CHAPTER II

BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

THE GROWING SIGNIFICANCE

The objective of effective utilisation of human resources in work organisations has received increased attention in recent years from both organizational researchers and practicing managers. The concern for an improvement in the quality of working life and for making work more meaningful has led to programmes of human resource development in organizations.

Practically every aspect of the activities in an organization is influenced by the effort given to it by its members. In the absence of human effort and direction an organization becomes unproductive. Its functioning depends very heavily upon the competence, motivation and overall effectiveness of human behaviour.

Individual differences in performance, motivation and behaviour of people in work organization are very wide indeed. Groups of people engaged in the same type of job are found to differ in their output and quality of product. Such differences raise a question of fundamental psychological interest: What are the causes of differences in behaviour at work? Of the earliest answers given was that these differences reflect varying
abilities and skills on the part of individuals. They have different amounts and kinds of experiences; they vary in the degree to which they possess the necessary intellectual and other endowments to learn from this experience. This approach to the understanding of differences in performance through a systematic study of individual differences led to a number of different strategies for improving performance in organizational practice. It has led, for example, to the charting of required skills and abilities for various jobs through job analysis and to psychometric devices for the measurement of those attributes. Scientific selection and placement by studying jobs and individuals are emphasised to ensure the right-man-right-job fit. It also led to attempts to develop the necessary abilities and skills to perform well on the job through systematic training. Thus, personnel management turned to industrial psychology for more scientific practices in selection, placement and training to minimise or even prevent inefficiency, low production, high labour turnover, indiscipline and a general waste of man-power. A systematic selection and placement was expected to generate higher motivation (Gellerman, 1968) and better mental health (Herzberg et. al., 1957; Cameron, 1951). However, the rider to all these prescriptions was a conducive situational context. Management had to assure, as Dunnette said: "That the right people move into the right jobs at the right times under the right circumstances." (Dunnette, 1966, P. 7).
There has been a second approach in explaining differences in job performance. This approach shifts the emphasis from individual differences in abilities to differences in motivation to perform work. At any given time people vary in the extent to which they are willing to direct their energies towards work. Performance in work organizations is here considered as a function of two sets of factors, namely, his ability and his motivation. Skills and other components of ability are supposedly ensured by proper selection, placement and training. The second set of factors related to willingness to perform effectively, are sought to be understood through a wide variety of studies of needs, motives, expectations and, of course, job satisfaction. The behavioural manifestations of these psychological states are crucial in determining the effectiveness of an organization, as they are mostly voluntary behaviours. Since work organizations represent an important and challenging behavioural context affecting the experiences of people, it is essential to learn more about the motivational processes that emerge in organisations so that organizational effectiveness can be achieved. The attempts at a comprehensive understanding of the concept of motivation and its behavioural outcome in the context of work organizations are virtually innumerable, as are the debates and controversies in the field. Motivation as a concept is highly complex, and as a phenomenon it affects and is affected by a multitude of factors in the organisational milieu. In the modern industrial society, with an ever increasing complexity in technology, it is essential that people are capable and willing to use the advanced technology.
Such developments tend to change the very nature of work and demand a highly motivated workforce to perform various jobs. There have been excellent reviews of the literature on work motivation periodically (Vroom, 1964; Heneman and Schwab, 1972; Lawler, 1973; Lawler and Suttle, 1973; Campbell and Pritchard, 1976); but the rate of development in theories of organizational behaviour and work motivation, as rapid as they might seem to the researcher, has only been behind the developments in new technologies leading to new forms of work organizations.

The third emphasis provided to the study of work effectiveness has been on the organizational context itself, thus completing the classic formulation: Performance = f [(A x M)O] in which O stands for the "opportunities" provided by the organizational environment. While the study of abilities and motivation might both be regarded as a focus on the individual and, therefore, in the realm of the academic discipline of psychology, the study of the organizational environment has demanded frames of reference, tools, methods and levels of analyses that have diverse origins and are, at least on the surface, widely different in their theoretical bases.

It is not uncommon to find introductory essays in organizational behaviour commenting that behavioural science research was heavily skewed towards individual attributes, and although these were important for understanding organizational behaviour, very little was known about the organizational attributes affecting behaviour. The behavioural processes which
take place in the organizational setting serve as vehicles through which conflicting inputs from individuals and organization must be dealt with. Guidelines for strategies for modifying ongoing behavioural processes in organizations to improve both organizational effectiveness and the quality of the organizational experiences appear a great necessity.

