The recent literature in the field of organizational psychology is marked with a number of studies focusing on different aspects of organizational climate (Forehand and Gilmer, 1964; Johanneson, 1973; Schneider, 1975; Payne and Pugh, 1976; Ganesan, 1985). In general trend the psychological climate of an organization is referred to as organizational climate. It stands to denote the set of characteristics that describe an organization, distinguish the organization from other organizations, which are relatively enduring over time and influence the behavior of people in the organization (Forehand and Gilmer, 1964; Pritchard and Karasick, 1973; Sims and LaFollette, 1975).

The Concept of Organizational Climate:

The term organizational climate has been first used by George A. Litwin and his associates in the research division of the Harvard Business School (Becker, 1975). The topic of organizational climate is regarded as a contemporary topic of interest by several investigators (Brayfield and Rothe, 1951; Pace and Stern, 1958; Halpin and Croft, 1963; Forehand and Gilmer, 1964; Likert, 1961, 1967; Litwin and Stringer, 1968; Taguri, 1968; Schneider, 1972; Dunnette, 1976; and others Pascal, 1981; Ouchi, 1981; Schein, 1980 and Ganesan, 1985). The concept permit studying the multiple dimensions of
behaviour within organizations and considering them under a global concept (Schneider and Hall, 1972).

The concept of organizational climate has been led by the discovery of how organization is a psychologically meaningful environment for individual organizational members. 'Organizational culture', 'Psychological climate' and 'Company Personality' are the descriptive terms used by investigators to reflect the concept (Gilmer, 1966).

Researchers find the concept of organizational climate as lending scope to understand the process by which organizational structure and managerial strategies affect the motivation and attitudes of individual employees. Climate provides linkage between the organizational and individual levels of analysis (Taguiri and Litwin, 1968; Pheysey, et al., 1971). Frame of reference centered upon either of these two levels of analysis.

At the individual level, climate has been defined as a summary perception of the organization's work environment that is descriptive rather than evaluative in nature (James and Jones, 1974; Gavin and How, 1975; Schneider, 1975; Payne, et al., 1976; Narayanan and Venkatachalam, 1982).

Organizational climate has generally been defined as an individual's perception of his work environment (Litwin and Stringer, 1968; Hellreigal and Slocum, 1974).
Organizational climate is taken to the characteristic or typical daily properties of a particular work environment as felt and perceived by those who work in it (Halpin and Croft, 1963; Litwin and Stringer, 1968; Taguiri and Litwin, 1968; Pritchard and Karasick, 1973).

Organizational climate refers to delineating the subjective environmental factors that affect organizational performance (Becker, 1975).

As a summative variable, organizational climate is intended to represent the individual's filtering, structuring, and description of the numerous stimuli impinging on him from the organization. It is contented, by a few researches, climate operates as a unitary main effect on all people. However, this conclusion ignores the possibility that certain types of individual differences could affect an individual's perception of the organization's climate (Hellreigal and Slocum, 1974).

The consensus among the investigators hold that organizational climate can be considered as an employee's subjective impressions or perception of his organization (Lawler, et al., 1974). The organization is best regarded as specialized group situation and that climate is determined by the normative behavioral standards and attitudes which direct activity within the organization and the basis of which the individual may interpret the situation.
The overall impressions the workers form about an organization comprise the organizational climate of work (Lyon and Ivancevich, 1974; Schneider and Snyder, 1975).

Organizational climate also may be defined generally as a set of attributes which can be perceived within a particular organization, department or unit (Campbell, et al., 1970).

Climate itself is a multidimensional concept (Campbell, et al., 1970). It also incorporate dimensions about the structure and rules of the organization, about interpersonal process and relationships and about how the tasks of the organization are achieved. Climate may also be thought of 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 (Campbell, et al., 1970).

Several investigators emphasize that organizational climate denotes a set of attributes which can be perceived about a particular organization and/or its subsystems, and that may be induced from the way that organization and/or its subsystem deal with their members and environment (Campbell, et al., 1970; Dachler, 1973; Schneider, 1973 and Becker, 1975).
Climate as a molar concept reflect the content and strength of the prevalent values, norms, attitudes, behavior and feelings of the members of the social system (Payne, 1971).

Organizational life space or organizational climate may be conceived as the total matrix of organizational system characteristics as perceived by various role incumbents (McCarry and Edwards, 1973).

Climate refers to the prevalent attitudes, values, norms and feelings employees have concerning the organization (Payne and Pugh, 1976). Climate takes the form of a set of attitudes and expectancies which describe the organization in terms of both static characteristics (such as degree of autonomy) and behavior-outcome and outcome-outcome contingencies for the individual member within the organizations.

