CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION
INTRODUCTION

People in the society spend a large portion of their lives in big organizations - colleges, schools, industries, government etc. The environment of these organizations has very important consequences for individual himself as well as for the manner in which he carries out a task for the organization. The ways with which he carries out a given task also depends on what kind of person he is. Climate and its related terms are used to explain that a person or a group may behave in a very different way when faced with similar task or problem. To take care of these variations in performance due to interpersonal variables such as attitudes and personality, it is essential to study the environment in which a person works. In this context, the phrase 'Organizational climate' is becoming current.

Many problems are faced by the researcher while dealing with environmental determinants in behavioral sciences. Psychologists and Sociologists found that certain difficulties
are common while dealing with the concept of organizational climate, such as: Firstly, it is difficult to distinguish between the "objective" and "subjective" environment. In other words, one cannot differentiate between "actual" and "conceptual" situation. However, Koffka (1935) drew a distinction between "geographical" environment and "behavioral" environment. He suggested that "geographical" environment includes objective, physical and social environment in which the individual is immersed, while "behavioral" environment is that which is perceived and reacted by the behaving individual. Again "subjective" environment may vary from person to person; Secondly, it is difficult to distinguish between "person" and "environment" because behaviour is a function of "person" and "environment". Angyal (1941) suggested that it is difficult to make a boundary between where the person "ends" and environment "begins." Thirdly, there is a problem of environmental aspects. What should be included in the concept of organization? What elements or aspects of environment should be focussed on? The problem is that the markedly different aspects of the environment become relevant depending upon the conditions internal to the person and upon variations in the environment itself; Lastly, the problem of structural and dynamic properties of an environment also comes. Sells (1963) suggested a
factorial approach to the problem of dimensions of environment, because the factorial relationship would reflect both content and structure. He found it difficult to distinguish between "the stimulus" and "other external determinants of behaviour" in respect to structure of environment.

ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE

The term "climate" is used in different contexts. McClelland (1965) defined it as a set of generalized attitudes and beliefs that exist in a community or nation. Crombie (1963) described technical, intellectual and social climate necessary for scientific and technical innovation. He found that these three aspects of environment constitute the total climate.

Organizational climate researchers occupy a popular position in current industrial and organizational psychology. However, conceptual and operational definition, measurement techniques, and ensuing results are highly diverse and contradictory. Guion (1973) concluded that the organizational climate represents a "fuzzy" concept. In order to remove these diversities and contradictions in the concept, it became necessary to review the major conceptualizations, definitions and measurement approaches regarding organizational climate. Approaches of organizational climate: James and Jones (1974) suggested that there are three separate
but not mutually exclusive approaches to define and measure organizational climate. These approaches are:

1. Multiple measurement - Organizational attribute approach: Representative of this approach is the definition of organizational climate as, 

"set of characteristics that describes an organization and that (a) distinguish the organization from other organizations (b) are relatively enduring over time (c) influence the behaviour of people in the organization" (Forehand and Gilmer, 1964).

Forehand and Gilmer (1964) postulated that the effect of organizational climate on individual could be seen in terms of the definition of stimuli presented to the individual members, the constraints placed upon the individuals' freedom of choice regarding behaviour, and the reward or punishment process. They further stated that the measurement of organizational climate at the organizational level rests on the assumption that an internally consistent and homogeneous set of measurements for organizational climate exist for at least organizational subunits and that these measurements are relatively permanent over time.

From a general standpoint, studies which may be included under the multiple measurement - organizational attribute approach are determined simply by one's definition of organizational climate. Following the broad definition of Forehand and Gilmer (1964), the
following areas of study would be appropriate: Studies of organizational models and taxonomies (e.g., Katz and Kahn, 1966; Sells, 1963), organizational context (e.g., Lawrence and Lorsch, 1967), and organizational structure. In addition, this broad definition would encompass system values and norms (Katz and Kahn, 1966) as well as studies on the different facets of organizational and subgroup processes such as leadership, conflict, reward, communication, and control. Indeed, any study focusing on organizational or group characteristics would be included in the general area of organizational climate.