Katz and Kahn (1966) specified three behavioural requirements in this regard: (a) the organization must attract people to join as well as to continue with the organization; (b) people must perform the assigned tasks in a dependable manner and (c) they must engage in some creative, stimulating and innovative behaviour at work. Keeping the 'open system' view of the organization, suitable changes in formal properties and informal processes become the essential development needs of the organization and its individual members.

The debate on the relative importance of individual attributes and attributes of organizations in shaping performance at work is as old as the subject of industrial psychology itself. However, both approaches emphasize the intermediate role of motivation. An individual's motivation has to do with the direction of his behaviour or what he selects to do when he has a number of alternatives. It also has to do with the strength or amplitude of response and the persistance of the behaviour.

A brief historical review of the approaches to work motivation in various schools of thought may thus be in order.
TRENDS IN ASSUMPTIONS: MOTIVATION AND BEHAVIOUR AT WORK

The basic relationship or psychological contract between man and organization is largely determined by assumptions and views held by managers about the fundamental nature of man and his needs, expectations and motivations. These assumptions have changed from time to time and have been influenced by the prevailing philosophy about man and work at that time.

Scientific Management Movement

The traditional model was represented in the writings of Taylor (1911) and his associates in the so-called scientific management school. Man was viewed as motivated to work mainly to satisfy his economic needs; he maximised his effort to get the greatest economic gain. This view of man might be said to have its origins in hedonism theory. Man is seen as calculating the actions that will maximise his self interest and he is expected to behave accordingly. Since economic incentives are under the control of management, man becomes a passive component, to be manipulated, "motivated" and controlled by the organization. Moreover, an employee is viewed as inherently lazy, aimless, dull and not interested in work per se. These assumptions were summarised succinctly by McGregor (1960) years later under theory X.

According to this view the major task before the management is to closely supervise and control subordinates. Various jobs are reduced to be made
simple and standardised on the assumption that people would produce more through repetitive and routinized cycles of work to get commensurate financial rewards. Thus, the routinization and fractionalization of work is assumed to be acceptable and even attractive for the monetary reward to be derived from it. The concept of an assembly line as an efficient way to maximise production in the automobile industry was the direct outcome of such a move, and large-scale modification of jobs in many other industries followed.

The dramatic success of the scientific management school was not without consequences, and several problems and issues emerged in the wake of early successes. The contract between the individual worker and the organization was reduced substantially to money terms only. On the one hand management designed incentive schemes that resulted in limited economic gains to workers. They also realised that their wage increases were not proportionate to the increases in output. On the other hand, with the standards of living rising steadily in an industrial society, workers had natural demands for more pay and disposable income. The exploitation of workers in the mass production system led to the development of unions which provided a powerful tool to workers for influencing management to meet their demands and expectations.

To solve these problems it became necessary to re-examine basic assumptions about the production system and to look for new methods to increase production with a stable manpower. Further, with rapid technological deve-
Development, many jobs became increasingly complex and required higher orders of human application. Thus the nature of the psychological contract between employer and employee changed as organizations became more complex and more dependent on their human resources.

Human Relations Movement

An early recognition of the shortcomings of the economic-man model and the need to investigate the dynamics of work motivation led industrial psychologists and sociologists to undertake several systematic studies and programmes of research on the subject. The earliest such work carried out by Mayo (1933; 1945) and Roethlisberger and Dickson (1939) brought several new facets of man's motivation and behaviour into light. These studies drew attention to the fact that it was necessary to consider the 'whole' person on the job. It became clear that a man had many motives, needs and expectations which went beyond the 'rational-economic man' assumption. His behaviour, performance and relationships with the organization were very greatly influenced by these motives, needs and expectations. They concluded that in determining work patterns, the need to be accepted and liked by fellow workers and colleagues was more important than the economic incentives offered by management. The emphasis on the man-machine relationship was thus replaced by the interpersonal, group relations and human relations concepts. This view of work emphasized the social nature of man, and led to the emergence of the Human Relations model.
Mayo (1945) proposed that it is in the nature of man that he is motivated by social needs and that he obtained his basic sense of identity through relationships with others. He is more responsive to social forces of the peer group than to financial incentives. Since simplification, repetitiveness and fractionalization had rendered work meaningless, social relationships at work had become more meaningful.

