CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL ORIENTATION
In this Chapter, a brief exposition of the theoretical framework regarding all the variables which formed a part of the present investigation is advanced. Certain concepts and the operationalizations of the same have not yet become a popular subject with empirical researchers in psychology, especially in India. Keeping this in mind, a certain basic familiarity and semantic clarification is considered essential. It is hoped that the following pages will be able to convey the historical trend and present status of each variable.

Organizational Commitment

There are many terms referring to a phenomenon which in some way can be considered similar to organizational commitment. Since a statement on the exact operationalization of commitment eludes researchers as of now, a lot of related concepts have mushroomed in the literature related to organizational commitment. Morrow (1983) stated that there may be more than twenty five commitment related measures and concepts. The study of commitment in organizational set up is intuitively appealing. This is so, because of the belief that increased commitment is in some way related to enhanced organizational effectiveness and hence is something worth developing in the employees (Scholl, 1981).

In the period that elapsed since the concept was first introduced in the field of organizational behaviour, it acquired various facets and became decisively an enriched concept. This enrichment worked as a double edged sword, its other edge being the compounding of confusion. Various
problems arose. Either there was identical nomenclature for seemingly different constructs or vice versa. Hence, a classification of the various streams regarding commitment can at best be termed as arbitrary.

It may be valuable at this juncture to consider the various typologies emerging out of different streams of thought. These have been reported by Mowday et al. (1982, p. 22).

Etzioni (1961) gave a typology in terms of moral, calculative and alienative involvement. In this typology, moral involvement addresses itself to a positive and high intensity orientation which is based on internalization of organizational goals and values, and identification with authority. Calculative involvement addresses itself to a relationship of lower intensity. It is based upon a rational exchange of benefits and rewards. Alienative involvement on the other hand is a negative orientation and is found in exploitative relationships.

Kanter (1968) mentioned three types of commitment, i.e., continuance, cohesion, and control. Continuance commitment is conceived of in terms of a dedication to organization's survival and benefit brought on by previous personal investments and sacrifices. These would make leaving the organization costly or impossible. Cohesion commitment refers to attachments to the social relationships in an organization brought about by techniques of public renunciation of previous ties or engaging in ceremonies which en-
hance group cohesion. Finally, control commitment refers to an attachment to those organizational norms which shape behaviour in desired directions resulting from requiring the members to publicly disavow previous norms and reformulate self conceptions in terms of organizational values.

A third typology has been given by Staw (1977). Staw refers to an organizational behaviour approach and a social psychological approach. The former refers to a view of commitment in terms of a strong identification with, and involvement in the organization brought about by various factors (attitudinal commitment). In the latter, commitment is viewed as sunk costs invested in the organization which bind the individual irrevocably to the organization (behavioural commitment).

In providing a perspective on commitment as it is thought of today, it would be correct to go to the first exposition of commitment available in literature related to organizational behaviour. Becker (1960) provided a conceptual exposition of commitment, although he used the forum of a sociological journal to do so. He stated that commitments come into being when a person, by making a "side-bet", links extraneous interests with a consistent line of activity. By making a side-bet, "The committed person has acted in such a way as to involve other interests of his, originally extraneous to the action he is engaged in, directly in that action" (Becker 1960, p.35). Simply stated, a side-bet is an investment made by the individual, valuable to him but originally unrelated to later gains. That investment ac-
crues benefits, e.g., while an individual is a member of an organization benefits like pension plans, etc. accrue and are lost if membership is discontinued. The explanation of organizational commitment where it was conceived of being a result of perception of this exchange came to be known as the side-bet theory or the "exchange approach" or the "structural approach". This line of thought contributed a large mass of theoretical basis upon which later empirical work was based. Hrebiniak and Alutto (1972) among the earlier researchers have provided empirical support to this viewpoint.

An entirely opposing viewpoint was put forth by Ritzer and Trice (1969). They tested the theory of side-bets empirically and came to the conclusion that it did not explain organizational commitment. They put forth another polarized viewpoint which simply stated that commitment to the organization, instead of being a structural phenomenon was "...basically a social psychological phenomenon." (Ritzer and Trice, 1969, p. 178). It was based upon the subjective meaningfulness of an occupation and an organization. Buchanan (1974) also spoke of commitment in these terms. One may say that this view of commitment emphasizes a set of affective elements, a kind of identification and attachment which goes beyond the consideration of mere instrumental worth.

Stevens et al. (1978) felt that none of the two approaches, i.e., the psychological or the side-bet approach,
have been able to develop an "...integrated consideration of the full range of relevant factors that may determine the attachment of the individual to the organization or the leaving or staying behaviour of the members" (Stevens et al., 1978, p. 381). Alutto, Hrebiniak, and Alonso (1973) provided empirical findings to suggest that commitment can not be understood as socio-psychological phenomenon alone, as it has very important structural concomitants.

This awareness for a kind of "blended approach" has not eluded recent researchers. Morris and Sherman (1981) remarked that neither of the approaches is single handedly sufficient to explain the commitment of employees to their organizations in any society. So they suggest a blending of the two approaches. A careful observation reveals the absence of existence of any real difference in the two approaches. Both the exchange and the psychological approaches conceive of commitment as an evaluation of those linkages that exist between members and their employing organizations. Alvi and Ahmed (1987) consider that both the approaches are based upon Maslow's (1954) hierarchy of needs, thus dividing the needs of societies and workers in terms of degree of affluence. Hence, the less affluent worker would consider physical needs to be more important and the more affluent worker would consider psychological needs to be more important.

Tokunaga and Staw (1986) in a critique of organizational commitment classified two theoretical trends
regarding organizational commitment. They termed them as the
a) organizational behaviour approach, and
b) the social psychological approach

The organizational behaviour approach has been mainly supported by the work of Mowday et al. (1982). For analyzing the results of the various studies which have been conducted, this approach has used the exchange framework. Organizational and structural variables are seen to increase the employee's sense of importance and involvement in the organization and also clarify the role expectation and demands (Tokunaga and Staw, 1986). It is further submitted that the strength of the approach lay in it being able to engulf the concept of involvement and include the contribution of tenure, effort, and satisfaction. The criticism levelled against it concerns the relevance of this statement of organizational commitment. Empirical work has not been able to substantiate this contention. Staw (1975) had suggested that there were some independent constructs being used in this model which should not be clubbed.

Staw and Salanick (1977) were the initial proponents of the social psychological approach. They maintained that the organizational behaviour approach was value laden and it viewed organizational commitment from the organization's point of view and disregarded the individual. This viewpoint uses Kiesler's (1971) contention to form the concept of "behavioural commitment". In this sense, commitment is
regarded as the extent to which an actor's previous behaviours serve to bind him to them as he becomes identified and linked with the consequences of his behaviour (Tokunaga and Staw, 1986). Based on this viewpoint, Salanick (1977) brought forth the concept of salience, explicitness, irrevocability, volitionality, and publicity, and conceived of organizational commitment to be the product of actions characterized by these attributes. Commitment, according to this view is not perceived as an affective state. It is viewed as a product of actual behaviour and the fact that perceptions of the nature of this behaviour (in terms of irrevocability etc.) serve to determine the actor's commitment level.