2. Perceptual measurements - Organizational attribute approach - The definitions discussed under the head of multiple measurement - organizational attribute approach give excessive attention to the organization as a whole and place insufficient emphasis on perceptions of the members of the organization. The greater stress should be made on the idea that the environment is interpreted by the members of the organization to have a certain quality which they affect their attitude and motivation.

Campbell et al. (1970) identified four categories of the organizational situation, which are (a) structural properties (b) Environmental characteristics (c) organizational climate and (d) the formal role characteristics. Organizational climate was defined as:
a set of attributes specific to a particular organization that may be induced from the way the organization deals with its members and its environment. For the individual member with an organization, climate takes the form of a set of attitudes and expectations which describe the organization in terms of both static (such as degree of autonomy) characteristics and behaviour - outcome and outcome - outcome contingencies.

Campbell et al., (1970) identified the following dimensions of organizational climate:

(a) Individual autonomy.
(b) The degree of structure imposed upon the position.
(c) Reward orientation.
(d) Consideration, warmth and support.

Pritchard and Karasick (1973) defined organizational climate based upon a number of previous definitions, (Gilmer, 1966; Litwin and Stringer, 1968; Taguiri, 1968):

Organizational climate is a relatively enduring quality of an organization’s internal environment distinguishing it from other organizations:
(a) which results from the behaviour and policies of members of the 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. Thus, they indicated that the climate of an organization should be measured perceptually.
Guion (1973) concluded that climate researchers were confused as to whether climate was an organizational attribute or an individual attribute. If considered an organizational attribute but measured perceptually, then he concluded that the accuracy of perception should be validated against objective, external measures of the situation or at least validated against consensus of perceptions.

Perception has been defined as, "the meaningful interpretation of sensations as representative of external objects." Cohen (1969) revealed that the perceptions are the sole internal representativeness of external objects - the mind's reflection of matter. Thus, perception is an internal representation of external objects and is subject to influence by several individual differences.

3. Perceptual measurement - Individual attribute approach: Schneider and Bartlett (1970) described organizational climate as a set of summary or global perceptions held by individuals about their organizational environment. These summary perceptions reflected an interaction between personal and organizational characteristics, in which the individual by forming climate perceptions "acts as an information processor using inputs from (a) the objective events in the organization (b) characteristics of the organization and (c) characteristics of the perceiver. Schneider (1973) showed that climate took the "form of situation..."
specific value" which reflected "those aspects of the situation to which individual attach importance."
Organizational climate was viewed as a summary evaluation of events based upon the interaction between actual events and the perceptions of those events.

Climate was conceptualized as an "intervening variable," because it was caused by discrete experiences and in turn caused later behaviours. Because of its intervening and perceptual nature, organizational climate was regarded as neither an independent variable subject to manipulation nor an outcome criterion. Second, and of major importance, organizational climate was seen as an individual attribute. Friedlander and Margulies (1969) viewed the relationship between situational variables and individual variables as dependent on the intervening variables of perceived organizational climate.

The review of the perceptual measurement - individual attribute approach appears representative of the approach to serve as a basis for the following critique. Although it was assumed that situational and individual characteristics interact to produce intervening variables, such an assumption does not mean that perceived climate is different from an individual attribute. Rather, the intervening variables are individual attributes which provide a bridge between the situation and behaviour. The point is that the interaction, intervention, and perception take place in the individual and therefore are individual attributes.
Accuracy and/or consensus are not a question when climate is treated as an individual attribute because it is the individual's perceptions that are important, not the objective situation (Guion, 1973).

Many of the criticisms of organizational climate as a perceived organizational attribute are equally appropriate for climate as a perceived individual attribute. House and Rizzo (1972) demonstrated that many organizational climate dimensions measure the same constructs as well - known role and leadership factors is an example.