In order to satisfy the social needs, attention had to be given to communication processes, informal groups, supervisor-subordinate relationships, etc. Several research studies were conducted to identify effective ways and means to provide social relationships at work.

Zaleznik, et.al (1958) found that productivity and satisfaction were unrelated to pay and job status but related to group membership. Seashore (1954) reported that group cohesiveness was associated with high productivity when group members had high confidence in management. Whyte (1948) found that when the supervisor allowed the formation of well integrated groups to emerge, the quality of work was superior.

Fleishman (1953) studied the relationship of supervisory behaviour with the productivity and morale of subordinates. The study revealed that supervisors who showed consideration to subordinates created a certain climate in their departments and high consideration resulted in higher productivity and morale. Likert (1961) identified production-centered and employee-centered supervisors and studied their leadership styles
and the productivity and motivation of subordinates. These two basic orientations in the relationships have appeared in the literature in a variety of forms as shown in the Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writer or Researcher</th>
<th>Dimension 1</th>
<th>Dimension 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Force</td>
<td>Love</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnard</td>
<td>Effectiveness - accomplishment of the co-operative purpose</td>
<td>Efficiency - satisfaction of individual motives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronfenbrenner</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halpin &amp; Winer</td>
<td>Initiating Structure</td>
<td>Consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likert</td>
<td>Production centred</td>
<td>Employee centred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake &amp; Mouton</td>
<td>Concern for production</td>
<td>Concern for people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>o Task orientation</td>
<td>Group orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Getting the job done</td>
<td>Keeping the men on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Task function</td>
<td>Maintenance function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Direction</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also - Psychoanalytical and anthropological writing on the needs of the personality - e.g. Freud, Montague</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Love</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vroom and Mann (1960) reported that the nature of job performed influenced employees' preference for type of supervision. Those whose task was interdependent, such as package handlers showed preference for employee-centred supervisors. Those who were working on independent tasks such as truck drivers and despatchers, preferred production-centred supervisors.
Studies such as those above revealed the significance of the social needs of man and shifted the focus in management from incentive schemes and economic rewards to human relations training, leadership development, group dynamics and other social interaction processes in an organization.

It has been observed that the Human Relations movement might have been a reaction to the cut-and-dry scientific management that preceded it. Over time the wild enthusiasm of the forties has mellowed and a larger, historical, perspective has helped to correct the exaggerations of earlier claims. For instance a counter argument has been made that Taylor's prescriptions were in fact humanistic (Learned and Sproat, 1966; Lichtman and Hunt, 1971) and Lee (1980) concludes that the Hawthorne studies were really very poor behavioural science research, and their findings quite unacceptable for any organization or management theory.

In spite of the new direction provided by the human relations movement, the problems of performance and productivity continued. Mayo (1945) concluded from the Hawthorne studies that organizational life, particularly in industries, had removed meaning from work. This loss of meaning was perhaps only indirectly related to man's social needs, but related more to man's inherent need to use his capacities and skills in a mature and productive way. Much of the literature on alienation, especially as relating to man-made life styles through technological advancement, stems from such a premise of an inherent need for experiencing meaning in man. The assumptions of the human relations approach have since
been challenged not only for being an oversimplified and incomplete statement of human behaviour at work, but for being as manipulative as the traditional model.

**Humanistic and Interactionist Approaches**

In the late fifties and early sixties a new approach emerged to explain human behaviour and motivation at work under different conceptual schemes, such as McGregor's (1960) Theory Y, Likert's (1967) System 4, Schein's (1965) Complex Man, Maslow's (1954) need hierarchy theory, and Herzberg's (1959) two factor theory. These approaches view man as motivated by many complex, interconnected, needs and motives. One of the needs is to contribute to any ongoing activity by using his abilities, skills, knowledge, talents, etc., in a meaningful way. Work does not necessarily have to be unpleasant or distasteful. Recent efforts at job redesign and making the work environment more enriched are aimed at increasing meaningfulness of work and improving the quality of work experience. This approach assumes that a man is capable of making significant contributions and rational decisions in his work. Increased self-control, clarity of objectives, task closure and completion of meaningful tasks determine the level of satisfaction on the job. Thus a man is considered as seeking growth through his work so that given an opportunity he can accomplish and achieve outstanding results from his efforts.
This approach indicates that the complex nature of motivational patterns should first be understood and then attempts made to determine how best the available potential may be used. In earlier approaches the psychological contract involved exchange of extrinsic rewards such as economic or social ones; in this approach the psychological contract involves the exchange of opportunities to obtain intrinsic rewards such as the satisfaction from achievement, responsibility and task challenge and the use of one's capabilities for high quality performance. The task of management is seen not as a manipulating authority, but of developing subordinates to accomplish individual as well as organization goals.

