of the organization feel confident in his potentialities and believes that his abilities are being well used.

Further, individuals reaction to any situation is always a function not of the absolute character of the
interaction, but his perception of it, how he sees things that counts, not objective reality. A subordinate reacts in terms of his own particular background, experience, and expectations.

On the basis of the above observation Likert (1961) has formulated the principle of supportive relationships. In his own words:

"The leadership and other processes of the organization must be such as to ensure a maximum probability that in all interactions and all 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" (Likert, 1961)

**Psychological Perspectives of Organizations:**

The social contexts of organizations are gaining more and more recognition in the writings of organizational theorists. The complexity of modern organizations and the challenges faced in organizing the operations and individuals have inspired attempts to conceptualize the social process. The efforts to arrive at a comprehensive model to interpret and predict behaviour in organization have necessitated propounding a motivational basis. Organization theorists
like Weber (1947), Argyris (1957), Blake and Mouton (1978), McGregor (1960, 1967) Schein (1980), Ouchi (1981) Likert (1961, 1967) have elaborated comprehensive theories to understand behaviour in organization. Of the approaches to the understanding of organizational behaviour Likert's system approach has an edge over others. The Likert's conception of four systems of human organization is based on empirical researches. It is also possible to relate the dimensions conceived in the other approaches to organization to the dimensions in Likert's system. This fact has been explicitly attested by writers in the area of organizational behaviour. (Rosenbaum 1982; Luthans, 1981). Further, the descriptions of systems on several dimensions of organizational characteristics given in Likert system provides a more pragmatic approach in studies of organizational behaviour. Admittedly, the early works of Argyris (1957), McGregor (1960, 1967) and Likert (1961, 1967) could be seen too theoretical overly anecdotal, or empirically primitive; however Likert's empirical work is more acceptable, though the theorizing could be doubted (Dunnette, 1972; Campbell, 1976).

Contribution of Likert to understanding climate:

Likert (1961) conceives variables such as organizational structure, the behaviour of managers and supervisors needs and desires of members of organization as causal variables. The causal variables are said to impinge upon the personalities
of the members or the organization. The causal variables and the personalities interact and determine the perceptions. The perceptions are influenced by such factors as the individual's past experience, his expectations and the traditions and the values of his work group. The individuals perceptions lead to cognitive orientations. Perception lead directly to motivational forces and also lead to attitudes via a process in which expectations perform a modifying or conditioning function. Admittedly, perceptions alone do not determine attitudes. Attitudes are determined by the relation of individuals perceptions to his expectations. Expectations of individuals are shaped by what happens to him. Motivational forces stem from perceptions directly, from attitudes, and from the values and goals of the individual's work group. It is possible for the motivational forces arising from one's attitudes and from one's work group to be in conflict with the motivational forces which come directly from perceptions. Possibly, motivational forces stemming from perceptions, attitudes, and the values and goals of the individual's work group tend to be additive and to reinforce each other hormonally. This happens when interaction influence system of an organization is working well. Behaviour includes such activities as planning obtaining tools and materials working etc. The results revealed by the measurements of the end result variables are capable of influencing all the variables
viz., behaviour, motivational forces, attitudes, expectations, perceptions, work group tradition etc. This is because the knowledge of results become past experience and influences entire process accordingly. In a similar fashion behaviour is connected to other variables. Perceptions both influence past experience and work group traditions and also influenced by them. Personality and work group traditions influence and influenced by each other.

Job Reactions Under Different Systems:

A dynamic relationship exists between the systems of management and job reactions. It is plausible to conceive such relationship and develop a partial model from which one can deduce the relationship possible between different systems of management of organizations and job reactions among the members of the organization. The present attempt to formulate such a model from which the relationship between a set of personality and motivational characteristics and the four systems of management conceived by Likert (1967) owes to Steers (1977). The partial model is presented in the chart 1.

Essentially, the nature and dynamics of management in an organization with reference to the various dimensions give rise to typical climate to the organization. Since, the typical systems stimulate the individual members in different ways their association with typical job reactions.
Personality psychologists have severelly shown that the patterns of reactions under different conditions are highly correlated with the traits of the individuals. Hence, it is logical that the pattern of organizational management and the personality traits of the individuals interact and decide the reaction outcomes in an organization settings.

Prolonged exposure to conditions inducing certain reactions may increment the personality disposition as well. When systems consolidate themselves the individual dimensions which determine such systems also get reinforced and sharpened. Psychologists have conceived the individual-organizational relationship in dynamic terms. The personality of the individuals will have subtle influence on the systems of the organization and in the long run may induce changes in the system itself. Admittedly, the relationships among the pattern of management in different dimensions of organizational climate and the attendant climate of the organization as a whole, and the person-climate and job reactions involve both primary and secondary influences. The primary relationships are indicated by coloured line in chart 1.

The present study attempts to test a few hypotheses deduced from the partial model of systems of management and job reactions in the educational institutional setting. The hypotheses confine themselves to a very few personality
Chart 1: A PARTIAL MODEL OF THE CLIMATE-JOB REACTIONS RELATIONSHIP

ORGANIZATIONAL MEMBERS' CHARACTERISTICS
- Trait Alienation
  - Trait Anxiety
  - Probabilistic orientation

ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE
- Exploitive Authoritative
- Benevolent Authoritative
- Consultative
- Participative

JOB REACTIONS
- State Alienation
- State Anxiety
- Job related tension
and motivational characteristics and the Likert's (1967) systems of management. The rationality for the choice of these variables and also the reasoning relating to the specific hypotheses are elaborated in the next chapter.