Criticism of the construct organizational climate:

Critics argue the organizational climate is one of the most debated and least understood constructs in the management literature (Johanneson, 1971 and 1973; Guion, 1973).

The organizational climate construct is criticized to be based on the assumption that individuals within a given subsystem or organization and at a given hierarchical
level should have similar perceptions about their climate (Forehand and Gilmer, 1964). One source of concern witnessed among researchers with perceptual measures of climate, in contrast to objective climate assessments, is that, 'there are potentially as many climates as there are people in the organization' (Johanneson, 1971). A number of studies report climate consistencies which would be difficult to explain as representing only a process of averaging extreme individual differences. Further, many of the climate studies lack a systematic effort to determine whether perceptions of climate vary significantly when evaluated on the basis of such objective individual measures as age, sex, years of service, organization practices, educational level and the like (Hellreigal and Slocum, 1974).

Real confusion is witnessed in the discussion over the question whether 'climate' refers to attributes of organization or attributes of people (Guion, 1973). The criticism that climate is confusing is commented to be a comprising comment by other investigators (Hellreigal and Slocum, 1974). Organizational climate is not always considered in terms of its perceived attributes and hence, it is difficult to discern how climate could be interpreted as referring primarily to attributes of people. Admittedly, possible overlap and redundancy is observed between job satisfaction and climate (Johanneson, 1973). Climate items are sometimes
culled from satisfaction scales. Studies on climate and job satisfaction so employ identical or similar methods of measurement. Perceptual climate measures elicit descriptive responses. The intent of organizational climate scales is primarily to clearly evoke perceptual rather than attitudinal or other types of responses. The stimulate or intend to stimulate, the responding participant to orient himself with specific factors and express his opinion as to how he perceives those factors, not whether he likes them or not (Stimson and LaBelle, 1971; Taylor and Bowers, 1972). Hence, climate instruments serve to describe work environments and on the other hand, satisfaction instruments serve to evaluate them (LaFollette and Sims, 1973).

Organizational climate could be distinguished from personal climate from several important respects (James and Jones, 1974; Schneider, 1975; Drexler, 1977; and James, et al., 1979). Personal climate is defined as the individual's cognitive representations of relatively proximal situational conditions expressed in terms that reflect psychologically meaningful interpretations of the situation.

Personal climate may be regarded as an individual attribute. Personal climate perceptions are not supposed to be veridical descriptions of actual situational events. Special emphasis is to be played on the personal meaning acquired by the individual for the situation, which is based
on the rationale that the most salient set of variables to assess the impact of a situation on an individual is the psychological significance and meaning that the situation has for that individual (Endler and Magnusson, 1976). The conception of personal climate do not subscribe to the assumption that the climate perceptions are primarily accommodative, bending to the need to develop an adaptive person-environment fit in each new situation (Schneider, 1975).

A few investigators distinguish organizational climate from collective climate; in comparison with previous research in organizational climate, the collective climate perspective emphasizes that there are multiple climates within an organization. The assignment basis of these climates is not based on the formal structure of the organization, but on the similarity of individual's psychological climate profiles.

Operationally, organizational climate is invariably defined by researchers as the pattern of responses a role incumbent makes to a sampling of questions indexing characteristics of his work environment milieu.

The construct of organizational climate seems to receive criticism at the operational rather than the conceptual level. A few rigorously designed experimental studies utilizing the organizational climate construct
report that job satisfaction to be highest in the affiliation induced climate, relatively high in the achievement induced climate and low in the power induced climate (Litwin and Stringer, 1968). It may be suggested that satisfaction may be an outcome and exist under different types of climate to varying degrees.

**Toward a definition of organizational climate:**

There have been intensive and diverse efforts to conceptualize, measure and utilise the organizational climate construct. Contradictory theoretical and research findings exist with respect to climate. A contingency perspective within a systems frame of reference facilitate research thinking in this important area of organizational psychology.

Several investigators have contributed to the definition of organizational climate (Campbell, *et al.*, 1970; Dachler, 1973; Schneider, 1973; and Becker, 1975). Organizational climate denotes a set of attributes which can be perceived about a particular organization and/or its subsystem, and that may be induced from the way that organization and/or its subsystems deal with their members and environment. Perceptual responses sought in studies of climate are primarily descriptive rather than evaluative. The level of inclusiveness of the items, scales, and constructs...
usually remain to be macro rather than micro. The units of analysis employed in climate studies tend to be attributes of the organization or specific subsystems rather than the individual. The construct of climate emphasis that the perceptions have potential behavioral consequences. Company personalities like individual ones do not readily fall in to neatly organized characteristics. Each is unique in many ways (Gellerman, 1960). Organizational climate can be thought as the personality of the organization. Climate serves as a basis for individuals to interpret situations, to act as a source of pressure and constraint for directing individual activity and determine in large measure the reward punishment system within the organization (Forehand and Gilmer, 1964; Gilmer, 1966; Pritchard and Karasick, 1973).