Both organizational behaviour approach and social psychological approach have not been able to explain organizational commitment in its entirety. The former has limitations regarding its use for, "...researchers or practitioners, or how it develops within or between individuals" (Tokunaga and Staw, 1986, p.16). Social psychological theory, on the other hand, has the disadvantage of having been conceived of and worked upon in settings outside organizations and thus has not been able to speak of the object of commitment (Tokunaga and Staw, 1986). Tokunaga and Staw (1986) provided an "integrated model" of organizational commitment falling between the two earlier approaches. It states that organizational commitment be thought of as "the obligation to a future course of action which results in a strengthening of the link between the employee and organiza-
The individual has to, because of previous behaviour, respond to pressures from both internal and external sources. Actions which increase the tendency to maintain investments in the organization are viewed as reflecting higher commitment on the part of the employee. This model or viewpoint serves to include altruistic behaviour as a potential moderator of commitment. This would be included along with more static, job oriented features.

Quite akin to the two approaches cited by Tokunaga and Staw (1986), O'Reilly and Caldwell (1981) also clubbed two streams explaining commitment as "prospective" and "retrospective rationality". Salanick (1977) suggested the difference between two approaches by stating that in the prospective view, commitment is thought of as an individual's psychological bond to the organization. This may be a function of loyalty, job involvement, and a belief in the values of the organization. As is quite clear, this draws heavily upon the social psychological approach to explain commitment. Subsequent work attitudes and work behaviour are seen as a function of the expectations met and of objective characteristics of the organization, job, and the individual (Louis, 1980; Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, and Meglino 1979; and Price, 1977). This seems to be an extension of the exchange approach.

On the other hand, retrospective rationality suggests that commitment results retrospectively or that individuals
become bound to behavioural acts. Drawing upon Kiesler and Sakumara (1966), Salanick (1977) defined commitment in terms of bindings of the individual to behavioural acts. This conception draws further upon the social psychological studies of dissonance (Festinger, 1957), cognitive consistency (Gerard, 1968), and self justification (Kiesler, 1971). The assumption of this viewpoint is that individuals attempt to resolve inconsistencies between behaviour they perform and attitudes they hold. Secondly, commitment serves to make an act or behaviour less changeable, hence people continue to act in ways consistent with previous behaviours. The notion is that those behavioural acts which can't be justified on the basis of extrinsic causes will result in the individual retrospectively interpreting the behaviour in positive terms and being more committed to the course of action, than to behaviours which are justified by extrinsic causes.

Finally, it would be in order to consider another distinction in terms of attitudinal and behavioural commitment. Although, this distinction has already been utilized in the earlier streams, it is explained in greater detail here. In this distinction, one approach emphasized the influence of commitment attitudes upon behaviour whereas the other approach emphasized the influence of committing behaviours upon subsequent attitudes. With regard to attitudinal commitment, commitment comes across as an attitude achieved by internalization of an organization's goals and values. Wiener (1982) referred to commitment as a totality
of the internalized normative pressures to act in such a manner that would meet the organizational interests. Buchan-
nan (1974), Hall, Schneider, and Nygren (1970), and Sheldon (1971) have all utilised attitudinal commitment as a con-
struct. Mowday et al.'s (1982) definition of commitment also draws heavily upon this conceptualization.

Behavioural commitment considers commitment in terms of a "behaviour loop". Commitment is distinguished from other behaviours as it extends beyond normative expectations. This viewpoint hence concentrates upon "...overt manifestations of commitment" (Mowday et al., 1979, p. 225). The problem with this perspective lies in the difficulty in distinguishing commitment behaviour in terms of its source which could also lie in effective reward systems.

The two approaches have more similarities than differences. In both, four characteristics of organizationally committed individuals arise, i.e.,

1) internalizing the goals and values of the organization,
2) being involved in the organizational role in the context of those goals and values,
3) a desire to maintain membership with the organization over a period of time to achieve goals, and finally,
4) a willingness to exert full effort in the interest of the attainment of the organization's goals and values apart from the instrumentality of the effort for attaining individual goals.
The difference between the two approaches (DeCotiis and Summers, 1987) could be that the attitudinal state focuses upon the cognitive state of attachment to an organization and views extraordinary behaviour and attitudes as correlates of being committed but as not being equivalent to it. DeCotiis and Summers (1987, p.448) have suggested commitment to be "...a two dimensional construct..." Using this, they put forth another definition of commitment which leans heavily on Buchanan's (1974) work and makes room for the importance of organizational role. Mowday et al. (1982) also spoke of interrelating the two approaches. They submitted that attitudinal and behavioural commitment could be conceived of as being reciprocally related over time. Their contention is that the following two propositions could be assumed to be reasonable:

1) Commitment attitudes may lead to committing behaviours which subsequently reinforce and strengthen attitudes, and

2) Committing behaviour may lead to committing attitudes and subsequent committing behaviours.

Mowday et al. further suggest that the process of "...commitment is characterized by the reciprocal influence of attitudes and behaviours" (Mowday et al. 1982, p.47). They suggest that the causal arrow between commitment attitudes and behaviour should not be thought of as pointing in one or the other direction. Instead, both should be viewed as being reciprocally related over time.
In the most frequently used definition, Mowday et al. (1982, p.27) define organizational commitment as, "...the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization. Conceptually, it can be characterized by at least three factors:

a) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization's goals and values;

b) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization, and

c) a strong desire to maintain membership with the organization."

They maintain that this definition entails a view of commitment as an active phenomena. It extends beyond a mere passive loyalty to the organization.

One may conclude by saying that as the status of organizational commitment concept stands today, Mowday et al.'s (1982) definition is the most comprehensive one. Though they have referred to their treatise as an explanation of attitudinal commitment, by including the concept of extraordinary "effort", they have roped in an attitudinal facet of behavioural manifestations. Though this definition and its operationalization called the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire need further refinement and could do well to borrow from integrative models of commitment, yet, as of now, it is the most inclusive statement regarding organizational commitment.

As expected, the conceptual diversity in organizational commitment led to diverse methods of its measurement. Most
of these measures were two-to-four items scales which were constructed on an a-priori basis and for which little or no validity and reliability data were available (Grusky, 1966; Hrebiniak and Alutto, 1972; Lee, 1971; Sheldon, 1971). The need for a comprehensive and standardized measure of organizational commitment was fulfilled by Mowday et al. (1979). The instrument is referred to as the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire.