Several organizational theories firmly believe that all people have certain important common needs and that the formal structure of an organization interferes with the expression of these needs. This restrictiveness results in negative responses such as low morale, dissatisfaction, withheld effort, minimal productivity, diverted effort, boredom and mental health problems.

The major influence in these views is clearly from Maslow's (1954; 1965) theoretical formulations emphasizing man's inherent need to use his potentials in a mature and productive way. The need hierarchy common to all normal people determines that a higher level need emerges only when the current preoccupation is adequately fulfilled. Therefore, organizational structure and conditions should be such as to facilitate expression and
fulfilment of higher level needs.

Argyris (1957a, 1964) expressed a similar view that there is a lack of fit between the formal properties of organization and the need of individual members to achieve psychological success. Organizations are usually created to achieve goals or objectives that can best be met collectively and the formal organization is often the architect's conception of how these objectives may be achieved. In this sense the individual is fitted to the job. The concept of formal organization leads to assumptions about human nature that are incompatible with the proper development of maturity in human personality. However, if a work climate is created in which everyone has a chance to grow and mature as an individual and as a member of a desired social group, it should be possible to satisfy his needs while working for the success of the organization. The implicit assumption in such an approach is that a man can be basically self-directed and creative at work if properly motivated. The two factor theory of Herzberg, et al. (1959) has been another influential line of thought relevant to motivation through job redesign and job enrichment. It emphasises psychological growth of an individual through work itself. The basic propositions of the theory are:

(a) factors of satisfaction and dissatisfaction are separate and distinct from each other.

(b) satisfaction stems from 'motivators' or factors intrinsic to work and dissatisfaction stems from 'hygiene' factors which are extrinsic to work itself.
The implication of the theory is that to enhance work motivation and satisfaction of employees, motivators should be designed into the work itself. Organizational changes relating to hygiene factors would not lead to increased motivation and satisfaction.

Herzberg's (1966) restatement of Maslow's theory described man's range of needs in a convenient dichotomy. One set of needs is related to his animal nature and motivates him to avoid pain, hunger, thirst and sexual deprivation. His preoccupation with the satisfaction of these biological needs is an example of his animal nature. This set of needs is induced and satisfied by the external environment. Another set of needs is related to man's unique urge to experience psychological growth through the use of his potentialities. This set of needs is stimulated by the nature of work, job or task in which he is engaged.

An improvement in job content would stimulate growth needs and the individual would be motivated to satisfy these needs. Job enrichment has been suggested as a possible solution to the problem of low motivation.

Paul, et al. (1969) described the concept of job enrichment as follows: Steps to improve both efficiency and human satisfaction by means of building into people's job, quite specifically, a greater scope for personal achievement and recognition, more challenging and responsible work and more opportunity for individual advancement and growth.
There has been considerable research to test the universality of Herzberg's theory across organizations, occupations and cultures, which has been adequately reviewed by Herzberg (1966), House and Wigdor (1967), Whitsett and Winslow (1967), and Bookman (1971). The experiments on job enrichment programmes designed around motivators are reported by Ford (1969), and Maher (1971).

Although the redesigning of jobs through job enrichment programmes is becoming increasingly prominent as a strategy to improve motivation, performance and quality of working life, evidence is beginning to be reported indicating its failure in producing expected results. For example, a field experiment conducted by Locke, et al. (1976) failed to increase motivation through job redesign. The laboratory experiment of Maher (1971) resulted in a significant decrease in satisfaction. The experiments reported by Bishop and Hill (1971), Ford (1969), Umstat, et al. (1976), and Hackman, et al. (1978) show that motivation was significantly increased after redesigning tasks or jobs. These experiments not only indicate contradictory findings about effect of redesign on motivation and satisfaction but also on performance, productivity and output. (For reviews, see Hackman, 1977; Katzell and Yankelovich, 1975).