Clearly, individual perceptions of organizational climate depend both upon factors which influence the real nature of the climate and upon factors which affect the individual's perceptions of it. In this context four broad groupings of variables suggest themselves viz., contextual, technological and structural parameters of the overall organizational system; the position in the organization from which the individual views the climate including such factors as hierarchical status and pay; personal factors such as attributes of personality attitudes and levels of satisfaction and the views of others within the organization with whom
the individual interacts whether superiors, colleagues or subordinates.

The major issues of controversy over the concept of organizational climate could be identified with the questions whether climate refers to organizational attributes or characteristics of people; whether climate measures have to be objective; whether climate and job satisfaction overlap between themselves; whether a general agreement on a climate instrument measuring from one to 254 different dimensions, which most considering 20 to 80 items; and whether climate could be treated as an independent, a moderating and dependent variable.

**Operational perspectives of the organizational climate:**

As could be recognised operationalization of the definition of organizational climate has proceeded along two lines, objective and perceptual (Johanneson, 1973). Attempts to characterize organizational difference in terms of objective variables such as size, levels of authority, ratio of administrative personal to production personal, quality of formal rules, etc., are seen in literature (Palmer, 1961; Evan, 1963; Lawrence and Lorsch, 1967; and Prin and Ronan, 1971). The findings of the studies suggest that situational or environmental measures must be obtained independently of the individual's perception of them (Sells, 1963; Bloom, 1964). A few
researches conceives organizational climate to refer to a set of measurable properties of the work environment, perceived directly or indirectly by the people who live and work in this environment and assume to influence motivation and behavior (Litwin and Stringer, 1968). Geographical environment (the objective physical and social environment) could be distinguished from the behavioral environment (the environment as perceived and reacted to by the subject) (Koffka, 1935).

Measurement of organizational climate:

Industrial-organizational psychologists have shown more concern with measurement techniques than with understanding and expliciting the concept of climate (Litwin and Stringer, 1968; Taguiri and Litwin, 1968; and Schneider, 1975). The main confusion is attributed to the unit of analysis used in studies that is whether one is measuring psychological climate or studying the organizational climate. If climate is regarded as an organizational attribute, the term 'organizational climate' seems appropriate; when regarded as an individual attribute, a new design such as 'psychological climate' may be employed (James and Jones, 1974).

Controversy exists concerning the problem of measuring organizational climate, relationship between climate and various factors of job satisfaction, and the direction (causal influence) of the climate satisfaction linkage.

Attempts have been made by different investigators using individual perceptions, to measure aspects of climate in varied organizational settings (Friedlander and Margulies, 1969; and Campbell, et al., 1970).

The diversity of environments like business organizations, elementary schools, government agencies, research and development labs, there is widespread disagreement concerning with specific dimensions or components involved in it. Scales purporting to measure dimensions of climate proliferate while considerable difficulty is encountered in any attempt to draw meaningful conclusions or generalizations from the various sets of findings.

Three approaches have been identified with the three types of definitions and measurement of organizational climate viz., multiple measurement organizational attribute, perceptual measurement-organizational attribute, and
perceptual measurement-individual attribute (James and Jones, 1974). The multiple measurement-organizational attribute approach regards organizational climate exclusively as a set of organizational attributes or main effects measurable by a variety of methods (James and Jones, 1974). Variables constituting organizational climate include size, structure, systems complexity, levels of authority, etc. A few studies based on multiple measurement-organizational attribute are reported in literature (Evan, 1963; Lawrence and Lorsch, 1967; Pugh, et al., 1969; Prien and Ronan, 1971). The perceptual measurement-organizational attribute or main effect, but is measured via perceptual means. A few studies represent this approach in literature (Schneider and Bartlett, 1968; Schneider, 1972, 1973; Schneider and Hall, 1972; and James and Jones, 1974). These approaches to defining and measuring organizational climate are not mutually exclusive, but they do not illustrate the diversity which has arisen in the literature regarding the concept of organizational climate (James and Jones, 1974).