The perceptual measurement - individual attribute approach to organizational climate has been criticized by Johannesen (1973), who concluded that "measuring climate via perceptual self-report measures may result in the replication of the work attitude literature" and by Guion (1973), who stated that the conceptualization of organizational climate as an individual attribute amounted to a "rediscovery of the wheel". This does not construed to mean that the idea of perceptual intervening variable is in question, but rather that the perceived intervening variables have already been identified and a new term such as climate is not needed.

Dimensions of organizational climate: There is a need of different methods which can measure and assess the concept of organizational climate. Thus, it become necessary to construct an instrument that could collect
member's perceptions and subjective responses to the organizational environment. Only then, the climate of an organization can be defined feasibly, as sum of the perceptions of the individuals working in that organization.

Organizational climate may be of several types. Laboratory and industrial studies have isolated several 'dimensions' of climate in an impressive manner which should be primarily concerned with the tasks.

The word 'dimension' has been defined as, "the particular set of environmental factors --- which reference to something is viewed --- one of the aspects of a cultural phenomena" (Webster Third New International Dictionary). Thus, dimension help in visualizing or conceptualizing something, and it represents a unified aspect of that thing.

Litwin and Stringer (1968) advocated a set of dimensions of organizational climate in a series of studies. These dimensions are:

1. Structure and constraint: Lewin et al. (1939) isolated situational structure as a climate dimension which reduces either of the job challenge or the perceived worth of succeeding at the job. Several studies of the business organization (Burns and Stalker, 1961; Woodworth, 1965) suggested that amount of structure is an important variable affecting individual and group behaviour. Employees absenteeism, accidents and turnover are directly related to structure.
2. Individual responsibility: Argyris (1964) emphasized that individual responsibility is logically associated with the structure of an organization. Studies of business organization showed that subjects with a high need for achievement prefer jobs which allow them more personal responsibility. Likert (1961) emphasized the importance of individual responsibility. He emphasized that the personal responsibility lead to "higher loyalty," "higher group flexibility," and "higher group performance standards."

3. Warmth and Support: Vroom (1964) proposed that warmth and support are major determinants of job satisfaction. Fleishman (1957) stated that the employee-oriented supervisor establishes a supportive personal relationship with his subordinates by being understanding and taking a personal interest in them. Likert (1961) stated that there should be a favourable, cooperative attitude throughout the organization with mutual trust and confidence. Organizations differ in the extent to which they provide personal and work-related support and warmth.

4. Reward and punishment: This dimension is closely related to the dimension of warmth and support. Through reward approach, the superior guides the subordinates towards the goals of the organization without unduly restricting their freedom. Superiors work toward the well-being of his subordinates and give them proper rewards, according to the contribution made towards
the achievement of organizational goals. In punishment approach, supervisor points out the mistakes of his subordinates rather than correcting them and making them learn new experiences. The punishment may be in the form of criticism, disapproval, withholding positive feedback, etc.

5. Conflict and its tolerance: This dimension was proposed by Litwin and Stringer (1968). Lawrence and Lorsch (1967) felt that the resolution of conflict is one of the important process involved in differentiation and integration of organizational functions. A good way of conflict resolution provides an effective integration in complex organization.

6. Performance and standards: It is to be expected that the level of standards that are set in the organization would be an important determinant of achievement motivation. It contributes to the knowledge of relationship between performance standards or expectations and individual motivation.

7. Organization identity and group identity: Individual identification with the group goals become important. The concept of group identity or loyalty has been recognized as an important determinant of the behaviour of members of an organization. Various studies showed different kind of feedback patterns of individual performance, interpersonal thinking, worker's satisfaction and group cohesiveness. Emphasis on group loyalty and group goals increased group identity and led to improved practices, more mutual trust and less strain in
interpersonal reactions. Gellerasn (1968) indicated that effective leader also benefits from group loyalties.

6. Risk and risk taking: In running business, the organisation need take risk. Environmental conditions regarding risk and risk taking are likely to be important determinants of achievement related behaviour.

