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Abstract

Models for predicting motives of organizational climate from personal, role stress and coping strategy variables have been developed in this paper by using step-wise multiple regression. Six motives of organizational climate, ten types of role stress and eight types of coping strategy were measured on 155 randomly selected executives in a public sector industry. Three personal variables (age, management level and qualification) were also recorded for each respondent. Self-Role Distance emerged as a determinant of Achievement, having a negative relationship. Qualification level, Self-Role Distance and Personal Inadequacy emerged as determinants of Expert Influence with the first two factors having negative relationships and the last factor having a positive one. Role Overload and Personal Inadequacy emerged as determinants of Extension, both having positive relationships. Self-Role Distance, Personal Inadequacy and Role Isolation emerged as determinants of Control, with the first and third factors having positive relationships and the second factor having a negative one. Role Stagnation and Personal Inadequacy emerged as determinants of Dependency, with the first factor having a positive relationship and the second factor having a negative one. Intropersisive coping strategy emerged as a determinant of Affiliation, having a positive relationship.
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Introduction

Organizational Climate (Forehand and Glimer, 1964) is a conceptually integrated synthesis of organizational characteristics. It describes the personality of the organization and influences the motivation and behavior of the members of the organization. Organizational climate is the result of interaction among an organization's Structure, Systems, Culture, Leader Behavior and Employees' Psychological Needs (Pareek, 1989). It depends on the perception of the individuals in the organization about organizational working and problems therein (Hellriegel and Slocum, 1974; Pareek, 2002, pp. 668 – 670).

Stress results from confronting an opportunity, constraint or demand, when the expected outcome is important and uncertain (Robbins and Sanghi, 2006, p. 542). It arises from a mismatch between an individual and his / her environment, if there is an inability to cope with the constraints or demands encountered (Harrison, 1976). Stress cannot be avoided (Pestonjee, 1999, pp. 15-34) as events influencing us are often beyond our control, things do not work as planned and unexpected changes take place.

Coping is the process of managing a potential stressor or a stressful event so as to minimize its harmful consequences. Coping is dependent on the cognitive appraisal of the potential stressor, the stressful event and the coping resources at the disposal of the concerned individual. When coping is effective (Igodan and Newcomb, 1986), potential stressors get dissipated and do not result in stress.
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Coping Strategy (Taylor et al., 1998) refers to the different ways of coping with stress or potential stressors.

**Rationale for the Study**

Market-share, sales-turnover and profitability are lagging indicators of organizational performance. On the contrary, organizational climate is a leading indicator of organizational performance. Functional organizational climate leads to enhancement of personal, role and organizational effectiveness. On the other hand, dysfunctional organizational climate jeopardizes personal, role and organizational effectiveness. Understanding the determinants of organizational climate is helpful in finding ways and means for strengthening the functional climate and de-emphasizing the dysfunctional climate.

Abstract in nature, organizational climate depends on the perception of the organizational members. Perception is influenced by the personality of the perceiver, his upbringing, education and experiential learning. Personal variables would therefore, qualify as some of the determinants of organizational climate.

Perception of an individual cannot remain unaffected by the stress experienced. Stress experienced in an organizational role (or role stress) will therefore have its impact on organizational climate. Different types of role stress thus qualify as some of the possible determinants of organizational climate.

Coping strategy determines the effectiveness of managing the problems in the organization and impacts the organizational climate. Different types of coping strategy would therefore qualify as some of the possible determinants of organizational climate.

Study of organizational climate was undertaken to enhance its understanding, taking it as a dependent variable, and finding out its relationship with personal, role stress and coping strategy variables.

**Motivational Analysis of Organizational Climate**


**Organizational Climate Motives**

There are three functional climate motives and three dysfunctional climate motives as explained below:

(i) **Achievement**: Focusing on attainment of goals with quality and excellence.

(ii) **Expert Influence**: Focusing on utilization of expertise to enhance organizational performance.

(iii) **Extension**: Heightened concern for making oneself relevant to others in the team/group/organization.

(iv) **Control**: Emphasis on consolidation of personal power in the organization.

(v) **Dependency**: Emphasis on seeking approval from others, instead of taking one's own decisions.