In the quest to develop a psychometrically sound standardized climate questionnaire applicable to a broad range of organizations, the specificity, and subsequent relevance of rewarded items would have to be sacrificed. At the present time the consequences of the trade-off between specific climate questionnaire applicable to many types of
organizations is unclear. Climates would be identified dependent upon our criterion of interest (Schneider, 1975).

Climate as dependent, independent and intervening variable:

A few studies have treated climate as a dependent variable. Climate is considered to be primarily affected by the leadership style used in an organization (Litwin and Stringer, 1968; Schneider and Bartlett, 1968). Climate has also been considered to be influenced by both leadership and coworker behavior (Fiedlander and Margulies, 1969).

It is contended that the structural design of an organization and the administrative procedures and processes that are in effect would seem to be likely influences on perceived organization climate; organization structure and such process variables as how pay is administered directly may affect such important parts of the objective environment as the rewards people receive, the kind of communication patterns that develop, and the amount of autonomy employees experience (Lawler, et al., 1974).

Climate may be conceptualized also as an independent rather than as an intervening or dependent variable. Many studies on the relationship between climate and such variables as aroused individual needs for power, affiliation and achievement, job satisfaction, performance, agency success, organizational income and turnover, treat climate as an independent

People's perception of an organization's climate should be related to the psychologically important characteristics of the objective environment such as the interpersonal style of the leaders, the nature of the interpersonal relationships among peers, the nature of job, the structure of the organization, and the reward systems (Vroom, 1964).

Climate can be further conceptualized as an intervening variable. Climate is not an output or dependent variable in the sense that performance and turnover are outputs. Climate is not to be regarded as an independent variable since it can be directly manipulated.

A few researchers have attempted to manipulate some aspects of the organization leading to differential climate perceptions (Schneider and Hall, 1972; Dieterly and Schneider, 1974).

People (Priests) in different roles, different tasks seem to result in a perception of the work environment as challenging and meaningful (Schneider and Hall, 1972). In laboratory setting it is possible to show that different climate perceptions (and also differential performance and satisfaction) can be achieved as a function of three
company president styles by manipulating the formal policies of an organization (Litwin and Stringer, 1968).

Specific work activities and climate are reported to be related (Schneider and Hall, 1972). Local office conditions have been found to influence climate (Pritcharcj and Karasick, 1973).

The fact that organizational properties are closely related individual behavior often emphasizes the role of perception of organizational properties as an intervening variable (Forehand and Gilmer, 1964).

Central importance is assigned in the interaction-influence model to organizational characteristics as they are perceived by employee. The causal variables structure, climate, objectives, supervisory practices, etc. are recognized to interact with personality to produce perceptions and it is only through these perceptions that the relationship between causal and end result variables may be understood (Likert, 1961).

Research Strategies:

Payne and Pugh (1976) have explicitly discussed three research strategies for identifying the relationship between organizational climate and characteristics of individual members. As a first step, one might collect data from an individual about his perceptions of climate and relate
them to other individual variables. Secondly, one might assign an individual mean organizational score derived from his/others perception of organizational climate and relate this to other variables which characterize the individual. It is possible to measure climate variance between individuals and calculate an individual climate discrepancy score which reflects the difference between his score and the groups mean climate score and then relate this discrepancy score to some independent variables. Thirdly, one might measure individuals within a given organization on variables such as personality and calculate a group of organizational score for each of these variables and relate these to the group or organizational climate score.


Other studies have employed a specific taxonomy to investigate relationships between climate and other variables, such as structure (Payne and Mansfield, 1973; Dieterly and Schneider, 1974; and Lawler, et al., 1974)

The concept of Alienation:

The origin of the concept of alienation, or estrangement is traced back to the writings of Plotinus. The fore runner of the term alienation is found in the Greek 'ekenosen' and the Latin 'exinanivit' and the term 'Entausserung'. The last mentioned term may be directly translated as 'self actualization'.

Since the writings of Marx, the concept of alienation has emancipated from the metaphysical clutches to a large extent. Alienation is no longer held to be inherent in man's 'being in the world', but rather in his being in a particular historical world, that of 'of alienated labor' (Marx, 1973).

Marx and the Post-Marxians have discussed the concern with human life under conditions of growing mechanization, specialization and dependence on an 'objectified'
or 'refined' external world. Marx and his followers emphasized that the industrial conditions under capitalism lead to dehumanization of the proletarian. The inspirations for the Marxian approach could be traced back to the writings of Herder and Schiller (1922). Schiller has himself alluded to dehumanization process and conditions contributing to it and envisaged that art and education may contribute to recovering the lost harmony. However, Marx and his coworkers have denounced the idealist tendency to seek refuge in a realm beyond that of ordinary material existence and emphasized materialistic solutions to overpower alienation. An industrial worker is, considered protection and that all the consequence result from the fact that the worker is related to the product of his labour as to an alien object. Hence, real producer could not recognize himself under conditions of alienated labour. Work under capitalistic industrial conditions is said to estrange the worker both from nature and from himself. Alienation is attributed to society, and specifically to the exploitation of the worker by the nonworker capitalist.