**JOB SATISFACTION**

"Do you like your job?" - When this question is asked from an employee, the answer depends on various factors. "No" indicates noncongratulation to his job, whereas "Yes" indicates satisfaction with the job. Job satisfaction is, therefore, an important aspect for employees as well as for the organisation in which they are working. The question at first core, arises that what is job satisfaction.

A lot of studies have been conducted by numerous scholars, administrators and investigators, but no such definition has been given which can entail the exact meaning of it. The traditional model of job satisfaction signifies that it consists of the total body of feelings that satisfies an individual's job. This total body of feelings include weighing up the sum total of the influences of job, the nature of job itself, the pay, the promotion prospectus, the nature of supervision, and so on. Kahn (1973) stated that job satisfaction is said at that time when there is reduction in absenteeism, increasing turnover and less accident rates.
Expectancy theory points out the importance of individual's expectations of his job in determining job satisfaction. For individuals who have expectations that their job should give them opportunities for say, challenge, failure of job to meet this expectation, will lead to dissatisfaction compared to a situation where no such expectation is involved.

Although job satisfaction refers to happiness of a person toward his job, it is difficult task to calculate the level of happiness required for a particular job. Inspite of this difficulty, the degree of happiness can be measured. Thus, job satisfaction can be defined as the degree to which the worker's need for health, security, nourishment, affiliation, esteem, etc. are fulfilled on the job or as a result of job. So, if one has to measure the act satisfying the employee of an organization, it would be appropriate to measure the satisfaction of workingman with the important facets of job such as, pay, promotion, recognition, and then adding the results to obtain sum measure of employee's overall job satisfaction. Some of the items for which the researchers normally obtain satisfaction measures are presented in the following points (Locke, 1969).

a) Work :- It include, how interesting work is, its varieties, learning opportunity, chances for success, amount, difficulty, and control over pace and methods.
b) Pay :- It include, amount, fairness of equity and
method of payment.

c) Promotion: It includes opportunity for fairness of and basis for.
d) Recognition: It includes praise for accomplishment, credit for work done and criticism.
e) Benefit: It includes pension, medical annual leave, paid vacations and cafeteria.
f) Working conditions: It includes hours, rest pauses, equipment, temperature, ventilation, humidity, location and physical lay out.
g) Supervision: It includes supervisory style, technical human relations and administrative skill.
h) Co-workers: It includes confidence, helpfulness and friendliness.
i) Company and management: It includes concern for employees as well as pay benefit policies.

Thus, it can be argued that job satisfaction is that when the individual is motivated toward his job and absenteeism is less. Hoppock (1935) added certain other factors that determine job satisfaction are: Job level, Job security, Participation and personal recognition, hours and working conditions, Supervision and Fulfillment of expectations of employees.

Hulin and Smith (1964) stated, "Job satisfaction is the feeling or affective response of a worker about his job or facet thereof." So, in their sense job satisfaction is an attitude, in particular
attitude toward one's job." Thurstone (1928) explained that the attitude was an opinion with regard to job and such an opinion depends upon belief. Fishbein (1967) referred to the belief as hypothesis concerning the nature of objects or concept or more particularly concerning one's judgment of the probability regarding their nature. So, in this sense a belief is the cognitive component of attitudes.

Determinants of job satisfaction: Job satisfaction depends on many factors. Motivation and job satisfaction are highly correlated. An individual will be motivated towards his job if he gets satisfaction of various needs which are expected by him from his job. Job satisfaction motivates the worker to strive his goals. It is more or less explained by McGregor (1960) in his study concerning the motivation. Some of the most important theories are as follows: -

McGregor (1960) said in his X and Y theory that people get the satisfaction when money and status are given to them and along with this they are coerced and kept under close supervision so that they can carry out their job satisfactorily (Theory X is called as Autocratic Theory). He further said that management works for its people on the democratic pattern (Theory Y). Theory X explains that people are ready to face the challenges. They are given fair chances to show their ingenuity and to seek growth and responsibility along with to manage themselves. This theory is based on the
motto, "We are paid to think and work together."
McGregor (1960) concluded that theory Y gives more satisfaction.
Herzberg et al. (1959) proposed two factor theory for job satisfaction. This theory states that if hygiene factors (working conditions, interpersonal relations with co-workers, company policy and administration, supervision and salary) are absent, they will render the employees dissatisfaction. On the other hand, some motivators (achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility and advancement) will also determine the job satisfaction.

