HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY

Rationale for Formulation of Hypotheses:

It may be stated as an axiom that behaviour is a function of interaction between organism and environment (Murray, 1938; Lewin, et al., 1939; Brunswik, 1956; Cronbach, 1957; Barton, 1961). The work of Lewin, et al., 1939 has demonstrated that the assumptions that social, psychological context has an impact on the individual creating climate holds good in group organizational behaviour. The existence of social climate in industries and organization could hardly be questioned (Roethlisberger and Dickson, 1939; Dunnette, 1972). The genesis of organizational psychology could be attributed to the recognition of the interaction between the individual and the group in industrial setting (Meltzer and Nord, 1973).

A few studies have attempted to investigate the influence of organizational climate on motivation of the individuals. Litwin and Stringer (1968) have applied McClelland’s theory of motivation to climate research. They simulated three business organizations headed by the president with a distinct leadership style and investigated the possible influence of climate on people. The findings reveal that different climates will stimulate different kinds of motivation, generate distinctive attitudes about a person's relationship with others and strongly influenced both feelings of satisfaction and
structures but disagree significantly with regard to their perception of personal environment when they express the responses to items in climate questionnaire that describe the environment in an emotional tone (Narayanan and Venkatachalam, 1979).

A study has related organizational perception to work commitment, alienation, probabilistic orientation and role conflict (Indumathi, 1986). The findings show that the profiles of the perception of organizational climate of the high and low groups on each of the variables differ not in kind but in degree. The high work commitment group has consistently a higher score on all the nine dimensions of organizational climate (Litwin and Stringer, 1968) compared to the low work commitment groups. The pattern of results pertaining to the similarities and differences between the high work commitment and low work commitment groups seem to hold good in the case of low alienation group and high alienation group, high probabilistic orientation group and low role conflict group and high role conflict group (Indumathi, 1986).
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Whether the workers and the employees in an organizational unit would differ in their perception of the climate and that the members of highly productive units may differ from the members of less productive units in their perceptions of climate have been studied in an investigation (Narayanan and Venkatachalam, 1982). The findings reveal that the employees perceive the climate of their units to be more human-oriented (System 2) while the workers perceive the climate as more task-oriented (System 3). Groups high and low in productivity do not show any difference with regard to the perception of climate. The findings further show that the agreement about perceptions of organizational climate lies along a continuum ranging from consonance to dissonance. Workers and employees agree markedly with regard to their nascent bureaucratic structures. But, they disagree significantly with regard to
of their perception, personal environment especially when they encounter items about climate which describe the environment emotionally (Narayanan and Venkatachalam, 1982).

Another study reports that supervisors feel that the organization is operating at System 3 level i.e., Consultative type with regard to the climate characteristics, Leadership, Motivation and Communication. With respect to Decision making and Goals the organization exhibits the nature of System 2 i.e., Benevolent authoritarian. For the climate characteristic of control it is slightly System 3. The organization in which the study was conducted is a public sector undertaking wholly owned by Government of India is paternalistic in nature and its produce is the monopoly in the domestic market (Mohankumar, 1981).

The relationship between perception and satisfactions regarding the various dimensions of organizational climate for creativity has been investigated in a study. The finding suggests that the two variables just cited are distinct though related (i.e., descriptive and evaluative). The findings of the study further suggest that organizational climate for creativity results in the fulfilment of need for self actualization. The study further reports that organizational climate for creativity for low level will not result eliciting the organizational behaviours relating to achievement, affiliation,
autonomy and dominance. In the absence of suitable climate for creativity, knowledge workers with high ideational fluency do not have more job involvement are give more importance to orderive more satisfaction from work life than the low creatives (Ganesan, 1985).

The perceptions of psychological influence would be related significantly to situational attributes, including supervisor behaviors, individual characteristics and person by situation interactions. The findings of the study have supported these assumptions and suggested that a cognitive information processing model assists in explaining environmental perceptions (James, et al, 1979). Specifically the study supports that perceptions of psychological influence will be related positively to achievement motivation and job involvement and negatively to externality, anxiety and education. The findings of the study generally support the predictions tested.

A model of Psychological Influence:

James, et al., (1979) have attempted to integrate psychological climate with (cognitive) social learning theory and interactional psychology. Psychological 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" (ibid, p.786). Further, psychological climate perceptions are
regarded as a function of proximal situational events. It is further assumed that the primary situational events that affect psychological climate are those that are proximal to the experiences of the individual in a particular environment (ibid. p.805).

While climate perceptions are primarily accommodative bending to the need to develop an adequate person environment fit in each new situation (Schneider, 1975), they are historical, in that they are affected by the prior learning and cognitive predispositions. Hence, it may be suggested that not only psychological climate perceptions would differ among individuals in the same or similar situations, but also that the reasons for these differences remain to be psychologically important.