The approach to instrument development followed by Porter and Smith (1970) was to identify fifteen items that appeared to tap the three aspects of Mowday et al.'s definition of organizational commitment. Some items in the scale were negatively phrased and reverse scored in order to reduce response bias. Mowday et al. (1982, p. 220) said, "It was intended that the scale items, when taken together, would provide a fairly consistent indicator of employee commitment levels for most working populations." They further state that there was reasonably strong evidence existing for the internal consistency and test retest reliability of the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire. Hence, this instrument became synonymous with the concept of organizational commitment.

**Job Involvement**

Often, the formalization of a concept is different from its early beginnings. The shape which job involvement has taken is different from the earliest stirrings that it created. Lewis (1944) and Lewis and Franklin (1944) demon-
strated that individuals became involved in their work even in the artificial context of a laboratory. It is since then that empirical investigations of ego involvement in the job began to appear with increased frequency (Saal, 1978).

Job involvement has been fraught with conflicting conceptions. Dubin (1956, 1958) has conceived of a related concept called "central life interest". This is meant to assess whether or not it is the job which is perceived to be a major source of satisfaction in a person's life. Guion (1958) considered the concept as being characterized by the employee's perceptions of the job as being of great importance.

An alternative interpretation of the concept seems to come forth in the works of Allport (1943), and Gurin, Veroff, and Feld (1960). They seem to stress the interactive aspect of the personality as it is related to a job situation. Allport (1943) brought to light the degree to which an employee is participating in his job and whether needs like prestige, self respect, self regard, and autonomy are being met with. Gurin et al. (1960) went further to include into the fold, dimensions of self expression and self actualization. Wickert (1951) and Bass (1965) conceived of a similar involvement. Bass (1965) considered that certain perceptions when engendered by the employees lead to a strong feeling of job involvement. He felt that if the employee reported perceived autonomy, held he was contributing to company's success, and had an opportunity to decide
work schedules etc., his job involvement would be strengthened.

Vroom (1959, 1962) stated that the participative dimension of job involvement could be judged by finding out how much an employee "psychologically" participated in the job. French and Kahn (1962) conceived of job involvement much in the same manner as did Lodahl and Kejner (1965), although the latter are credited with including the concept into the fold of organizational psychology. French and Kahn (1962) and Lodahl and Kejner (1965), treated job involvement primarily as the degree to which an employee perceived that his job performance was central to his self concept i.e., the degree to which it affects his self esteem. Lodahl and Kejner (1965), however, included another dimension, that of the degree of psychological identification with the job, in their definition of job involvement.

Siegel (1969) also treated job involvement in terms of self worth and degree of importance of work in determining the self worth of a person. Finally, job involvement has also been conceived of by Vroom (1962, 1964) as the degree to which a person's performance is consistent with the characteristics central to his self concept. The difference between the conceptualization of Vroom (1962) and that of French and Kahn (1962) is that whereas the former has used self concept as an existing realistic state, the latter have conceived of it as a valued self concept.
To summarize, a person has been thought of as being job involved when:

1) work is a person's central life interest,
2) there is active participation by him in his job,
3) performance is perceived as central to his self esteem, and
4) performance is also perceived as being consistent with self concept.

Saleh and Hosek (1976) conducted a study using a measure based upon the previous measures (Davis, 1966; Dubin, 1956; French and Kahn, 1962; Iverson and Reuwer, 1956; Lodahl and Kejner, 1965; Vroom, 1962, 1964; and Wickert, 1951). They did alter the format of few items, although majority of the items were retained in their original form. Their study comprised two samples, i.e., students and management employees. The results of this study, obtained after factor analysis, show that the factors found were much like those of Lawler and Hall (1970). The factor of "satisfaction" corresponded to Saleh and Hosek's (1976) factor of "active participation", "job involvement" was similar to "central life interest" and the factor of "intrinsic motivation" was similar to that of "centrality of performance to self esteem." Saleh and Hosek (1976) propounded, on the basis of their study, a three factor structure of job involvement which may be perceived as engaging three components of the self.

Saleh and Hosek (1976, p. 223) have defined job in-
volvement as "...the degree to which the self, with its three components, identity, connative, and evaluative is reflected in the individual's job. It is the degree to which the person identifies with his job, actively participates in it, and considers his performance important to his self worth." Hence, it may be thought of as a complete concept considered to be based upon all the three pillars of cognition, conation, and affection.

Hence, job involvement becomes clearly an attitude with all the three necessary components. Studies by Lawler and Hall (1970), Lodahl and Kejner (1965), Schwyhart and Smith (1972), and Weissenberg and Gruenfeld (1968) have been supportive of this attitudinal conceptualization of job involvement. Citing the problems which have often been encountered in the job involvement research, Kanungo (1982a) stated that:

1) Past conceptualizations of job involvement have confused it with the issue of intrinsic motivation (Gorn and Kanungo, 1980). Kanungo (1981) has included the Lodahl and Kejner's (1965) scale as also suffering from this malady. There are certain items in the scale where the words job and work are used interchangeably.

2) Another apparent problem is that the state of job involvement and its subsequent effects have been confused with the antecedent conditions of job involvement (Kanungo, 1979). Kanungo (1979) has criticized Saleh and Hosek (1976) on this account.
3) The third manner in which confusion is created, is, when job involvement is described as both a cognitive and positive emotional state of the individual.

The final criticism labelled against job involvement lies in the spill over which "job" and "work" have faced. Although, in speech, the two terms are used interchangeably, but in the conceptualization of a term or concept, such an ambiguity may defeat the very purpose of proposed investigation. Kanungo (1982a) postulates that involvement in a specific job is a belief which is descriptive of the job and would tend to be a function of how many of the needs of the individual are satisfied by the job. Whereas the involvement in work is a far wider concept. This is a normative belief regarding the value of work in one's life. This could be a function of many factors including socialization or conditioning. Hence, whereas one is a descriptive belief, "contemporaneously caused" the other, i.e., work involvement, is a "normative belief" which is "historically caused". In his study, Kanungo, (1982a) supported this conceptual distinction between job and work involvement and also evolved psychometric measures for the same.

Since the concept has not clearly determined peripheral limits as yet, there are new dimensions added regularly. For instance, Pinder (1984) has consolidated the previous studies and definitions and given the same detailed definition as Saleh and Hosek (1976). Saleh and Hosek (1976) and Jans (1982) have found job involvement to be multidimensional.
Blau (1985) stated that all the conceptions of job involvement portray that there is a common focus upon the job itself. These conceptions, however, are different from other related constructs, be it organizational commitment or job satisfaction. But, there are some constructs with which job involvement does overlap.

Blau (1985) referring to "epistemic correlation" (Northorp, 1959) which is a link between a conceptual definition and its operationalization, states that the best epistemic correlation with regard to job involvement was that of Lodahl and Kejner's (1965) scale. Different factors of this scale have been reported by different researchers. For instance, Schwyhart and Smith (1972) found only one factor similar to that proposed by Lodahl and Kejner (1965). Wood (1974) obtained five factors. Blau (1985) got four factors across four samples, out of which psychological identification and performance - self esteem were two factors.