Maslow's (1954) theory of hierarchy needs give the meaning of job satisfaction in the way that if needs of an employee are satisfied on the job, there will be job satisfaction. The need's sequence according to Maslow (1954) is: physiological, safety, social, ego and self-actualization. He suggested that various levels of needs are interdependent and overlapping. If the lower needs are satisfied, the next becomes important and as such the need of "self actualization" stands at the top of pillar of needs which can be satisfied only at the time when job provides greater responsibility, autonomy and challenges.

Atkinson (1957) revealed that job satisfaction is related to 'the need to achieve'. It was found that people preferred those tasks which showed better perspectives in future and avoided the works not giving
of the same. They further suggested that there is a good relationship between achievement motivation and both economic and entrepreneurial success. Further studies in this theory argue that a person's achievement motivation can be increased through training and it is directly related to the performance of work.

Porter (1961) used Maslow's (1954) hierarchy of needs as framework in investigating the importance of various needs of people and the extent to which such needs are perceived as being fulfilled in their jobs. Autonomy and self actualization needs were most important needs perceived by the managers of high level. Kirkpatrick and Cummings (1964) has provided an overall impression of the occupational goals of the general work force. Each respondent was asked to describe in his own words the attribute of an "ideal job" and the "worst possible " job. He made an analysis based on the factors - enjoyment of work, financial reward, personal relations, self - determination, security, work that fits on capacity, work that is worthwhile and opportunity for growth ( all are satisfiers ).

It is evident to some extent that motivation towards one's job is the indicator of "job satisfaction." But not only motivation but morale is also sufficient factor for the job satisfaction. Behaviour of higher authorities and the nature of relationship also effect the work, and hence, job satisfaction. If the workers are well treated and their interpersonal relationships are harmonious then there will be motivation amongst
the working force. In other contemporary studies, sex, age, hierarchical levels, experience, etc. have been given weightage to take the job rich. Friedlander (1964) have concluded that the same things were found in their survey of executives in the state- Federal- Government and Private Industry. Salary, political interference, and lack of self - actualization were also found to effect the job in their survey.

If a worker, for instance, is working in an organization which has a good right in the society, then he will feel satisfied working with that organization. The bank service is understood a good job in Indian society and any person working in bank feels satisfied. It may be possible that any employee in bank is not getting the facilities as in other organization, but still he is having a good reputation which adds to his job satisfaction.

Srivastava and Sinha (1975) found that job satisfaction is the adjustment of various areas of job like social, political and homely. They concluded that these areas should be well adjusted. This adjustment will satisfy the workers and, in turn, the satisfied worker will make these factors more well adjusted because of job satisfaction.

Urban and rural background also determine the job satisfaction. A man working in the organization and belonging to village will be less satisfied than a person who is from an urban area. But Kapoor (1967)
found no significant relationship between job satisfaction and urban / rural background.

Lahiri (1965) concluded that salary and security were highly needed for job satisfaction. Bose (1958) concluded that pleasant working conditions and satisfactory social relations in the organization substantially contribute to motivation and can far outweigh wages as reward for good work.

Job satisfaction also varies with the level of education scales also. Klein and Maher (1966) found the same factor in their study. More educated managers were less satisfied with the salary they were getting than the less educated managers.

Job satisfaction also depends on the work and the place where he lives. Katznel et al. (1961), for instance, found that employee's attitude and behaviour in 72 geographically dispersed warehouses were influenced by situational variables. Using five situational variables - community size, number of employees in the decision, union representation, average wage rate, and proportion of employees who were males, they found a small town versus an urban culture patterns. Employees in the area with small town culture pattern were characterized by greater job satisfaction and productivity while the correlations were modest, ranging from .21 to .32, they were consistent in showing the positive influence of the small town culture patterns.
Employees are influenced by their environmental frames of reference. Equally paid workers, for instance, in communities where the cost of living is high are not as satisfied with their pay as are those in the communities where cost of living is lower. Job attitudes are moderated both by the preference people have for elements in their job situation and by the surrounding community environment.