(vi) **Affiliation**: Heightened concern for maintaining friendly and affectionate personal relationships, even when they come in the way of attainment of goals.

**Measurement of Organizational Climate**

MAO-C, the instrument for measurement of organizational climate (Pareek, 1989; 2002, pp. 757 -773), comprises 72 statements. For each dimension, there are six statements (labelled a, b,
Organizational Role Stress

Organizational Role is a position assigned in the organization, which is defined by the expectations of the concerned group of people (e.g., the role occupant, the subordinates, the peers and the boss). The role occupant performs certain functions in the organization in response to his / her role expectations (Pareek, 2004, pp. 209 - 224). The concept of organizational role has in-built potential for stress. Stress resulting from occupation of an organizational role and performing therein, is known as Organizational Role Stress (ORS). Framework of ORS developed by Pareek (1983) defines ten types of role stresses, as explained below:

(i) Inter-Role Distance (IRD): Arises when there are difficulties in balancing between organizational and non-organizational roles.

(ii) Role Stagnation (RS): Arises when there are difficulties in taking over the new role responsibilities due to lack of preparedness. The role occupant keeps on stagnating in the old one, which is secure, familiar and comfortable.

(iii) Role Expectation Conflict (REC): Arises when there are conflicting role expectations.

(iv) Role Erosion (RE): Results when some of the important functions of one’s role are performed by others or when the credit for one’s role performance is given to others.

(v) Role Overload (RO): Results from too high or too many role expectations.

(vi) Role Isolation (RI): Results when the role occupant feels isolated due to lack of communication.

(vii) Personal Inadequacy (PI): Results from lack of competence for the role.

(viii) Self-Role Distance (SRD): Results when (a) the role occupant has to do what he / she dislikes, (b) his / her main skills are not utilized, or (c) the role occupant perceives a conflict between the self and the role.

(ix) Role Ambiguity (RA): Results from unclear role expectations.

(x) Resource Inadequacy (RIn): Results when the role occupant perceives that role performance is suffering from lack of external resources.

ORS Measurement

ORS-Scale (Pareek, 1983) measures the ten types of role stresses described above. It consists of 50 statements. Each statement is scored as 0, 1, 2, 3 or 4, depending on how frequently the respondent feels the way expressed in the statement (0 for never feeling that way and 4 for always feeling that way). Score for each type of role stress (ranging from 0 to 20) is obtained by adding the scores for the given five statements. Sum of the scores for the ten types of role stresses, ranging from 0 to 200, is called Total ORS (TORS).

Coping Strategy

Role–PICS Framework of Coping Strategy developed by Pareek (1987; 2002, 487 - 491) is based on the following three dimensions:

(a) Internality: Reflects the extent (high / low) to which the individual concerned engages the self with the problems to confront them or to avoid them.

(b) Externality: Reflects the extent (high / low) to which the individual concerned engages others with the problems to confront them or to avoid them.

(c) Mode: Depends on individual’s intention. In Avoidance mode, one intends to consciously avoid the problems. On the other hand, problems are
intended to be confronted and solved in Approach mode.

It is important to note that Internality and Externality are not mutually exclusive. Combinations of the above mentioned three dimensions represent eight types of coping strategies for dealing with role stress. These are briefly described in the following paras. It can be seen that four of these are avoidance-coping strategies and the other four are approach-coping strategies. Avoidance-coping strategies are dysfunctional, as they leave problems unattended, providing only temporary emotional relief to the concerned individual. Approach-coping strategies, on the other hand, are functional, as they lead to confronting the problems, seeking their solutions.

(i) **Impunitive**: Denoted by M, characterized by fatalistic thinking, this style represents low internality, low externality and avoidance mode. Problems are accepted as unavoidable.

(ii) **Intropunitive**: Denoted by I, characterized by self-blame, this style represents high internality, low externality and avoidance mode. Aggression is directed towards the self but nothing is done to solve the problem.

(iii) **Extrapunitive**: Denoted by E, characterized by external-blame, this style represents low internality, high externality and avoidance mode. Aggression is directed towards others but nothing is done to solve the problem.

(iv) **Defensive**: Denoted by D, characterized by denial or rationalization of the problems, this style represents high internality, high externality and avoidance mode. There is apprehension about the impending harm to the self.