The general picture that emerges from the literature on job design and its impact is that enriched characteristics of work are capable of enhancing motivation and performance but only under certain conditions.
Thus instead of making negative or positive overgeneralizations about this particular approach that 'it never works' or 'it always works' it is necessary to understand why it fails in some situations and works in other situations. Many researchers have expressed a strong need to analyze causes of its success and failure so that future attempts can be made more selectively (Locke, et al., 1976; Orpen, 1979; Oldham and Miller, 1979; Hackman, et al., 1975; Oldham, 1976).

The Job Design Model

A more systematic and comprehensive theory of work motivation has been developed by Hackman and his associates (Hackman and Lawler, 1971; Hackman and Oldham, 1976). This theory follows earlier work in this area by Herzberg et al. (1959) and Turner and Lawrence (1965). A theoretical model explaining the relationship between specific job characteristics and emerging psychological states is presented in Figure 2. The empirical work of the Hackman group identifies five core job dimensions and asserts that certain psychological states are achieved through these job dimensions.

These core dimensions are expected to produce certain psychological states. When a job is high on the first three dimensions a job holder experiences meaningfulness at work; autonomy makes him feel responsible for the outcome of the work; feedback provides him knowledge of the results of his work; The resulting psychological states produce high internal work motivation, better work performance, high work satisfaction and low absenteeism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORE JOB DIMENSIONS</th>
<th>CRITICAL PSYCHOLOGICAL STATES</th>
<th>PERSONAL AND WORK OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skill Variety</td>
<td>Experiences meaningfulness of the work</td>
<td>High internal work motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Identity</td>
<td>Experiences responsibility for outcome of the work</td>
<td>High quality work performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Significance</td>
<td>Knowledge of the actual results of the work activities</td>
<td>High satisfaction with the work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Low absenteeism and turnover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This theory also emphasises job content and suggests that jobs should have certain inherent characteristics. The Herzberg theory revolves around motivators and the Hackman theory around core job dimensions.

There have been a few attempts to identify organizational conditions which may be essential in producing desirable results through job design. Oldham, et al. (1976) found that employees' satisfaction with extrinsic aspects of work was important. Those who reported higher satisfaction with extrinsic factors responded more positively to enriched jobs. In another study Oldham and Miller (1979) concluded that job complexity of coworkers has a significant effect on one's satisfaction through enriched job. Oldham (1976) studied social relations at work and found that employees who were satisfied with their supervisors and coworkers were more satisfied and motivated while working on enriched jobs. Oldham and Hackman (1981) examined the relative power of the attraction-selection framework and the job-modification framework in explaining the relationship between organizational properties such as size, structure, formalization, centralization, etc., and employee reactions to the work and the work context. Results show that the job modification framework better explains the relationship between organizational structure and employee reactions. In another study Brass (1981) found that job characteristics mediate the relationship between structure and individual responses. The structural variables studied by Brass were centrality of task position, criticality of task position, and the transaction
Porter and Lawler (1965) reviewed several studies explaining various organizational characteristics affecting need satisfaction, motivation and behaviour at work. Line/staff hierarchies, levels, size of sub-unit and shape (tall/flat) of organization were found to be specific factors influencing work motivation of employees and such behavioural outcome as performance output, absenteeism, employee turnover, accidents and grievance rates. Certain dependent variables were more highly related to properties of organizational structure than were other dependent variables.

The scope for fulfilment of psychological needs was found to be more in flat organizations (Porter and Lawler, 1964), in less bureaucratic structures (Dimarco and Norton, 1974), and in small organizations (Cummings and Elsalmi, 1970). Moreover, organizations that provide more creative jobs, greater control over jobs and more opportunities to use abilities and skills are more conducive to satisfaction of higher order needs (Lawler and Hall, 1970; Porter, 1964). Various organizational features affecting the functioning of an organization are discussed in Etsioni (1961) and March and Simon (1958).

Although the organizational setting may be seen as limiting and influencing members' behaviour (as described by Lewitt, 1965), it is very difficult to arrive at precise relationships among variables such as organization size, structure or technology and changes in behaviour of members. For
nearly two decades now, behavioural science research has attempted to study such organizational variables to explain changes in perceptions and behaviours. The acceptance of the reality of structured social relationships has generated the study of concepts such as control, authority and power. The enormous impact of the concept of organizations as open systems (e.g., Katz and Kahn, 1966) with its major features of interaction with the environment has created interest in the organization as an environmental setting for individual and group behaviours.