Plans and policies of organization are important factors for job satisfaction. Friedlander and Margulies (1969) found that workers are more satisfied with their jobs if they perceive policies that 'get the organization moving'. If co-ordination, cooperation, responsibility and good control processes are characteristics of an organisation, employees will feel satisfaction in working in such an organization.

Herzberg et al., (1957) concluded that job satisfaction shown by the employees was related to their satisfaction with life in general. Moreover, usually those who are less satisfied with their job are also those whose adjustment tends to be lower than normal. Workers who have poor personal relationships were also found to be less satisfied. They tend to be less outgoing and more discontented with their personal adjustment to family as children also make more satisfactory adjustment to work situation.
MOTIVATION

The term 'motive' etymologically refers to a force or push which moves or activates the organism. In psychology, this term refers to 'inner springs of action,' which have been variously called, needs, drives, wants, wishes, urges, cravings, instincts, by different writers.

All human behaviour is motivated. Motive implies a reference to the direction and the goal of activity. Motive is a more comprehensive term which includes reference to the need, and the direction toward a certain goal of the motivated behaviour, the inner spring or force impelling effort at satisfaction of the need; while drive refers to the internal motive power which impels the organism to a particular behaviour, and which is aroused by a need.

A need is a condition of lack or deficit of something required, which the organism finds necessary in order to maintain its existing balance, or something not required by the organism which it wants to expel or do away with.

McClelland and his associates (1953) define a motive in the following terms:—"A motive is the redintegration by a cue of a change in an affective situation." Redintegration means the reinstatement in consciousness of a psychological process as a result of stimulation by an environment cues. Thus, a scene from one's past may be redintegrated by the sight of a long-
forgotten childhood friend, a toy discovered in the attic, or perhaps an old photograph. The term "affect" denotes conative processes such as feeling, will, emotional, and motivational states.

Maslow (1954) views motivation not in terms of a series of drives, but rather than in terms of hierarchy, certain higher needs becoming activated to the extent certain "lower" ones become satisfied. McGregor (1960) summarizes these as follows:

Physiological needs: Man is a wanting animal - as his one need is satisfied, the other one appears at its place. This process is unending from birth to death. These needs are hierarchically organized. At the lowest level are physiological needs. Man lives for bread alone when there is no bread. His needs for love, for status, for recognition are inoperative when his stomach has been empty for a while. But when he eats regularly and adequately, hunger ceases to be an important motivation. Same is true of other physiological motives like sex and thirst and rest etc.

Safety needs: When physiological needs are satisfied, needs at higher level begin to dominate man's behaviour, to motivate him. These are safety needs. They are needs for protection against danger, threat, deprivation. Management actions, behaviour which arouses uncertainty with respect to continued employment or which reflect favoritism or discrimination, unpredictable administration of policy - these can be powerful motivators of the safety needs in the employment relationship at every
level, from labourer to President.

Social needs:—When physiological and security needs are satisfied, social needs such as needs for belonging, for association, for acceptance by his fellows, for receiving friendship and love, become important motivators of one's behaviour. Management knows today of the existence of these needs, but it often assumes quite wrongly that they represent a threat to the organization. Many studies have demonstrated that the tightly knit, cohesive work group may be far more effective than an equal number of separate individuals in achieving organizational goals. Yet management often goes to considerable lengths to control and direct human efforts in ways that are inimical to the natural 'groupness' of human beings. When social needs of an individual are thwarted, he tends to behave in ways which defeat the objectives of organization. He becomes resistant, uncooperative, and antagonistic. But this behaviour is a consequence, not cause.

Ego needs:—Above the social needs are the needs for greater significance to management and to man himself. These are ego needs and are of two kinds:—

1) Those needs that relate to one's self esteem (needs for self-confidence, for independence, for achievement, for competence, for knowledge).