Alienation is recognized in literature as an important phenomenon connoting to individual's dehumanizing industrial social psychological conditions. A few investigators have complained on the ambiguity of the term and have suggested that the term itself should be removed from usage (Fetter, 1963). However, the concept has still useful purposes
to serve and used by contemporary researchers in their writings on the social and organizational conditions (Horowitz, 1966; Korman, 1977; Vendal, 1982 and Michael, 1985). As used in current literature alienation is taken to mean spectrum of experiences of dissatisfaction, disharmony, and dissatisfaction showing the future of, deriving from or involving feelings of alienation of some sort (Schachi, 1971). Writers and analysts of the social and organizational conditions in 19th century used the concept of alienation to denote a distinctly identifiable characteristics of certain experiences in the social context (Weber, 1930; Durheim, 1933; Parsons, 1952, 1967 and Marx, 1973).

The concept has been made popular by Marxian writings since the contribution by Marx (1973) on alienation experience of peasants and workers. Alienation has been operationalized by Seeman (1967) and he contends that the dimensions of powerlessness, normlessness, meaninglessness, social isolation and self estrangement comprise of alienation as an experience. The alienation is a multidimensional concept elaborated in the work of Neal and Retting (1963).

Powerlessness, normlessness and meaninglessness are regarded as the conditions predisposing an individual to alienation (Faunce, 1968). Under such condition isolation

The pioneering investigators conceived alienation as a resultant of factory conditions which typically involve the hierarchical leadership conditions and the specialization and routinization of factory work. These conditions deny a man part of his being leading to struggle for survival. Hence, under such conditions one feels separated, or estranged from the kind of life he is capable of. Essentially, alienation results when one is forced to play a role rather than assuming role of his choice. Feeling of alienation could be attributed to the condition wherein a worker has to give up his or her control over his or her own fate and desire for self expression in return for a wage.

That a worker in a factory is essentially suffering from alienation has been well adumbrated by the Marxian proposition and also receives support in the work of Kornhauser (1965). Findings contradicting the proposition just cited are also reported in literature (Bartlome, 1972; Ramey, 1972; Form, 1973; and Tarnowieski, 1973). Atleast one investigator
(Blauner, 1964) has suggested that the type of industry may play a role in determining scope for alienation in an industrial setting.

It has been hypothesized by Korman (1977) that job characteristics such as role ambiguity and role conflict, role over lead—qualitative and quantitative interaction across organizational boundaries, responsibility for people and lack of participation are comparable to conditions predisposing to alienation. The inspiration for hypothesis has come from the work of French and Caplan (1973). Korman (1977) observes that Marxian hypotheses are narrow and are based on oversimplification of reality. He holds that several other dimensions of work experience in different areas of work might be worthy of other research to understand alienation. It is unlikely, Korman (1977) contends hierarchical and external control, in and of themselves, generate alienation. Rather, the alienation occurs depending upon who sets the guides, the working individual or some external force. It is here that the differences in styles and systems of management become significant in a psychological analysis.
The Concepts of Anxiety and Job Related Tension:

The concept of anxiety refers to a sense of threat of impending disaster, a growing feeling that despite best efforts to protect some unforeseen danger will unpredictably strike out. Originally anxiety was regarded as a negative emotion and work on anxiety emphasized the role of negative aversive and unpleasant emotions in general. Kierkegaard (1984) and Bain (1859, 1899) have focussed their attention on anxiety in the existential philosophical writings. Bain (1859, 1899) emphasize the motivational aspects of anxiety. Psychologists in the 20th century have popularize the concept and have emphasized a role played by anxiety in various conditions. Anxiety is regarded as a concept unifying perspectives of various aspects of a broad complex of phenomena.