(v) **Impersistive**: Denoted by m, characterized by wishful thinking, this style represents low internality, low externality and approach mode. It is believed that problems will be solved due to change in the circumstances.

(vi) **Intropersistive**: Denoted by i, characterized by self-effort, this style represents high internality, low externality and approach mode. The concerned person takes the responsibility and initiative for solving the problem himself / herself.

(vii) **Extrapersistive**: Denoted by e, characterized by external-effort, this style represents low internality, high externality and approach mode. Responsibility for solving the problem is transferred to others.

(viii) **Interpersistive**: Denoted by n, characterized by team-effort, this style represents high internality, high externality and approach mode. Problems are shared with others and joint efforts are made to solve problems.

**Measurement of Coping Strategy**

Pareek (1987; 2002, 487 - 491) developed a projective instrument for measurement of coping strategy. It has three versions, viz., Role-PICS (G), Role-PICS (E) and Role-PICS (O), respectively for general, entrepreneurial and organizational roles. Role-PICS (O) comprises 24 cartoon-like pictures. Each picture depicts a boss, colleague, subordinate, or spouse; raising a question for the respondent, projecting a role stress situation. The respondent is influenced by the situation projected to him by the picture and his response is based on the strategy (style) that he would have adopted to handle the projected situation. Coping (or problem management) strategy used by the respondent is identified with the help of a scoring guide (Pareek, 2002, pp. 582 - 610). Quantitative score for each type of coping strategy (style) is obtained by counting the number of times the particular strategy has been used by the respondent while responding to 24 situations projected to him by the Role-PICS (O) instrument.

**Objective**

To develop a greater understanding about the determinants of organizational climate, by building models to predict each motive of organizational climate from personal, role stress and coping strategy variables.

**Hypotheses**

Organizational climate depends on the perception
that organizational members hold about various dimensions of organizational working. It is important to note that personal variables of an individual can impact his / her perception. Stress experienced can also influence the perception of the individual. Coping with stress means managing the problems that lead to stress and management of problems is an important dimension of organizational climate. This results in the emergence of the following hypotheses related to organizational climate (Srivastav, 1993).

(i) Organizational climate depends on personal variables.
(ii) Functional climate is negatively correlated with role stress.
(iii) Dysfunctional climate is positively correlated with role stress.
(iv) Functional climate is positively correlated with functional coping strategies.
(v) Functional climate is negatively correlated with dysfunctional coping strategies.
(vi) Dysfunctional climate is negatively correlated with functional coping strategies.
(vii) Dysfunctional climate is positively correlated with dysfunctional coping strategies.

Methodology
A large public sector industry was selected for the study. Workshops were conducted, explaining the framework of organizational climate, role stress and coping strategy. Participants in the workshop represented the diversity present in the organization (age groups, hierarchical levels, educational qualifications and functional groups). Participants were promised that they would receive their individual climate, role stress and coping strategy profiles and feedback on implications thereof. MAO-C, ORS – Scale, Role – PICS (O) instruments were administered for measuring the six motives (types) of organizational climate, ten types of role stress and eight types of coping strategy for each respondent. Responses that were complete and error-free for all the three instruments constituted 155 MAO-C / ORS / Role – PICS (O) samples. Feedback as promised was given to the participants. Three personal variables, namely, age, hierarchical (or management) level and qualification level (coding them as per Table – 1) were also recorded for each respondent.

Step-wise multiple regression analysis was carried out taking each one of the 6 motives of organizational climate as a dependent variable. 21 independent variables, comprising 10 types of role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lower Qualification Group</th>
<th>Medium Qualification Group</th>
<th>High Qualification Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NC* Qualification</td>
<td>NC* Qualification</td>
<td>NC* Qualification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Matriculation</td>
<td>6. Non Technical Postgraduate Degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Higher Secondary</td>
<td>7. Technical Graduate Degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Non Technical Graduate Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Technical Postgraduate Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Technical Diploma</td>
<td></td>
<td>10. Technical Doctorate Degree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Numerical Code (Source: Srivastav, 2006f)
stress, 8 types of coping strategy and 3 personal variables, were tried with each dependent variable.