In concluding a detailed study, Blau, (1985, p. 33) stated, "The cumulative results of these studies indicate that job involvement is a unidimensional construct which can be operationalized in terms of the degree to which the job is central to the person and his psychological identity."

It is not as if there is an unequivocal agreement upon referring to job involvement as an attitudinal construct. There are viewpoints which serve to contain the scope it may cover. Mckelvey and Sekaran (1977) have suggested that job involvement, rather than being a generalized construct,
should be conceived of in terms of being career based. Schwyhart and Smith (1972) have also suggested that special scales for the various occupational groups be prepared.

Rabinowitz and Hall (1977) in a very significant study of job involvement conceived of it as having a kind of cybernetic structure. They felt that involvement may be high because a person is motivated or satisfied with his job or a person may experience high job satisfaction or job motivation because job involvement is high. They felt that there are two classes of definitions of job involvement which have guided past research, viz.,

a) job involvement as a performance - self esteem contingency, and
b) job involvement as a component of self image.

Commenting upon theoretical perspectives, they stated that job involvement has been variously conceived of as either

a) individual difference variable, or
b) a function of the situation, or
c) as an interaction between individual and situation.

Rabinowitz and Hall (1977, pp.284-286) on the basis of their detailed study, gave the following concluding remarks:

1) Job involvement is related to three classes of working variables i.e., personal characteristics, situational characteristics, and work outcomes. In their analysis, no one class of variables showed clearly stronger relationship with job involvement than any other;
2) Job involvement is quite a stable attribute;
3) Much of the variance in job involvement remains unexplained;
4) The data collected so far are more consistent with the "importance of work" definition of job involvement than with the "extent to which performance affects self esteem" definition;
5) Job involvement seems to be a "feedback variable". It is a cause and an effect of job behaviour;
6) Personal and situational variables exert independent effects on involvement;
7) Situational variables have differential effects upon people with different levels of job involvement. These affect the low job involved more than the high job involved.

Veerbhadriah and Jalihal (1983) conducted a factor analytic study of job involvement. The sample they used was drawn from extension workers of Indian Council of Agricultural Research in Karnataka. These officials were at the levels of Assistant and Deputy Directors. They found that the common factors which emerged in the sample of Assistant Directors and Deputy Directors were
1) Job Centrality
2) Duty Consciousness
3) Striving for perfection
4) Indifference to work
5) Disgust with work, and finally
6) Inconsistency
Most of the work on job involvement in India has been done only in the past one decade. Aggarwala (1976) developed a scale of job involvement which contains seven dimensions, some of which were not previously covered in other scales.

It would still take some more time and more research before the clear delineation regarding job involvement can take place. As yet, there are a lot of concepts which step into the arena of job involvement. However, the scale developed by Lodahl and Kejner (1965) has not been replaced by an equally strong or popular instrument. Hence, so far it remains the instrument which aligns itself in a manner closest to the concept.

Role Stress

A formal organization is a system of positions and their associated roles. Organizational positions are locations in the system and roles are the expectations associated with particular position (Gross, Mason, and McEachern, 1958).

Role stress theory represents major theoretical development in organizational psychology in the area of stress. Role stress, as a set of constructs, gained prominence owing to work done in sixties by members of Survey Research Centre at the Research Centre for Group Dynamics at the University of Michigan (French and Kahn, 1962; Kahn, Wolfe, Snoek, and Rosenthal, 1964). Role conflict was defined by these researchers as the simultaneous occurrence of
two or more role pressures, so that compliance with one would make it more difficult to comply with the other. Role ambiguity was defined as an incomplete sort of role sending, where the information necessary to carry out the job was not available or was incomplete.

Tracing the rumblings of the role theory through classical organization theory, Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman (1970) draw upon the principle of chain of command and unity of command. These have implications for role conflict in complex organizations. According to these authors, theoretically, a single chain of command was considered desirable as it was consistent with the principle of unity of command. This principle states that for any action, an employee should receive orders from one supervisor only, and there should exist only one leader and one plan for a group of activities having same objectives. Essentially, this is directed at saving an employee from being caught in the crossfire of incompatible orders or incompatible expectations from more than one supervisor. Davis (1951) also suggested the idea of single accountability. Role conflict would be the degree to which the expectations of a role are incompatible or incongruent with the reality of the role. Role conflict then may be viewed as resulting from the violation of the two classical principles. Regarding role ambiguity, the authors go on to suggest that if an employee does not know the expectations from him, he will hesitate in making decisions.
Rizzo et al. (1970), on the basis of research conducted earlier, proposed that role conflict and role ambiguity were important intervening variables mediating the effects of various organizational practices on individual and organizational outcomes. A role, for them, was typically conceived of as "a set of expectations about behaviour for a position in a social structure" (Rizzo et al., 1970, p.155).

Role conflict could be said to occur when a role incumbent feels that he or she is faced with incompatible expectations (Gross et al., 1958) and role ambiguity (Lyons, 1971) may be said to result if position incumbents lack adequate role-relevant information, as when information is restricted or when role expectations are not clearly defined. Rizzo et al. (1970) argued that role ambiguity was related to the predictability of responses to one's behaviour and the clarity of behavioural requirements or expectations.

Role conflict may be defined in terms of congruency-incongruency or compatibility-incompatibility in terms of role requirements. Here congruence or compatibility is judged relative to a set of standards or conditions which impinge upon role performance.

Role ambiguity was defined by Rizzo et al. (1970) in terms of:
1) Predictability of outcome or response to one's behaviour, and
2) Existence or clarity of behavioural requirements re-
garded often as inputs from environment, serving to
guide behaviour and provide the knowledge that beha-
viour is appropriate.

Role ambiguity has not been elaborately conceptualized
in the available literature (McGrath, 1976; Sarbin and
Allen, 1968;). Generally, it has been conceived of in terms
of the degree to which clear information is lacking
regarding both, the expectations associated with the role
and the methods for fulfilling role expectations and/or
consequences of role performance (Graen, 1976; Kahn et al.,
1964).

A further thought invested in unveiling the concept of
role ambiguity leads to the following possibilities:
1) There could be unclear information regarding the role
potential;
2) There could be clear information regarding the expec-
tation to be met but no clear information regarding
what behaviour will lead to the expectation;
3) Consequences of the behaviour could be unclear or
ambiguous.

Vansell, Brief, and Schuler (1981) suggest that the
above mentioned forms of role ambiguity could exhibit a
reciprocal causal relationship with the dimensions of role
conflict. Hence, even though role conflict and role ambigui-
ty are conceptually distinguishable kinds of role stress,
empirical indices may not be necessarily unrelated. They
further suggest that although the number of those studies
which document the dysfunctional outcomes of role stress are
large, research has only focussed upon organizational factors which may cause role stress or mediate its effects.

Hence, it may be stated that although the historical journey made by the two concepts of role conflict and role ambiguity has been rather exhaustive, they have not deviated too far from the original definition proposed by Katz and Kahn (1966). They referred to the concepts as a, "...major means for linking the individual and organizational levels of research and theory; it is at once the building block of social systems and the summation of the requirements with which such systems confront their members and individuals" (Katz and Kahn, 1966, p.197).