Freud (1916-1917)(1952) conceives anxiety as transformed libido. He conceives that whenever an organism is prevented from carrying out instinctually motivated act anxiety will result. The resultant anxiety may serve as a motive for a symptom that inturn function to terminate or completely prevent the occurrence of anxiety (Freud,1926; 1936). In subsequent writings Freud maintains that it is possible that both repression and anxiety mutually interact and influence each other. Anxiety essentially is related to the inability of organism to cope with situation that threatens to overwhelm.
Anxiety is regarded as a drive in Hullian paradigm (Hull, 1933). Anxiety is regarded as a conditioned response and has been extremely applied to complex human behavior (Dollard and Miller, 1950). Anxiety is regarded as a mediating mechanism in learning situation (Mowrer, 1960). When an organism avoids a situation anxiety serves as a mediating mechanism to preclude the occurrence of noxious or painful event.

Existential psychologists content that the very consideration of possibilities and potential courses of action leads to anxiety. Choice involves to anxiety and the antecedents of anxiety are presumed to be the very existence of man in a world in which choices exist.

Distinction could be validly made between state and trait anxiety. State anxiety is regarded to be a more transitory experience, as in the person who is anxious about an upcoming test. Trait anxiety is regarded to be a more stable disposition of the person. The relation between the two concepts of state and trait anxiety has been well enunciated in literature

"analogous .... to the relation between physical concepts of kinetic and potential energy. State anxiety like kinetic energy, reports to .... a reaction which is taking place now at a given level of intensity. Trait anxiety like potential energy, indicates a latent disposition for a reaction of a certain type to occur if it is triggered by appropriate (sufficiently stressful) stimuli",

(Spielberger, 1966b p.16)
Tension is regarded as a negative emotional aspect. Tension arises when an organism encounters uncertainty. Essentially conflict leads to job related tension (Kahn, et al., 1964). Tension may be taken to indicate internal motivational conflict. Chronic conditions of conflict in one's work role tend to be tension provoking. Role ambiguity leads to increased emotional tension. Tension is associated with uncertainty on the part of the role actor and also the uncertainty in evaluations of his or her associate about him or her. Absence of information about how one is esteemed by his or her associates remains to be a major source of tension. It is also reported that the effects of experience ambiguity on tension are considerably more pronounced for those who have high need for cognition than those who have low need.

Uncertainty induces anxiety and tension. Both anxiety and tension have negative motivational properties. The negative motivational properties will combine with other motives present in a situation and influence the behavior.

The concept of Probabilistic Orientation:

One source of individual differences in temperament may be identified with the orientation of individuals. Extraversion Introversion (Jung, 1923; Eysenck, 1957), Dogmatism Conservatism Internal-External locus of control (Rotter, et al., 1972; Lefcourt, 1983) are a few of the orientations explored.
in present researchers. Another attempt to identify individuals' orientations in terms of allegiance to a set of beliefs called Probabilistic Orientation is witnessed in a recent research (Narayanan, 1979). The concept of probabilistic orientation has been derived from an analysis of the attitudinal orientations found among mature individuals as documented in ancient Indian literature. Succinctly, probabilistic orientation connotes the awareness of the individual of the total condition here and now. Probabilistic orientation enables the individual to be completely aware of all the possible contingencies in a situation. This enables the individuals to be alert and disposes him to meet any possible outcome without resorting to labeling it good or bad, luck or odd luck, fortune or misfortune. Probabilistic orientation contribute to greater tolerance on the part of the individual and a clear perception of reality. It is plausible that probabilistic orientation facilitate coping with reality by coming into grip with reality with total awareness.

The prototype of the concept of probabilistic orientation is contained in an ancient Tamil literature called Purananuru (Meaning, an anthology of 400 poems pertaining to external adventure in life). The conception of Probabilistic orientation is well documented in one of the 400 poems of Purananuru. It is written by one Kanian Poonkundranar, a Poet, Philosopher. The poem has been rendered
A balanced perception of freedom and bondage available to an individual in reality characteristics probabilistic orientation. In every situation exists the scope for effort. But, several contingencies exist in course of an effort resulting in success. Such contingencies may remain implicit or explicit in different conditions. The freedom available to an individual is limited by a dynamic sequential programming of contingencies set in Nature since evolution. It is possible to compare the freedom available to an individual, to that of the freedom available to the individual for drawing a specific ball from among the balls containing in an urn by when attempting to blindly picking up the balls one by one without replacement. Admittedly, single effort could alter the evergoing serial program in Nature at every step, but every time the Gestalt of the conditions also change along with an outcome.

Attempts to relate probabilistic orientation to a host of psychological variables such as personality, cognition, motivation and social variables are available in literature.

It is reported that adults who are highly probabilistically oriented are found to have greater security as expressed by themselves on Security-Insecurity Inventory
(Maslow, 1954; Narayanan and Govindarasu, 1984). Since the findings are based on correlation between scores of the Ss on a Probabilistic Orientation Questionnaire and Security-Insecurity Inventory it is plausible that both probabilistic orientation and security are mutually interrelated to each other in a dynamic manner. Probabilistic Orientation may contribute to security and security to probabilistic orientation (Narayanan and Govindarasu, 1984).