Results

(i) SRD has emerged as a determinant of Achievement (Table 2). The relationship is significant at 0.0072 level. Four percent of variance in Achievement can be determined by SRD. Achievement weakens with strengthening of SRD.

(ii) Qualification level, SRD and PI have emerged as determinants of Expert Influence (Table 3). The relationship is significant at 0.0001 level. 11 percent of variance in Expert Influence is determined by these variables. Expert Influence weakens with increase in qualification level and strengthening of SRD. It strengthens with strengthening of PI.

(iii) RO and PI have emerged as determinants of Extension (Table 4). The relationship is significant at 0.0054 level. 5.4 percent of variance in Extension is determined by these variables. Extension strengthens with the strengthening of RO and PI.

(iv) SRD, PI and RI have emerged as determinants of Control (Table 5). The relationship is significant at 0.0001 level. 11.25 percent of variance in Control can be determined by these variables. Control strengthens with strengthening of SRD and RI. It weakens with strengthening of PI.

(v) RS and PI have emerged as determinants of Dependency (Table 6). The relationship is significant at 0.0083 level. 4.9 percent of variance in Dependency can be determined by these variables. Dependency strengthens with strengthening of RS. It weakens with strengthening of PI.

(vi) Intropersistive coping strategy has emerged as a determinant of Affiliation (Table 7). The relationship is significant at 0.0086 level. 3.8 percent of variance in Affiliation can be determined by Intropersistive coping strategy. Affiliation strengthens with strengthening of Intropersistive coping strategy.

Table 2: Determinants of Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step No</th>
<th>Variable Entered</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig. F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>0.21492</td>
<td>0.04619</td>
<td>0.03996</td>
<td>14.97880</td>
<td>7.40949</td>
<td>0.0072</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Determinants of Expert Influence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step No</th>
<th>Variable Entered</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig. F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td>0.24736</td>
<td>0.06119</td>
<td>0.05505</td>
<td>14.61943</td>
<td>9.97170</td>
<td>0.0019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>0.30307</td>
<td>0.09185</td>
<td>0.07990</td>
<td>14.42589</td>
<td>7.68696</td>
<td>0.0007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>PI</td>
<td>0.35683</td>
<td>0.12733</td>
<td>0.10999</td>
<td>14.18805</td>
<td>7.34409</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Determinants of Extension

\[ \text{EXT} = 0.84244 \text{ RO} + 0.51175 \text{ PI} + 43.55664 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step No</th>
<th>Variable Entered</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig. F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>RO</td>
<td>0.19681</td>
<td>0.03873</td>
<td>0.03245</td>
<td>12.68427</td>
<td>6.16482</td>
<td>0.0141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>PI</td>
<td>0.25779</td>
<td>0.06646</td>
<td>0.05417</td>
<td>12.54106</td>
<td>5.41032</td>
<td>0.0054</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Determinants of Control

\[ \text{CON} = 1.54117 \text{ SRD} - 0.96454 \text{ PI} + 0.94653 \text{ RI} + 39.28127 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step No</th>
<th>Variable Entered</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig. F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>0.28515</td>
<td>0.08131</td>
<td>0.07531</td>
<td>19.36217</td>
<td>13.54202</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>PI</td>
<td>0.32502</td>
<td>0.10564</td>
<td>0.09387</td>
<td>19.16685</td>
<td>8.97674</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>0.36028</td>
<td>0.12980</td>
<td>0.11251</td>
<td>18.96863</td>
<td>7.50801</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Determinants of Dependency

\[ \text{DEP} = 0.75118 \text{ RS} - 0.49992 \text{ PI} + 57.98389 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step No</th>
<th>Variable Entered</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig. F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>0.18499</td>
<td>0.03422</td>
<td>0.02791</td>
<td>12.23799</td>
<td>5.42145</td>
<td>0.0212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>PI</td>
<td>0.24730</td>
<td>0.06115</td>
<td>0.04880</td>
<td>12.10577</td>
<td>4.95052</td>
<td>0.0083</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Determinants of Affiliation

\[ \text{AFF} = 0.89813 \text{ i} + 45.50292 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step No</th>
<th>Variable Entered</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig. F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>0.21051</td>
<td>0.04431</td>
<td>0.03807</td>
<td>12.91735</td>
<td>7.09424</td>
<td>0.0086</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

(i) Focusing on attainment of goals is not possible when the role occupant distances himself / herself from the role (instead of integrating therewith). This explains why Achievement climate weakens with the strengthening of SRD. Such a finding has also been reported by Khanna (1985) and Srivastav (1997).