Discovering how the organization is a psychologically meaningful environment for individual members has led to the concept of the organization's climate (the terms climate, organizational climate, and OC are used interchangeably in this report as in the literature). Thus the links across the structural features of the organization, employees' need satisfaction, the expression of motives, and the behavioural outcomes are strengthened with an understanding of organizational climate. The following section describes the concept of organizational climate and the scope of the present study.

PRECURSORS TO ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE

One of the major forces influencing motivational and behavioural processes is in the nature of the organizational environment. The reality of the impact of environmental factors on behaviour was first discussed by
Lewin (1938; 1951). The essential dynamics that linked human behaviour to generalized environmental stimuli, were stated by Lewin in the following terms:

"To characterise properly the psychological field, one has to take into account such specific items as particular goals, stimuli, needs, social relations as well as more general characteristics of the field as the atmosphere or the amount of freedom. These characteristics of the field as a whole are as important in psychology as, for instance, the field of gravity for the explanation of events in classical physics. Psychological atmospheres are empirical realities and are scientifically describable facts" (Lewin, 1951, P. 241).

The essential similarity in the Gestalt tradition is seen in the writing of Koffka (1935) who distinguished between geographical environment which constitutes physical and social environment and the behavioural environment as perceived and reacted to by the subject. Koffka concluded that behaviour could be more meaningfully understood if it was related to the behavioural environment.

Murray (1938) pointed out that behaviour cannot be described without reference to the environment in which the behaviour occurred, because it was the individual-environment interaction that shaped behaviour. Relevant characteristics of the person were termed as needs and relevant characteristics of environment were termed as press by Murray. These
theoretical formulations may be regarded as the first developments of the interactionist view of behaviour (Murphy, 1947; Rotter, 1954). Years later, the attempts made to summarise and integrate interactionist observations and formulations suggested that future research would be especially salient if the study of environmental variations in organizations used the interaction approach (Pervin, 1968; Bowers, 1973; Ekehammar, 1974; Forehand and Gilmer, 1964).

CLIMATE: CONCEPTUAL SEARCH

Central to a discussion of organizational environment is the concept of organizational climate. In Lewin's theory the concept of 'atmosphere' or 'climate' is an essential functional link between the person and the environment. Several recent studies and reviews have attested to the current popularity of climate research. The growing interest in organizational change through process intervention programmes indicates the need for a better understanding of OC and its impact on organizational processes and the resulting behaviour of individuals. Considerable diversity exists in the definitions, dimensions and measurement techniques of the concept of OC.

Schein (1965) emphasized the need for a concept which links individual behaviour and organizational situations. According to him "it has been easy to accept organizational circumstances as a given condition and to explain behaviour variations as a function of different motives. However,
we cannot understand the psychological dynamics if we look only to the individual's motivations or only to organizational conditions and practices. The two interact in a complex fashion requiring us to develop theories and research approaches which can deal with systems and interdependent phenomena" (P. 64-65).

Dubin (1973) pointed out that all social settings are subject to variable perceptions by their participants, and the work organization is one such setting in which the characteristics of those perceptions would be worthy of study. Many attempts have been made in the past to identify various features of OC which might be relevant in impact on the attitudes, motivation and behaviour of members.

For an understanding of the concept of climate it is necessary to first consider some potential properties of climate.

Payne and Pugh (1976) reviewed the literature on organizational structure and climate. Processes emerging in social systems, reflecting values, beliefs and attitudes of the members become part of the climate. "In a geographical analogy, the organizational context and structure variables are the hills and rivers or physical features of the geographical area. Climate dimensions such as progressiveness and development, risk taking, warmth, support and control correspond to temperature, rainfall and wind velocity which have been generated by the interaction of physical features with the sun's energy. The social system's equivalent energy sources are
people, who also create and are part of the climate. Although both physical and social climate may affect their respective structures, the context and structure of a social system are more stable than its people whose energies may not always be spent in predictable cycles" (Payne and Pugh, 1976, P. 1128).