Probabilistic orientation may be regarded to be a non cognitive variable. It is reported in a study of school boys and girls that the level of intelligence and creativity do not have any significant effect on probabilistic orientation (Natarajan, 1983).

Probabilistic orientation is not directly having any effect on the mental health of individuals (Narayanan and Govindarasu, 1984; Jayaraj, 1984). Probabilistic orientation is also not correlated with adoption-innovation characteristics of individuals (Narayanan, 1984; Jayaraj, 1984).

Probabilistic orientation is reported to be meaningfully related to pattern of aspiration among adolescents (Narayanan, 1984). The findings of the study suggest that probabilistic orientation is having significant effect on mean level of aspiration and negatively related to mean level of performance, goal discrepancy and achievement discrepancy.
Rotter's Level of Aspiration Board was made use of in the study to assess level of aspiration (Narayanan, 1984).

Age is found to have a significant effect on probabilistic orientation in the case of elders and not in the case of adults (Narayanan, 1984). Adults differ significantly from elders in probabilistic orientation; the elders are more probabilistically oriented than adults.

Probabilistic orientation has significant effect on internal-external orientation (Narayanan, 1983). Different pattern of relationship between Probabilistic orientation and the MMPI characteristics is found and reported (Narayanan, 1983). Probabilistic orientation positively correlates with hypochondriasis and psychopathic deviate and negatively correlates with masculinity. Femininity, Schizophrenia and social introversion varying pattern of relationship between Probabilistic orientation and Holland Personality Dimension is also reported (Narayanan, 1984). Probabilistic orientation is also reported to correlate with certain personal variables (Narayanan, 1984). It significantly correlates with variety, practical mindedness, orderliness, decisiveness and typically, not related to achievement.

Likert (1967) well documented the impact of systems management on human relations. The evidence from the large scale field experiments and other studies indicates that the
toward manager and high motivation to produce. System 4 management has been demonstrated to have significant effect on motivation, decision making process and performance goals. Under system 4 the motivational forces arising from non economic motives of members and from their economic needs will be harmonious and compatible. Further, the motivational forces within each individual will result in cooperative behavior focused on achieving organizational goals.

**Systems and Job Reactions:**

The review of literature presented in this chapter suggest that individuals depict differing patterns of perceiving their organizational environment. Both subjective and objective evaluations take place in climate perception. Organizations have their own personality and their pattern of functioning in different dimensions of management is consistent and long enduring. These gives rise to organization systems.

The long enduring characteristics of the system of management tends to influence the motivation of the individual members of the organization. Likert (1961; 1967) has shown it possible that four typical systems could be identified. The systems of management induce different patterns of motivation since they act as a causal variable and motivation remains to be intervening variable. It is plausible that Likert's system analysis have a wide generality.
System 4 may contribute to a reduction of negative motivational states among the members of the organization and system 1, increase the negative motivation among the members.

A few studies have also shown that individual's personality characteristics may influence perception of organizational climate. The various studies reviewed in this chapter lend some support to the partial model of systems-job reactions given in chapter 1.

Organization Climate and Job Reactions:

The consideration of research perspectives presented thus far suggest that the systems of organization has reasonable effect on motivation of the members of the organization. The work of Lewin, et.al., (1939) has classically demonstrated the effect of experimentally simulated climate on members of the groups including their motivation. Simulation different kinds of business organizations has been reported to stimulate different kinds of motivation, generate distinctive attitudes about a person's relationship with others, strongly influence both feelings of satisfaction and performance level. Different kinds of climate arouse achievement, affiliation and power motives (Litwin and Stringer, 1968). Authoritarian structured climate is said to raise power motivation, lower self acceptance, commonality and responsibility, increase tension and encourage withdrawal, lower job satisfaction, increase
management system of an organization exercises an important influence on its labour relations. It is reported that marked change in union management relationships occurs when the firm shifts its management system from system 2 to system 4. Though real and important differences continued to exist between the union and the company there was a great increase in the capacity to attain acceptable solutions to difficult problems as the shift toward system 4 progress. The shift resulted in improvement in labour relations. Labour relations appear to be best in plants whose management system falls toward the system 4 and they are poorest in plants whose management system falls toward the system 1. The relationship improves when the management shifts towards system 4 and the worsen when the shift towards system 1.