To systematically examine the concepts of role ambiguity and role conflict and their relationships with organizational and personal variables, Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman (1970) constructed, from a factor analysis of 29 items, two scales called Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity Scales. These scales are the most widely utilized ones for measuring role conflict and ambiguity, despite their being subject to occasional criticism. For instance, Tracy and Thompson (1981) mention that the two factors of role conflict and role ambiguity do not possess the required validity. They are of the opinion that factor-I should be said to represent both role clarity and role comfort and when reverse scored it should tap role ambiguity and role discomfort. They opine that though the scales possess a fair degree of face validity yet the same is not confirmed by factor analysis. Howev-
er, Schuler, Aldag and Brief (1977) on the basis of their study had supported the two scales of role conflict and role ambiguity developed by Rizzo et al. (1970). Szilayagi (1977) had also reported similar results.

To sum up, it may be said that both, role conflict and role ambiguity, are important constructs in the repertoire of the organizational behavioural research issues. Couch (1979) contended that the jobs of middle level managers are characterized, at times, by lack of role clarity and specificity, so this problem demands adequate attention. Also, role conflict and ambiguity should not be conceived of as parsimonious constructs. As Hamner and Tosi (1974) suggest, role stress is a multidimensional construct and components of role conflict and role ambiguity would act in different ways under different conditions. In unstructured environments, especially in case of managerial jobs, these assume greater relevance. House and Rizzo (1972) suggest that they may also be treated as intervening variables between possible sources and various outcomes.

Bulk of research supports these concepts as being associated with negatively valued states. Hence, they warrant continued attention from researchers of organizational behaviour.

**Protestant Work Ethic**

The concept of Protestant Work Ethic was introduced by Weber (1905). Weber's work was translated into English by Parsons (1958). Weber (1905) proposed a theory that related
the Protestant Calvinistic faith had a spiritual thrust towards capitalism and was based upon the assumption that work and financial success were means to achieve, not only professional goals, but religious goals as well. As a result, the holder of the Protestant ethic is committed to the values of hard work, to the work itself as an objective and the work organization as the inevitable structure within which those internalized values can be stated (Weber, 1905).

Some studies of work values and beliefs have been carried out by Cook, Hepworth, Wall, and Warr (1981), Furnham (1984a), Slomczynski, Miller, and Kohn (1981). Referring to the genesis of the Protestant Work Ethic and its evolution, Furnham (1984) states that psychologists have not been concerned with the nature of the historical, political and sociological arguments concerning the Protestant Work Ethic.

The basic hypothesis in Weber's argument was that Protestant Work Ethic provided a moral justification for the accumulation of wealth. And even though the validity of the historical, economic, sociological and theological hypothesis remains in doubt and hotly debated (Marshall, 1982), few have denied the validity and accuracy of Weber's specification of behaviour pattern, goals and values dictated by the Protestant Work Ethic, namely, asceticism, hard work, postponement of gratification, thrift, frugality, etc.

One of the elements in Weber's scheme stated that work itself was virtuous and had to be excellently and honestly done. However, this aspect was least central to Weber's
argument and served merely as an introduction to Protestant Work Ethic itself.

The term, Protestant Work Ethic, implies that the concept has been borrowed from the writings of Weber. This is not true for the concept, as it is used today in psychology. Not very many psychologists appear to have read Weber's works in detail or paid much attention to the metaphysical aspects of Protestant Work Ethic beliefs. Hughes (1958, p. 323) spoke of Protestant Work Ethic as "an ethic that endorsed and encouraged the life of rationally oriented business activities." Fullerton (1959) believes, that the establishment of work as a conscious calling and service to God provided a religious rationale for the establishment of profit making, the charging of interest, the pressure upon the employee for work beyond the support of his immediate needs, the obligation not to waste time or money, and, in general, to commit idleness and other conditions which prevent full utilization of one's time and efficiency to the category of sinfulness. Hence, Protestant Work Ethic was a religious and moral sanction to the accumulation of wealth. It was McClelland (1961) who brought the concept of Protestant Work Ethic into the domain of psychology. He offered a socio-psychological explanation for the link between Protestantism and Capitalism. His contention is that Protestant Work Ethic influences the child rearing practices in terms of independence, procrastination of gratification, and mastery training, which in turn leads to the children ac-
quiring strong achievement motivation. Hence, McClelland has subsumed Protestant Work Ethic concept into the concept of need for achievement which was seen by him as a basic dimension of personality.

McClelland (1961) does not mention the religious basis of Protestant Work Ethic and it is McClelland's efforts at the refinement of the concept and separation from religion which brought the Weberian thesis into the twentieth century. Weber's (1905) emphasis on religion is no longer a part of the concept as it is studied today.

While dwelling upon the religious element, thought to be inherent in Protestant Work Ethic with its original Weberian flavor and the considered linkage between Protestant Work Ethic and economic development, it will be correct to report lack of empirical support for the idea as per today's classifications. Ray (1982) failed to find a difference between Protestants and Catholics on the basis of the Protestant Work Ethic, hence the Protestant ethic according to him is not Protestant. So, the term Protestant is being increasingly dropped (Beit Hallahmi, 1979).

Protestant Work Ethic has been viewed in a variety of ways. It has been thought of as a "dimension of personality" by Mirels and Garrett (1971) who were the first ones to mention and conceptualize the variable in this manner, i.e., as a disposition of the personality. They stated that in psychology, Protestant Work Ethic is usually conceived of as a dispositional variable, characterized by a belief in the importance of hard work, rationality, and frugality which
acts as a defense against sloth, sensuality, and religious doubt (Mirels and Garrett, 1971). Protestant Work Ethic, hence, may be considered as an important individual difference measure.

Another conception of Protestant Work Ethic has been offered by Beit Hallahmi (1979). He suggested that Protestant Work Ethic could be regarded as an orientation towards the place of work in one's life and society, which is related to a great extent to various social background variables.

Regarding the relevance of the concept to present day intellectual streams, very divergent views have been thrown up. Furnham (1984) concluded that a decade of intensive work on the Protestant Work Ethic had confirmed its place as an important individual difference variable related to human motivation. Psychologists have chosen to conceive of and measure Protestant Work Ethic as a coherent bipolar belief system similar to Locus of Control. Present measuring devices appear to concentrate on only a few dimensions of Protestant Work Ethic, and provide a single score. Cook et al. (1981) state that Protestant Work Ethic beliefs and behaviour as defined and measured by the many Protestant Work Ethic scales appear to be concerned with work values, beliefs, needs, and more particularly a person's continuing commitment to paid employment. However, Protestant Work Ethic is neither exclusively Protestant, nor only about work, and nor exclusively concerned with ethics. Furnham
also suggests that Protestant Work Ethic "...does appear to predict certain quantitative and qualitative aspects of work behaviour. By and large, Protestant work ethic believers had to work harder and be more satisfied with extrinsic aspects of their work and Protestant Work Ethic beliefs appear to be more closely associated with higher order needs..." (Furnham, 1984, p.95). This viewpoint is not the sole statement upon the status of Protestant Work Ethic. Kelvin and Jarett (1985, p. 104) dismiss the existence of Protestant ethic as "...little more than an invention of 20th century social science with unwarranted pretensions to an ancient lineage." They argued that Protestant Work Ethic was a myth historically and appeared to be an explanation with no real basis.