2) Those needs that relate to one's reputation (needs for status, for recognition, for the deserved respect of one's fellows).
Unlike the lower needs, ego needs are rarely satisfied. Man seeks indefinitely for more satisfaction of these needs once they have become important for him. But they do not appear in any significant way until physiological, safety and social needs are satisfied.

Self-fulfilment needs: Finally - a capstone, as it were, on the hierarchy of man's needs - there are what one may call the needs for self-fulfilment. These are the needs for realizing one's own potentialities for continued self-development, for being creative in the broadest sense of that term.

Atkinson (1964) has developed a formalised model of the motivational behavior which puts considerable emphasis on environmental determinants of motivation.

The assumption underlying this model can be stated as:

1) All individuals have certain basic needs or motives. These motives represent behavior potentials and influence behavior only when aroused.
2) Whether or not these motives are aroused depends upon the situation or environment perceived by the individual.
3) Particular environmental properties serve to stimulate or arouse various motives. In other words, a specific motive will not influence behavior until the motive is aroused by an appropriate environmental stimuli.
4) Changes in the perceived environment result in changes in the pattern of aroused motivation.
5) Each kind of motivation is directed to the satisfaction of a different kind of need. The pattern of aroused
motivation determines behaviour, and a change in the pattern of aroused motivation will result in a change of behavior.

Several motives have been identified and studied (Atkinson, 1958). Among the most significant of these are: the need for achievement (a Achievement), defined as the need for success in relation to an internalized standards of excellence, the need for affiliation (a Affiliation), defined as the need for close interpersonal relationships and friendship with other people, and the need for power (a power), defined as the need to control or influence others and to control the means of influencing others. Systematic methods for measuring the strength of these motives through content analysis of 'thematic apperception' stories have been developed and validated (Atkinson, 1958).

Each kind of motivation (Achievement, Affiliation and Power) has a "characteristic" kind of behavior associated with it. Achievement motivated individuals set high but realistic goals, are likely to plan ahead, enjoy taking personal responsibility and are desirous of prompt and concrete feedback on the result of their actions. Affiliation motivated individuals seek warm relationship. They are not concerned with getting ahead but enjoy jobs where they can be with people and help people. Power motivated individuals tend to seek positions of power or influence. They are politicians, teachers, executives, or military officers.
In the Atkinson model, two situational or environmental determinants of motivation are described. These are: Expectancy and Incentive value. Expectancy refers to the subjective probability or likelihood of need satisfaction (or frustration). Incentive value is the amount of satisfaction or frustration the person attaches to the outcome of a behaviour sequence. These variables are rather particularistic and molecular - in any real life situation, many hundred of expectancies and incentive values might be generated. The assessment of expectancies and incentive values has proven feasible in the controlled laboratory studies that have been conducted by Atkinson and his associates (Atkinson and Feather, 1966), but such assessment is extremely difficult, if not impossible, in complex social situations.

After presenting the theoretical framework and review of relevant studies regarding three important organizational variables, the way to proceed toward the problem of present study becomes clear. Various studies reported significant correlations between job satisfaction and organizational climate (Pritchard and Karasick, 1973). Not only this, various researchers use more or less similar items in measurement of organizational climate and job satisfaction. Both being cognitive responses of members of the organization to the work cognitions to work itself. Such a situation in the literature of organizational psychology gives rise to cast doubts regarding both the concepts. As a result
the redundancy hypothesis had been formulated.

Johannesson (1973) hypothesized that perceptual climate research and job satisfaction research were, to a large extent, redundant. The paradox Johannesson (1973) poses is that "...... description of one's environment or situation is directly affected by the satisfaction with that environment."

Johannesson (1973) suggested in discussing his redundancy hypothesis if the hypothesis is confirmed in this research is to have continuing relevance the results need to be replicated. Alternative designs might include ..... assessing whether or not climate measures behave as do satisfaction measures ( e.g., related to turnover and absenteeism ) but not generally to performance.