Likert (1961, 1967) has summarized the dynamics of the systems in his conceptual model based on empirical models. When system 1 or 2 is used by manager the organization is said to display less group loyalty, lower performance goals, greater conflict and less cooperation, less technical assistance to peers, greater feeling of unreasonable pressure, less favourable attitudes toward manager and lower motivation to produce. When the manager follows system 4 the organization is said to display greater group loyalty, higher performance goals, greater cooperation, more technical assistance to peers, less feelings to unreasonable pressure, more favourable attitudes.
acceptance of others ideas, discourage independence and lower performance. A democratic climate is said to give rise to affiliation motivation, lower the responsibility and less mature attitude towards work. The achieving climate arouse achievement motivation, higher job satisfaction and perceived efficiency (Litwin and Stringer, 1968). The relationship between climate perception and satisfaction is demonstrated in another study (Friedlander and Margulies, 1969). That school climate is related to students' sense of alienation has been demonstrated in another study (Hoggy, 1984).

A relationship between civil liberties climate, job satisfaction and alienation has been exploded in another study. It is reported that the civil liberty climate positively correlate with job satisfaction and negatively with alienation. In the case of climate alienation relationship the correlation reported is significant only in the case of females and not in the case of males (David, 1983).

A study has explored the relationship between perceived organizational climate and motivation defined in terms of sales. A significant correlation between organizational climate variables and motivation is reported in the study (Kumar, 1981).

While the studies cited above conclusively suggest that climate may induce different motivational patterns
another set of studies reveal that an individual's personality and other variables may influence climate perception itself. The extent to which an individual perceives and understands an organizational goals may depend upon perceptions of skills and attitudes (Gilmer, 1966). In general how an individual perceives his or her organizational climate is influenced only to a lesser extent (Forehand and Gilmer, 1964).

A correlation study reveals that organizational climate assessed by Likert is not related to personality orientation conceived by Bass (1962). However, deprivation of need satisfaction (Porter, 1966) is reported to lead to negative perception of organizational climate (Ganesan, 1978).

A study has attempted to relate organizational climate to personality factors (EPPS). The results reveal two aggressive personality factors to exist and to be negatively related to perceptions of organizational climate. The first factor is loaded with dominance, abasement, order, succorance, exhibition and achievement. The second factor is loaded with autonomy, aggression, deference, and succorance (Philip, 1983).

A study comparing the perception of organizational climate of the employees and that of employers has given a clue to interpret relationship between climate perception and other factors. The study reveals that workers and employees agree markedly with regard to the nascent bureaucratic
performance level. The findings further reveal that achievement motivation, affiliation motivation and power motivation are aroused different kinds of climate. Specifically, the authoritarian, structured climate gives rise to a high level of power motivation, lowering of self acceptance, commonality and responsibility, suggesting tension and withdrawal, lowered job satisfaction and attitudes were generated which suggest members to be close to others' ideas, independent, and rebellious toward authority and organizational performance was generally low under this climate condition. On the contrary, a friendly democratic climate gives rise to a high level of affiliation motivation, lowering the responsibility and suggests a less mature attitude towards work.

In another study the relationship between climate and satisfaction was explored (Friedlander and Margulies, 1969). The subjects who placed high on the satisfaction dimensions maximized satisfaction in a climate of high thrust, high intimacy, and low in hinderance. The low value group maximised satisfaction in a climate high in spirit, low in dissension, and low in disruption (disengagement) which has well demonstrated the interaction between personality and environmental variables (Friedlander and Margulies, 1969).

Influence of climate on job and work attitudes has been investigated in another study (David, 1983). Specifically,
the study is concerned with civil liberties climate in work organizations as perceived by employees and its relationship with job satisfaction and alienation. The findings reveal that the civil liberties climate was positively correlated with job satisfaction and negatively with alienation at statistically significant levels. Preferred climate, it is reported, did not act as a moderator for these relationships. Further, for the climate-alienation relationship, the correlation was reported to be significant for females but not for males. Sex is reported to be a moderator value in this study. Self esteem, general civil liberties and the number of levels of the organizations also reported to show some evidence of moderating the relationships of climate with satisfaction and alienation.

Whether high and low groups identified on work commitment, Alienation, Probabilistic Orientation and Role Conflict would differ in their perception of organizational climate has been examined in a study (Indumathi, 1986). The findings of the study show that the profiles of the perception of organizational climate of the high and low groups on each of the variables studied differ not in kind but in degree. Specifically, the profiles of perception of organizational climate of the groups are found to be parallel, coincident but not at level. The high and low groups on the variables also consistently differ with regard to their perception of