Furnham and Lewis (1986) suggest that psychologists, unlike other social scientists, have been concerned with the assessment of behaviour patterns of those holding or not holding Protestant Work Ethic beliefs.

There were various scales which were used to measure Protestant Work Ethic and subsequently put to disuse Goldstein and Eichorn, 1961; Hammond and Williams, 1976;). Furnham (1984) suggested that scales devised to measure the Protestant Work Ethic might measure some aspects of a person's belief system and behavioural patterns but definitely not what Weber himself had in mind. Hence, according to him, the use of the term Protestant Work Ethic should be challenged.
Apart from Mirels and Garrett's (1971) scale, there is a scale constructed by Blood (1969). Both these scales tap a bipolar dimension. Wollack, Goodale, Wijting, and Smith (1971) also constructed a Survey of Work Values. All these measures correlate moderately well with each other (Waters, Bathis, and Waters, 1975; Furnham, 1982).

It is reasonable to agree with Furnham and Roses' (1987, p. 570) views, which state "...Protestant Work Ethic believers don't necessarily totally reject leisure, but they don't necessarily believe that it is by definition a 'good thing'." They also maintain, "Although the Protestant Work Ethic has been found to be a robust, discriminating, and parsimonious belief system, it overlaps with certain other issues such as leisure, wealth, and welfare. Future work on the Protestant Work Ethic as either an independent or a dependent variable would benefit from an inclusion of these other measures" (Furnham and Rose, 1987, p. 571).

**Organizational Climate**

Organizational Climate may be conceived of as the aggregate perception of the characteristics of the work place by the respondents. The organization is an entity with varied features. These features will be perceived and reacted upon by the respondents. The role of features of the organization as influencing agents of people's behaviour has been of inherent interest to the industrial/organizational psychologists. Hence, organizational climate has been rigorously investigated even if not stated by this
al as they provide a frame of reference.

Hence, the Gestaltists' explanation would be in terms of people being almost 'driven' to create order as they have no choice. Functionalists, on the other hand, speaking of order, stated that order is apprehended as well as created for people to function adaptively in their world. They viewed adaptation as a generalized phenomenon and individual differences in adaptation were also considered. As a generalized phenomenon one could say that organizations seem to adopt styles of organizational behaviour which fit their environment (Lawrence and Lorsch, 1969). Similarly, individuals will also adopt strategies which fit the dynamics of their environment, which is the specific organization (Argyris, 1957a).

Guion (1976), and Holdsworth (1971) maintain that it is possible for situational demands to overwhelm individual differences if they have a narrow range in a work setting. Hence, using this and reversing the argument, one can say that organizations which create climates in which full range of individual differences are displayed at work will also be organizations in which validity coefficients for the prediction of performance will be higher (Schneider, 1975).

Stretching the individual differences aspect, Forehand concluded that studying climate from the point of view of individual differences "....provides some badly needed guidelines for selecting and defining environmental variables relevant to the study of climate" (Forehand, 1968, p. 75). Hence, one may say that as per the Function-
alists' view, adaptation has been cited as the explanatory concept for the impact of climate perceptions upon behaviour. Individuals require information from the environment to know which behaviour the organization requires from them, which will aid them in achieving a homeostatic balance with their environment (Schneider, 1975).

Some behaviourists have proposed that organizational climate can be perceived by employees within an organization (Forehand and Gilmer, 1964; Friedlander and Marguiles, 1969; Halpin and Croft, 1963; Pace and Stern, 1958; Payne and Mansfield, 1973; Pritchard and Karasick, 1973; Schneider, 1973, and Schneider and Hall, 1972). In forming climate perceptions the individual acts as an information processor, using information regarding the following:

a) the events occurring around him as well as characteristics of the organization, and

b) personal characteristics, e.g., needs.

Hence, it is assumed that perceptions emerge as a result of the activities, interactions and experiences of the individual (Forehand and Gilmer, 1964; Halpin and Croft, 1963; and Litwin and Stringer, 1968).

Organizational climate research has most often concerned itself with describing forms or styles of behaviours in organizations. Research has been conducted from vantage points and has assumed that, on the basis of perceptions of organizational practices and procedures, individuals evolve a global or summary perception of their
organization (James and Jones, 1974; Schneider, 1973; Sells, 1968; Taiguri, 1968).

James and Jones, (1974) in an extensive review and critique of the theoretical and empirical research carried out in organizational climate admitted the existence of three separate but not mutually exclusive approaches to the definition and measurement of organizational climate:

1) Multiple Measurement - Organizational attribute approach

2) Perceptual Measurement - Organizational attribute approach

3) Perceptual Measurement - Individual attribute approach.

A brief review of each of the three approaches is as follows:

1) According to the multiple measurement-organizational attribute approach, climate is a set of characteristics that:
   i) distinguish the organization from other organizations;
   ii) are relatively enduring over time; and
   iii) influence the behavior of people in the organization (Forehand and Gilmer, 1964).

Keeping this as a representative definition, the following have been considered by James and Jones (1974) to be appropriate studies of organizational models and taxonomies (e.g., Hall, Haas, and Johnson, 1967; Indik, 1968; Katz and Kahn, 1966; Sells, 1963; 1968a), and organizational structure (e.g., Porter and Lawler, 1965; Pugh, Hickson, Hinnings
and Turner, 1968; Thomas and Fink; 1963).

In accordance with this concept, any study focussing on organizational or group characteristics would be included in the general area of organizational climate. Hence, 'climate' almost becomes synonymous with the situation. In terms of providing the concept with clarity or crystallization there is not much that this approach has contributed.

2) The second approach is the perceptual measurement-organizational attribute approach. As per this approach, climate is viewed as a situational variable or organizational main effect. Campbell and Beaty, (1971) stressed that organizational climate was a description of the organizational situation and as such must contain a significant portion of the between group variance.

Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler, and Weick, (1970) reviewed and synthesized the studies of Kahn et al. (1964), Litwin and Stringer (1968), and Schneider and Bartlett (1968) and put forth four dimensions of organizational climate. The factors which evolved were few and items were similar. This indicated that the list was incomplete and more factors were yet to be determined.

The two concerns expressed regarding this approach were:

i) the importance of the actual situation versus the perceived situation in determining behaviour and attitudes in organizations, and
ii) the concern regarding the relationship between objective and perceptual factors, specially in terms of determinants and accuracy of such perceptions.