It is contended that psychological climate perceptions are function of both person variables and Person X situation interactions, since, the higher ordering schemes and environmental perceptions are predisposed toward the construction of a subjective reality that is compatible with such factors as existing (or desired) attributions, beliefs, needs, self-concepts, and self-regulatory systems (Mischel, 1973, 1976; Erdelyi, 1974). Hence, individuals with different attributions, needs and values, which reflect different learning experiences may be
considered to be cognitively predisposed to differ somewhat they judge to be (i.e., perceive as) influencing.

The interaction between self and work environment has been focussed in self-implementation theory stated by Korman (1977). Korman observes that the persistent opinion one has of oneself, a generalized feeling regarding the level of competency and the opinion one has of oneself based upon a situation, a feeling regarding competency in handling certain kinds of tasks and a feeling of competency based upon the given social contexts of the moment contribute to performance in work organizations. It could be argued that to the extent performance and competency are related in organization, chronic situational and socially defined perceived self-competency will influence the climate.

Festinger (1957) has elaborated his theory of cognitive dissonance pointing that conflict occurs when beliefs or assumptions are contradicted by new information. Since conflict produces feelings of discomfort it is likely that individual having conflict may attempt to assuage the feelings by actually reconciling the differences, convincing himself or herself that they do not exist, or by generating various defense mechanisms. Succinctly, there appears to be a desire for consistency or consonance, in human behavior and a need to make inconsistent or incongruent
dissonant experiences constant. The relevance of cognitive dissonance to work climate has been made explicit by Rosenbaum (1982). Rosenbaum suggests that if workers have negative perceptions about themselves, they need negative outcomes to achieve the consistent result; work climates which focus on incompetence inspire incompetent performances, just as work climates which focus on self-competency inspire competent performances.

Job reactions also colour climate perceptions both at micro and macro level. Here again, individual characteristics have a role to play in deciding the perception of organizational variables. Individual characteristics not only colour perceptions of organizational climate both at macro and micro levels but also interact job reactions. Job reactions may be regarded to reinforce individual motivational characteristics and contribute to differences in perception of the organization.

A Partial Model of the Climate-Job Reactions Relationship:

In view of the research findings on organizational climate and motivational constructs reviewed in this chapter it is plausible to construct a partial model of the climate-job reactions relationship. Such a model might help identifying and delineating job reactions under different systems of management. The hypothetical model herein attempted owes to Steers (1977).
The hypothetical model presented in chapter 1 is specifically confirmed to only the few variables used in this study. The organizational variables conceived by Likert (1961, 1967) give rise to organizational climate. The climate contribute to different job reactions in individuals. Similarly, the characteristics of the individuals also lead to different job reactions. Essentially, the climate and individual characteristics interact and decide the job reactions.

Specific Hypotheses Developed in the Study:

It is plausible that the four systems of organizational characteristics denoted by the Tables Exploitive Authoritative, Benevolent Authoritative, Consultative and Participative fall in a linear fashion on a continuum and are correlated with typical job reactions like alienation, anxiety and tension. Again, the personality traits like alienation, anxiety and probabilistic orientation may be influencing the organizational perception especially with regard to climate perception. The specific hypotheses along with the research questions which generated them stated in Chapter V stem from the conceptual model herein conceived.
OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS OF THE VARIABLES INVOLVED IN THE HYPOTHESES

The following operational definitions are adapted in conceiving the variables involved in the hypotheses of the present study.

Systems of management: The systems of management are operationally defined as the four patterns of management viz., Exploitive Authoritative, Benevolent Authoritative, Consultative and Participative identified by Likert (1967).

Organizational Characteristics: The organizational characteristics are operationally defined as Leadership processes, Motivational forces, Communication process, Interaction-influence process, Decision-making process, Goal setting or ordering, Control process and Performance goals and training that provide a valid description of the pattern of management practiced in an organization (Likert, 1967).

State Alienation: The State Alienation is operationally defined as the score of an individual on the AQ.
Trait Alienation : The Trait Alienation is operationally defined as the score of an individual on the ASs.

State Anxiety : The State Anxiety is operationally defined as the score of an individual on the State Anxiety Scale in STAI.

Trait Anxiety : The Trait Anxiety is operationally defined as the score of an individual on the Trait Anxiety Scale of the STAI.

Job Related Tension : The Job Related Tension is operationally defined as the score of an individual on the JRTI.

Probabilistic Orientation : The Probabilistic Orientation is operationally defined as the score of an individual on the POQ.