According to Forehand and Gilmer (1964) OC consists of a set of characteristics that describe an organization, distinguish it from other organizations, are relatively enduring over time, and influence the behaviour of the people. This definition considers OC as a characteristic property of an organization. Tagiuri (1968) added that OC refers to a quality of the members of the organization and can be described in terms of values or the meaning of a particular set of characteristics of the environment. Thus climate represents the organization as people seek it in a holistic and global sense. A similar description of OC as a set of summary or global perceptions held by individuals is given by Schneider and Hall (1972). These summary perceptions reflect interaction between personal and organizational characteristics.

Schneider and Bartlett (1968, 1970) defined climate as that which prompts an individual to be in a set or readiness, in line with expectations and general experiences specific to organizations.

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

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

Georgopoulos (1965) suggests a normative structure of attitudes and behavioural standards which provide a basis for interpreting the situations and act as a source of pressure for directing activity. These properties, according to Litwin and Stringer (1968), must be perceived by members of the organization, resulting in patterns of expectations and incentive values that are evolved by members of the work organization. Style of management, policies and procedures are important aspects of climate (Meyer, 1968; Gellerman, 1959).
Payne (1971) describes organizational climate as a molar concept reflecting the content and strength of the prevalent values, norms, attitudes, feelings and behaviours of the members of a social system.

Baumgartel (1971) defines organizational climate as a product of leadership practices, communication patterns, and enduring and systematic characteristics of the working relationships among persons and divisions of any particular organization.

Likert's (1967) description of intervening variables in the theory of management systems is similar to a climate description. "The intervening variables reflect the internal state and health of the organization, e.g., the loyalties, attitudes, motivations, performance goals and perceptions of all members and their collective capacity for effective interaction, communication and decision making" (P. 29). The structural variables were considered as causal variables and the end results such as productivity, costs, profit, etc., as dependent variables. Climate is thus considered by Likert as linkage between structural attributes of an organization and its effectiveness.

Schneider (1975) describes climate as a set of macro perceptions which reflect processes of concept formation and abstraction based on micro perceptions about specific organizational conditions, events and experiences. Campbell and Besty (1971) express similar ideas of perceptual filtering, summation and cognitive structuring. Ittelson, et.al.
suggest that the individual organises perceptions of the environment into an abstract 'cognitive map' that serves to guide future predictions and behaviour. This cognitive map refers to the individual's internalised representation of the situation and reflects an inherently inseparable combination of perceptual and cognitive processes. The intervening nature of climate in a model of organization functioning is thus a sub-set of the concept of cognitive map. Individual members transform situational stimuli into perceived situational influences. Such perceived influences as warmth, ambiguity, progressiveness, etc., are employed to achieve a fit with the situation by apprehending order and gauging appropriateness of behaviour (Ittelson, et al., 1974; Schneider, 1975).

There appears to be considerable agreement that the situational variables that are more related to perceived climate are those with relatively direct and immediate ties to individual experience. Some researchers have also pointed out that characteristics that are conceptually more distinct or remote from individual experiences require complex intervening linkages to be related to individual perceptions and behaviour (Indik, 1968; Jessor and Jessor, 1973; James and Jones, 1976). A similar argument is made by Lawler, et. al. (1974) that perceptions of climate are related more to relatively immediate characteristics such as organizational and sub-system processes than to structural variables.

Insul and Moos (1974) characterised organizational environment as having 'personalities' that exert directional influences on behaviour.
Payne and Mansfield (1973) described climate as a conceptual linkage between organization and individual. From this perspective, climate intervenes between specific situational attributes or events and individual perceptions, attitudes and behaviour.

Since the concept of OC describes attributes of the organisation as well as attributes of individuals, James and Jones (1974) suggest the use of the term OC only when it is regarded as an organizational attribute. As a reconceptualisation, it is suggested that the term psychological climate should be used when it refers to individual attributes, particularly the intervening psychological process whereby the individual translates the interaction between perceived organizational attributes and his own set of expectations.

Aspects and Dimensions of Climate

When OC is defined as a "global impression of what the organization is" (Schneider and Snyder, 1975) or a collection of properties or components of an organization that may be induced from "the way that the organization deals with its members and its environment" (Campbell, et. al., 1970), a large number of organizational and environmental factors are relevant contributors to emerging climate.

Many different events, practices and procedures contribute to the summary perception of the organization. Each individual perceives his organization in many ways depending upon the context and the set of information
available about the organization. In this way there is a great variety of climates, describing various organizational situations. For example, Taguiri's (1968) study revealed the following five factors of climate from a large sample of managers.