In this research, job performance was highly related to 33 % of the climate factors and to 21 % of the Practices factors, but job performance is significantly related to 100% of the job 'Descriptive Index' scales. If all these measures are indeed redundant measures, it would not be expected that the significant relationship between job performance and various constructs would vary so dramatically. There are some significant correlations between the Climate factors and job satisfaction, and the practices factors and the job satisfaction. Nevertheless, the correlations between the climate factors and the practices factors are much higher. If these measures were, in fact, redundant, one would expect virtually
equal correlations across the board.

Generally, a claim of redundancy is not supported by the result of this research. This conclusion is based on the logic of transitivity. If \( A \) equals to \( B \), and \( B \) relates to \( C \), then \( A \) should also relate similarly to \( C \). This research has shown that organizational climate and organizational practices factors do not relate to performance as do satisfaction relate performance.

Johannesson (1973) raised an important and thought provoking question. What if perceptual climate is redundant with job satisfaction measurement? However, Johannesson went one step beyond that. He assumed that, in fact, the two constructs were redundant and set out to find an analytical method to confirm his hypothesis. One cannot find fault with that technique, per se. However, cluster analysis is fundamentally multivariate form to evaluate the degree of association among variables, and is, in fact, based on correalational techniques. Although correlation is a variance, a strong correlation does not prove redundancy, nor does it prove causality. To explicate further, if two variables, \( A \) and \( B \) are highly correlated, at least four mutually exclusive explanations are possible:

1) \( A \) and \( B \) are redundant: This explanation assumes that \( A \) and \( B \) are in fact measuring the same property. A legitimate example of this assumption is the use of a correlation coefficient to estimate a concurrent
validity coefficient.

2) A causes B (or, conversely, B causes A). This explanation represents an assumption all too frequently made in organizational behaviour literature. A classic example is the early "satisfaction - causes - performance" assumption.

3) A correlates with B, but are not determinants of each other. This explanation is frequently found when A and B are both causally related to a third variable, but not causally related nor redundant with each other.

4) A and B are related by happenstance. This explanation is possible when two variables exhibit statistical covariance, but no logical explanation to define the relationship can be found.

Social scientists who use correlational analysis to evaluate relationships are frequently guilt of preenptory acceptance of one of the four explanations. However, a statistically significant relationship, by itself, is not proof of redundancy, nor is it proof of causality. Johannesson (1973) has criticized earlier researchers for accepting the causality assumption based only on judgment. Yet, Johannesson has been all too amenable to accept the redundancy assumption, even though his conclusion also rests on the subjective judgment of redundancy, rather than on causal, longitudinal, or experimental evidence.

The organization climate researchers are left on the "horns of a dilemma." The fact that
organizational climate and satisfaction are related is clear in some manner from the literature (Hallriegel and Slocum, 1974), and has been confirmed by this study. Yet, whether one accepts the redundancy assumption or the causality assumption remains largely a matter of subjective judgment. The question of redundancy can only be resolved through research signs which entail longitudinal causal analysis.

Like Downey et al., (1974) "... We have not resolved the disputes of the utility of the organization climate construct, (and), further research needed on such questions as: are satisfaction and climate instruments redundant ...?"

It will be premature to proceed with redundancy hypothesis or causal hypothesis, let us form one more alternate hypothesis that both relate to a third common variable and the best choice for this variable comes out as 'motivation'. It has been demonstrated in great number of studies that motivations also determine the perceptions of organizational climate. At the same time it is a common finding that motivation also determine job satisfaction. Thus, the present study will attempt to explore the possible relationship between these three variables. It will be centered on following three hypotheses.

1) Job satisfaction and organizational climate are redundant or/and
2) Job satisfaction is a function of organizational climate or/and
3) Job satisfaction and organizational climate have common correlates, such as individual motivation.

The problem of present study can be advanced, here, in crystal clear terms, as:

JOB SATISFACTION IN RELATION TO ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE AND MOTIVATION: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY AMONG BANK EMPLOYEES.