(ii) Normally one would expect that higher the
qualification level, higher the level of expertise and its influence in the organization. Hence, there should have been a positive correlation between the qualification level and Expert Influence. It is to be noted, however, that Expert Influence is weak in the organization under study, having the fifth rank among organizational climate motives (Srivastav, 2007 a). Under the circumstances, expertise is generally not seen to be playing an important role. Contribution of expertise in the organization is perceived to be higher when the qualification level is lower. This explains the negative relationship between Expert Influence climate and qualification level found in this study. Weakening of Expert Influence climate with strengthening of qualification level, however, cannot continue indefinitely. When qualification gets high enough, it will start building up Expert Influence, reversing the relationship between the two variables from negative to positive. It can therefore be hypothesized that Expert Influence has a curvilinear relationship with qualification level, as depicted in Figure 1.

(iii) When SRD strengthens, role occupants distance themselves from their roles. They need greater expert help for role-making (or getting own role redesigned to utilize their special skills, making it more likeable and effective) (Srivastav, 2006 a). They perceive that expert help is more difficult to obtain. Hence strengthening of SRD leads to weakening of Expert Influence.

(iv) Positive relationship between Personal Inadequacy and Expert Influence is unusual and not reported earlier. It is noted that the organization under study has comparatively higher Personal Inadequacy (having the fourth rank among ten types of role stresses) (Srivastav, 2006 b) and Expert Influence is comparatively lower (having the fifth rank among six motives of organizational climate) (Srivastav, 2007 a). When expertise is not abundant but scarce, expert help is provided where it is needed most. Those who experience higher Personal Inadequacy, therefore, perceive a stronger Expert Influence climate. This finding may not hold good when Expert Influence is strong enough to impact Personal Inadequacy, which will start reducing with strengthening of Expert Influence. It can therefore be hypothesized that Expert Influence has a curvilinear relationship with Personal Inadequacy as depicted in Figure 2.

(v) Positive relationship between Extension and Role Overload has not been reported earlier. It
is to be noted that the organization under study is characterized by the lowest rank for the Extension climate (Srivastav, 2007 a). Thus there are very few people who make themselves relevant to others, extending them the needed help. Those overloaded in the organization need and get more help. Strengthening of Extension climate with strengthening of Role Overload found in this study is thus explained. It is felt, however, that increase in Extension with Role Overload will stop when Extension gets high enough to influence Role Overload. It can therefore be hypothesized that Extension has a curvilinear relationship with Role Overload as depicted in Figure 3.

(vi) Positive relationship between Extension and Personal Inadequacy is also unusual. As reported above, the organization under study is characterized by comparatively higher Personal Inadequacy and weakest Extension climate. When people helping others are not easily available and help is difficult to obtain, it is given to those who need it most. Those experiencing higher Personal Inadequacy need and get more help from others. This explains the positive relationship between Extension and Personal Inadequacy. Increase in Extension with Personal Inadequacy will stop when Extension gets high enough to influence Personal Inadequacy. It can, therefore, be hypothesized that Extension has a curvilinear relationship with Personal Inadequacy as depicted in Figure 4.

(vii) As Self-Role Distance or Role Isolation strengthens, there is a tendency for carrying out one’s minimum role just by giving instructions to others to follow and insist on their compliance. This explains how Control climate strengthens with strengthening of Self-Role Distance or Role Isolation. Positive correlation of Control climate with Self-Role Distance has been reported by Khanna (1985) and Srivastav (1997) and that with Role Isolation has been reported by Khanna (1985).

(viii) When Personal Inadequacy is high, one is not confident of himself/herself and depends on others for solving the problems. Delegation of problem-solving responsibility to juniors is therefore encouraged. This explains the negative relationship between Personal Inadequacy and Control climate. Though logical to understand, it has not been reported earlier.