(1) Practices related to providing a sense of direction or purpose to their jobs - setting of objectives, planning and feedback

(2) Opportunities for exercising individual initiative

(3) Working with competitive and competent supervisor

(4) Co-operative and pleasant people

(5) Being with a profit-minded and sales-oriented company

Schneider and Bartlett (1968) reported six factors of climate as listed below:

(1) Management support

(2) Management structure

(3) Concern for new employees

(4) Intra-agency conflict

(5) Agent independence

(6) General satisfaction
Kahn, et. al. (1964) in a study on role conflict also attempted a dimensional analysis of climate. The factor analysis yielded five factors:

1. Rules orientation
2. Nurturance of subordinates
3. Closeness of supervision
4. Universalism or the degree to which the individual should identify with the organization as a whole
5. Promotion of achievement orientation

Litwin and Stringer (1968) identified dimensions of climate related to functioning of organizations and tasks. The dimensions were as follows:

1. Structure
2. Responsibility
3. Reward
4. Warmth
5. Support
6. Identify
7. Risk
8. Standard
9. Conflict
Baumgartel (1971) reported the following characteristics observable in organizational environment as determining the developmental organizational climate:

(1) Freedom to set own performance goals and performance based rewards
(2) Emphasis on growth and development
(3) Willingness to train the executives
(4) Opportunities to use new knowledge, experimentation and innovation
(5) Participation from various hierarchical levels in decision making
(6) Confidence and trust in competence and judgement of top management
(7) Open communication and interpersonal trust
(8) Less formal, having minimum rules and administrative procedure

Pritchard and Karasick (1973) considered a large number of dimensions of OC such as autonomy, conflict vs. co-operation, social relationship, structure, rewards, performance based rewards, status polarisation, flexibility and innovation, decision centralisation, supportiveness, and achievement orientation of organization.

Although it is extremely difficult to synthesise the various aspects of climate included in different studies in a meaningful way, Campbell et al. (1970) reported four factors with a good deal of communality. The composite view of these factors is described as follows:
Factor 1 Individual autonomy: This is perhaps the clearest composite, and includes the individual responsibility, agent independence and the rules orientation factors found by Litwin and Stringer, Schneider and the rules orientation factors found by Litwin and Stringer, Schneider and Bartlett, and Kahn, et. al. respectively, and Taguri's factor dealing with opportunities for exercising individual initiative. The keystone of this dimension is the freedom of the individual to be his own boss and to reserve considerable decision-making power to himself. He does not have to be constantly accountable to higher management.

Factor 2 Degree of structure imposed upon the position: Litwin and Stringer's structure; Schneider and Bartlett's managerial structure; Taguri's first factor dealing with direction, objectives, etc., and Kahn, et. al.'s closeness of supervision seem similar enough to be lumped under this label. The principal element is the degree to which the objectives of, and methods for, the job are established and communicated to the individual by superiors.

Factor 3 Reward orientation: Another meaningful grouping includes Litwin and Stringer's reward factor; Schneider and Bartlett's general satisfaction factor, which seems to convey reward overtones; Kahn, et. al.'s promotion-achievement orientation; and Taguri's reference to a profit-minded and sales oriented company. These factors do not hang together quite as well as the previous two groups and seem to vary a great deal in breadth. However, the reward element appears to be present in all.
Factor 4 Consideration, warmth and support: This dimension lacks the clarity of the previous three. Managerial support from the Schneider and Bartlett study and nurturance of subordinates from Kahn, et. al. seem quite similar. Litwin and Stringer's warmth and support also seem to belong here, since apparently this is a characteristic attributable to supervisory practices. Taguri's mention of working with a superior who is highly competitive and competent does not fit quite so easily, but nevertheless seems to refer to the support and stimulation received from one's superior. However, the human relations referent is not as clear as in the factors derived from the other studies. (Campbell, et. al., 1970, P. 393).

Even the summary review above suggests that organizational climate has received considerable attention in the recent past and that it has been accepted as both valid and important as an organizational feature. Studies regarding climate dimensions as independent variables in experimental and quasi-experimental designs have shown the impact of climate on motivation, needs, output, performance and satisfaction (Litwin and Stringer, 1968; Frederiksen, 1968; Frederiksen, et. al., 1972, Dieterly and Schneider, 1974). Moreover, field studies examining the impact of climate on motivation, performance and other behavioral manifestations have provided interesting results.