Organizational climate was viewed as a situationally determined psychological process, in which the organizational climate variables were considered to be either causative or moderator factors for performance and attitudes. Hence, organizational climate was a perceptual measure which described the organization, and was different from attitudinal, evaluative, and need satisfaction variables.

Guion commented that the stipulation of the perceptual measurement of organizational climate appeared to be "...more a function of methodological convenience than a deliberate intention to move to a new construct..." (Guion, 1973, p. 121). He further stated that climate researchers were confused in the sense of its being either an organizational attribute or an individual attribute. If considered an organizational attribute but measured perceptually then Guion concluded that 'accuracy' of perception should be validated against consensus of perceptions.

Finally, the case against perceptual measures would be that perception being an internal representation of external objects is subject to influence by several individual differences. It may be said that reliance on perceptual measurement may be interpreted as meaning that
organizational climate includes not only descriptions of situational characteristics, but also individual differences in perception and attitudes.

James and Jones (1974), basing their work on review of some related studies like that of Herman and Hulin (1972) stated that studies demonstrate "... the degree to which perceived climate is based upon individual differences in job attitudes rather than differences in situations requires additional empirical validation of the accuracy and/or consensus of the organizational climate data" (James and Jones, 1974,p.1104).

Authors committed to this viewpoint regarded perceived organizational climate as a psychological process intervening between organizational processes and dependent variables. (Campbell et al., 1970). The model of organizational climate given by Likert (1961, 1967) is also an interaction - influence model. Here, climate dimensions are causal variables and leadership techniques interact with personality to produce perceptions. Hence, organizational climate intervenes and mediates an individual's perceptions about an organization.

The major criticism levelled against this viewpoint is that individual differences in perception in similar situation are indicative of not differences in climate but rather appear to represent other sources of variation. Another aspect is that if organizational climate is seen as encompassing certain situational variables like leadership, autonomy etc. but not other variables, like size, and span
of control then the criterion for differentiation is unclear.

James and Jones (1974, p. 1105) say, "Thus it appears inconsistent to require the same set of organizational climate data to be accurate measures of organizational stimuli and simultaneously to be representative of the response-oriented psychological process level of explanation."

3) Perceptual measurement-individual attribute approach:
Most of the features of this approach have been presented in a series of articles by Schneider and his associates. (Schneider, 1972, 1973; Schneider and Bartlett, 1968, 1970; Schneider and Hall, 1972). Schneider and Hall (1972) referred to organizational climate as a set of global perceptions held by individuals about their organizational environment. They used the behaviourist framework by saying that in forming climate perceptions, an individual acts "as an information processor, using inputs from
a) the objective events and characteristics of the organization and
b) characteristics (e.g., values, needs) of the perceivers" (Schneider and Hall, 1972, p. 248).
"Thus, organizational climate was viewed as a summary evaluation of events based upon interaction between actual events and the perception of those events" (James and Jones, 1974, p. 1105). Since, climate was caused by discrete
experiences and in turn caused consequent behaviours, it was considered to be an intervening variable.

Friedlander and Margulies (1969) also viewed climate as an intervening variable. However, the departure from Schneider lay in treating climate as a situational variable which is assumed to affect the individual versus perceived organizational climate which is a function of individual and situational characteristics.

Padaki (1986) reported that a series of studies conducted by the Human Resource Division of Ahmedabad Textile Industry's Research Association (ATIRA) to study organizational climate showed that climate played a moderating role in understanding employee motivation. In the study, she reported that dimensions of organizational climate moderated the relationship in the job design model. Climate is perceived as a macro level concept.

This approach, hence, assumes that there is an interaction of situational and individual characteristics to produce another set of perceptual, intervening variables. This assumption does not consider perceived climate to be different from an individual attribute. Rather, the intervening variables are individual attributes which provide a bridge between situation and behaviour (James and Jones, 1974). Guion (1973) considered that when the climate is treated as an individual attribute, accuracy and/or consensus are not a question. The problem in this regard most often is the validation of perceptual measurement against objectively existing facts. And in any situation,
the nature of interaction between the objective situation and perceived situation needs substantial clarification (James and Jones, 1974).

James and Jones, in their most effective and exhaustive review of organizational climate suggested, "Only after the conceptual boundaries of organizational climate are spelled out should the measurement and operationalization become matters of major concern" (James and Jones, 1974, p. 1108). Another contention has been that a differentiation must be made between climate regarded as an individual attribute and as an organizational attribute. The term 'organizational climate' should be used in the latter case and the term 'psychological climate' would be more appropriate in the former case. They also felt that organizational climate would include the multiple measurement-organizational attribute approach. This approach would also subsume the perceptual measurement-organizational attribute approach. Psychological climate would of course include the perceptual measurement-individual attribute approach.

If perceptual measures have to be used, then variance should be contributed by differences in the situation and not by the differences in the individual. It must be a statement on the organization's characteristics.

Psychological climate on the other hand should be given a separate identity. The relationship between organizational and psychological climate must be studied. The measure should also study intervening psychological
processes whereby individuals translate the interaction between perceived organizational attributes and individual characteristics into a set of expectancies, attitudes, behaviour, etc.

Drexler, however, conducted a study and stated that descriptive measures of organizational climate characterize organizations and possess organization specific variance. They purport that calling them "psychological climate" measures "...would be misleading if it connotes a construct that is largely intra-individual" (Drexler, 1977, p.41). He states that organizational climate should be considered an organizational attribute and though there are differences in the climate across various departments in the same organization, the departmental effects are much weaker than the organizational effect.

Heller, Guastello, and Aderman (1982) identify 'analytic' and 'synthetic' approaches to the study of organizational climate. They maintain that climate can be viewed either as an attribute of the individual or the organization depending upon the researcher's focus. If the unit of analysis is at the individual level, the operating construct is psychological climate and if the unit of analysis is the collective level, then the operating construct is organizational climate (Litwin and Stringer, 1968).

Heller et al. (1982) also conducted a study, synthetic in orientation. The results of their study contrasted the findings of Jones and James (1979). There was a lack of
convergent validity between some of the psychological and objective climate indices, suggesting that the psychological event is not determined by the objective indices chosen. This view gives some credence to James and Jones' (1974) contention regarding validation against objective criteria.

Upadhyay (1983) gave an extended conceptualization of organizational climate. He extended the boundary to include the social factors and climate was made a dependent variable, determined by external and internal factors. The external influences considered important were:

1) The cultural system;
2) The economic system;
3) The political/administrative system;
4) The science and technology system.

Keeping in view the nature of organizations as a part of the larger unit, i.e., the society, these influences have to be reckoned with. In India, where public sector was set up to meet many economic and ideological goals, the political and other systems, also end up exerting a larger than life influence. Hence, these influences have to be accounted for, studied, and dealt with in terms of their contribution in structuring the organizational climate.