(ix) When one does not grow to undertake his / her higher responsibilities, one cannot possibly undertake any initiative or responsibility and becomes more and more
dependent on others to cover-up his/her deficiencies. This explains the positive relationship between Dependency and Role Stagnation. Such a finding has also been reported by Khanna (1985).

(x) As Personal Inadequacy becomes stronger, the role occupants have a tendency to shrink their roles, limiting them to available competencies. Hence, there is a lesser need for the role occupants to refer their problems to others for seeking guidance or solutions. This explains the negative relationship between Dependency and Personal Inadequacy. Such a finding has not been reported earlier.

(xii) Positive relationship between Affiliation climate and Intropersistive coping strategy found in this study is unconventional and has not been reported earlier. It points to possible dysfunctionality of Intropersistive coping strategy under certain conditions. Dependency climate is dominant in the organization under study (Srivastav, 2007 a). Passing the buck (Srivastav, 2006 c) is therefore a common phenomenon. Those prominently using Intropersistive coping strategy have a tendency to take work and responsibility for problem solving from others on themselves. Organizational members prefer such people to others for developing closer relationships for off-loading their own work and responsibility. This explains how Affiliation climate can strengthen with strengthening of Intropersistive coping strategy.

Conclusions

(i) Dominant climate has emerged as a moderating variable in this study. Unconventional relationships of climate with personal, role stress and coping strategy variables; reported in this study are possibly dependent upon the dominant climate obtained in the organization.

(ii) Lack of relationship of organizational climate motives with several of the 21 independent variables considered in the study points to multiple co-linearity of independent variables. Intercorrelations: (a) among role stress variables (Srivastav, 2006 b), (b) among coping strategy variables (Srivastav, 2007 b), (c) between personal and role stress variables (Srivastav, 1995, 1997, 2005, 2006 d), (d) between personal and coping strategy variables (Srivastav, 2006 e, 2007 c) and (e) between role stress and coping strategy variables (Srivastav, 1995, 1997), have already been reported.

(iii) Models for prediction of motives of organizational climate from three personal variables, ten types of role stress and eight types of coping strategy considered in this study have high validity, their level of significance ranging from 0.0054 to 0.0001.

(iv) Marginal predictability of organizational climate motives as above is in the range 3.8 – 11.25 per cent, which points to the need for finding out the additional variables that may be determinants for the different motives of organizational climate.

(v) Personal Inadequacy is a determinant of four motives of organizational climate. Self-Role Distance is a determinant of three motives. Qualification level, Role Overload, Role Isolation and Intropersistive Coping Strategy have individually emerged as determinants of one of the motives of organizational climate.

Recommendations

(i) Further research on the determinants of organizational climate need to be conducted under different types of dominant organizational climate.

(ii) Additional variables such as those related to personality, organizational system, structure, culture, working environment, etc. need to be examined for inclusion in multiple regressions to obtain a better fit, enabling a higher order of prediction for the different motives of organizational climate.
(iii) **Self-Role Distance** needs to be minimized (Srivastav, 2006 a) for strengthening *Achievement* and *Expert Influence* motives and for weakening of *Control* motive of organizational climate.

(iv) Over-qualified employees may be dysfunctional, particularly when *Expert Influence* is weak.

(v) Organizational members should be sensitized to the need for enhancing their competence. This will strengthen *Expert Influence* and *Extension* motives of organizational climate and weaken *Control* and *Dependency* motives of organizational climate, making it more functional.

(vi) Organizational members need to be sensitized for having a reasonable workload. Moderate *Role Overload* may be functional when *Extension* is very weak. *Role Overload* need not be indiscriminately minimized.

(vii) Role-Interlinkages among roles related to critical roles need to be strengthened (Srivastav, 2006 a). This will lead to reducing *Role Isolation*, contributing to weakening the *Control* motive of organizational climate.

(viii) *Role Stagnation* needs to be minimized (Srivastav, 2006 a) for weakening of *Dependency* motive of organizational climate.

(ix) Intropersistive coping strategy (i.e. problem solving through self-effort) need not be indiscriminately promoted, lest it becomes dysfunctional in strengthening the *Affiliation* climate.
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