So, climate may be viewed as a function of:

a) Organization's structure;
b) The organization's membership; and
c) More recently, the member's effort to understand the organization (Ashforth, 1985) has also been included.
Although, a precise and widely shared definition of the climate construct does not exist, it can be defined as a shared and enduring molar perception of the psychological aspects of the work environment (Schneider, 1975; Woodman and King, 1978). This definition emphasizes that climate is a perceptually based abstraction. Hence, not only the organization's policies and norms but also their perceptually based evaluation and subsequent, internalization have relevance for the researcher wishing to study organizational climate. Secondly, this makes it clear that climate perceptions serve to reflect whatever is psychologically meaningful to the individuals concerned. This substantiates what has already been stated. Finally, climate perceptions are shared. The argument upon the status of the organizational climate and its operationalization either as an organizational specific variable or as an individual variable continues. But, according to the interactionist approach the newcomer is led to build a "situational identity" based upon his personalized perception of the norms and other policies of the organization. Climate, hence may be regarded as a system variable (Field and Abelson, 1982) serving to integrate the individual, the group and the organization.

If climate measures seemingly tap individual perception and are criticized for being measures of 'psychological climate', the criticism may be answered by a proper placement of emphasis upon the individual, his perception about the organization and the organization itself. The
organization's setup is to be tapped and may be consequently the focus of change. The individual has to perceive, interact, and be productive in the environment where he has been placed, i.e., the organization. So the organization's characteristics are the focus of attention but it is the summarized internalized perception of the respondents which are of consequence for the organization itself and for the researcher too. Hence, measures of organizational climate tapping this aspect are a justified and logical outflow from the organizational behaviour point of view. Sharma (1989), on the basis of a study he conducted covering the entire country, stated that even when organizational climate is measured through the perceptions of employees, it is not entirely a property of the individual. It can be safely considered as an attribute of the organization.

Sinha (1980), commenting upon the conceptual diversity of perceived organizational climate stated that an organizational climate may be,"...as varied as one's perceptual domain could be" (Sinha 1980,p.124). He further stated that the elements /dimensions to be included in the construct would depend upon the purpose of investigation. Sinha (1980) constructed a scale to tap the organizational climate and to evaluate whether organizations were bureaucratic. The scale was constructed after editing a large number of items pertaining to various aspects of organizational climate and then factor analyzing them in order to extract the dimensions of organizational climate. Factor analysis revealed
nine dimensions or factors. Two out of these, i.e., authoritarian and bureaucratic climate were negatively keyed. They were related to each other. The other seven dimensions extracted from the factor analysis may possibly be referred to as the positive dimensions. This is probably because a climate characterized by a low presence of these dimensions may not be as negative as a climate perceived to be high on authoritarian and bureaucratic dimensions. These positive dimensions were, viz., a) Status Acceptance, b) Task Oriented Climate, c) Work Relationships, d) Interpersonal Relationships, e) Involvement, f) Efficiency, and g) Favourable Working Conditions. These factors did not emerge to be completely orthogonal.

To conclude, one may tentatively state that since research continues to enrich the concept of organizational climate, defining and limiting boundaries is increasingly difficult. Measurement too is eagerly contingent upon available conceptualizations. The findings of Pritchard and Karasick (1973) could be considered a frame of reference for many later interpretative findings. They stated that the relationship of organizational climate to job attitudes may be described best as a combination of predictor and moderator variables depending on specific climate factor being examined.

Khandwala, on the basis of review of the work in the area of organizational climate, suggests that the climate may be "...a significant molar variable indicative of organizational culture and institutionalized organizational..."
practices " (Khandwalla, 1988, p. 177).

The present state of the concept remains elusive and hence requires more rigorous research.

Orientation

In an attempt to formulate generalizations about social behaviour of the individuals, Bass (1967, p. 260) said that attention needs to be paid on "...how stimulus differences interact with individual differences." These interactions would result in varied responses by individuals.

An organization is a complete social system. There are certain objective facts about its existence and certain subjective perceptions of those objective realities. The subjective perceptions and consequent reactions could in part be determined by the respondent's "orientation". There are consistent individual differences, according to Bass (1967) in concern for self, interaction, and task. These could be considered as an input leading to behaviour.

Apart from orientation which has been perceived in terms of self, task and interaction, there are other concepts which stem from concerns for self and task, e.g., need achievement (McClelland, 1958) and generalization about the individual differences in concern for interaction e.g., need affiliation (Schacter, 1959).

The behaviour of a respondent in an organization would, task oriented, as assessed by 'The Orientation Inventory' (Bass, 1962). The inventory is a 27 item, relatively scored
self report inventory. The items concern "...attitudes and opinions to which the examinee responds by choosing both the most and least preferred of three alternatives" (Bass, 1967, p. 262). The inventory examines whether the individual is self oriented, task oriented, or interaction oriented.

Self orientation, according to Bass (1967, p. 265) would tend to explain an individual best described in following terms, "...who likes to assert himself, to compete, to stand out and be visible, but who is not necessarily interested in exerting control or influencing others. He is dogmatic, but not necessarily conservative. In his search for extrinsic rather than intrinsic rewards for effort, the self oriented individual describes himself as being easily irritated and showing a variety of related neurotic tendencies."

The self oriented person would
a) need recognition for efforts,
b) like to receive personal praise, and
c) prefer to be a respected leader.

Whereas, a person, high on interaction orientation would be described as a person who wishes to belong, to affiliate and to depend upon others. This person would like to
a) have fun with friends,
b) work cooperatively, and
c) make more friends.

Finally, an individual who is predominantly task
oriented "...tends to be slightly more liberal, intelligent, intellectual, and open minded person than the interaction oriented person" (Bass, 1967, p. 267). Such an individual would help to solve the problems of the group, be concerned about the successful completion of a group's tasks and be persistent with regard to work assigned to him. To this person, the following issues are of great concern.

a) to have the feeling of a job well done, and

b) to be wise and be a leader who gets things done.

To bring these abstractions into a more concretized frame, it would not be incorrect to say that respondents who are highly self and task oriented would perform tasks for both the challenge inherent in them and the consequent glory or increment in self esteem which the task at hand would provide.

Although the concept of orientation has theoretically a logical basis and intuitive appeal, much needs to be done as regards its empirical operationalization. The present measure has failed to give credence to the enriched concept.

The Orientation Inventory (Bass 1962) has received controversial views from various quarters. Barrett (1965) states that the concurrent validity results show the more successful people to be task oriented and the less successful ones to be self oriented. Barrett (1965) commenting upon the Orientation Inventory stated that it could be viewed as a research instrument with potential in any of those fields, where a person's orientation towards himself, his coworkers, or his work is important. He also stated that the inventory
accurately measured not three but only two dimensions, i.e., self and a bipolar task-interaction orientation. According to him, this inventory does have promise in trying to deepen our understanding about how people work. Sagen (1965) also mentioned in a review regarding the need for additional studies to be undertaken so that the inventory can lead to stronger and more rigorous research in future.