CHAPTER II

HISTORICAL RESUME
The quality of working life movement arose as a response to the changing values of workers in Europe and America. The purpose of OWL has been defined as ......... to arrange organisation, management procedures, and jobs for the maximum utilisation of individual talents and skills in order to create more challenging and satisfying work and improve organisational effectiveness (Jenkins, 1983). So, quality of working life is more concerned about the impact of work on people as well as on organisational effectiveness. There is a wide range of reasons which firms give for doing this kind of work, and the general results are low psychological strain, good working relations between superiors and subordinates, positive attitude towards work, low absenteeism, low turnover and high level of productivity (French & Caplan, 1973).

During the past decade, there has been major growth in efforts to study and improve quality of work life. The fundamental objective of quality of working life projects is to design a whole work system that serves needs of people as well as production requirements. OWL researchers are attempting to change the nature of work rather than solve specific problems that arise in the work place (Cherns, 1983). The innovative experiments in quality of working life projects (usually named as experiments in socio-technical systems) were developed in 1960s and 1970s at Saab-Scania and Volvo in Sweden and at General Foods in the
One of the earliest efforts toward quality of working life projects or integrated socio-technical system was at Saab-Scania Gasoline Engine Plant in late 1960s and they pioneered the use of autonomous work groups to automobile sub-assembly and the results were high production, increased satisfaction and reduced turnover and absenteeism (Saab-Scania Report, 1973; and Tichy, 1974).

The more widely publicized example is that of a Volvo Automobile Plant in Sweedan (Gyllenhammer, 1977). The problem was that of serious turnover and high absenteeism. When Pehr Gyllenhammer became the head of Volvo plant, he was convinced that these problems were symptomatic of the values of the employees. With the emerging values of society as a whole, the Volvo employees were demanding more meaningful work, better pay and security, participation in decision making etc. In line with quality of work life objectives, a more humane work climate was designed for the plant and changes were brought in technical process. The results were improved quality of working life and reduction in turnover and absenteeism.

Another example of OWL project is that of General Foods plants in Topeka, Kansas, U.S.A. The work was redesigned with
autonomous work groups, increased participation and responsibility and a humane work climate. The results were that ninety percent quality problems reduced and absenteeism and turnover dropped below the company average (Walton, 1977). After the General Foods project, General Motors, Wyerhaeuser, TRW, Rushton Mining, Herman International Heinz and Nabisco have reported initiated socio-technical programs and have reportedly resulted in lower turnover, absenteeism and accident rates, better products and service quality and more efficient working methods (Cohen, 1979).

So, the general results of providing better quality of working life through socio-technical programmes are reduced turnover, absenteeism and increased production.

Many studies of job design and socio-technical manipulations indicate that positive changes in work life provided by quality circle participations are associated with reduction in absenteeism (Heckman & Lawler, 1971). Tharakar (1983) has also found that with introduction of QWL movement, the quality has gone up and the absenteeism has gone down. Similar results have been reported by Marks, Mirvis, Hackett and Grady Jr. (1986).

The need for starting QWL movement or to redesign jobs on socio-technical pattern arises when the employees in a particular
firm have poor quality of working life and which leads to increase in absenteeism of that firm. In their study, Warr, Cook and Wall (1979) gave eight components of quality of working life named as work involvement, intrinsic job motivation, higher order need strength, perceived intrinsic job characteristics, job satisfaction, life satisfaction, happiness and self rated anxiety. Each of these eight components has different meaning and reflects one or the other part of overall quality of working life. They have included life satisfaction, happiness and self rated anxiety also in the components of quality of working life because a relationship exists between working life and non-working life. The institute for Social Research (ISR) Quality of Employment Surveys also included quality of life indicators that went beyond immediate work place concerns, for example, overall life satisfaction, health, satisfaction with family, free time, marriage etc. (Quinn & Shepard, 1974; Quinn & Staines, 1979). Champboux, (1981), Kabanoff, (1980), Kahn, (1981), Near, Rice and Hunt (1980), Rice, Near and Hunt (1980), Staines, (1980) also examined the relationship between work and non-work domains of life. So, individuals with low level of these eight components have poor quality of working life and high level of these eight components is indication of better quality of working life.
Work Involvement and Absenteeism

Work involvement may be viewed as a component of protestant work ethic (e.g. Blood, 1969; Wollack, Goodale, Wijting & Smith, 1971). It emerged as a measurable concept from the paper by Lodahl and Kejner (1965). It is closely related to job involvement (Hall, Goodale, Robinnowitz & Morgan, 1978; Kanungo, 1982; Robinowitz & Hall, 1977; Ruh, White & Wood, 1975). Both are sometimes taken as identical terms.

Work (job) involvement has received scant attention in the literature since the late seventies when a burst of research centered on the identification of specific causes and effects of job involvement and on the categorization of variables that could lead to the formulation of an overall conceptual framework to guide research in the concept (Knoop, 1986).

Involvement has also received attention in the research concerned with absenteeism. Patchen (1965) found a significant negative involvement-absence correlation with full day absences for both engineers and steam plant personnel. Hackman and Lawler (1971) found in their study that frequency of the absences related to job involvement ($r = -0.15; p < .05$). Goodale (1973) found negative effect of work involvement on absenteeism.
Robinowitz and Hall (1977) in their literature review found empirical evidence for a negative involvement-absence relationship. Similar results were reported by Ilgen and Hollenback (1977). Involvement also seems to be conceptually close to the idea of 'attachment to work' which Nicholson (1977) suggests as a determinant of individual variations in the susceptibility to the proximal causes of casual absence.

Saal (1978) reported a significant, negative involvement-absence correlation for 218 manufacturing employees. Similar results were obtained by Cheloha and Farr (1980), Kanungo (1980) and Mobley, Griffeth, Hand and Meglino (1979).

Boal and Cidambi (1984) suggest that job involvement is better predictor of frequency of absences than duration. On the other hand, Blau (1985) found job involvement to be significantly, negatively related to excused personal absences but not to unexcused absences.

In their most recent work, Steers and Rhodes (1984) also recognised that job involvement may be a promising attitudinal predictor of absenteeism. Brooke (1986) also in his absenteeism model states that work involvement affects absenteeism. In a
recent study Mathieu and Kohler (1990) reported that organisational commitment and job involvement interact in relation to personal absences.

However, Siegel and Ruh (1973) found no relationship between involvement and absences in their study on 238 manufacturing employees. Singh and Kumari (1988) also found in their study that workers in high and low job involvement groups do not show a significant difference in their levels of absenteeism.

**Intrinsic Job Motivation and Absenteeism**

Intrinsic job motivation refers to the internal feelings of the job holder. By performing the job well, he gets some kind of internal satisfaction rather than some external rewards. Hackman and Oldham (1975 & 1976) developed "internal motivation scale".

An employee’s intrinsic motivation to come to work represents the primary influence on actual attendance, assuming that one has the ability to come (Herman, 1973; Locke, 1968). Other-things being equal, when an employee enjoys the work environment and the task that characterizes his or her job situation, employee has the strong desire to come (Hackman & Lawler, 1971; Lundquist, 1955; Newman, 1974; Porter & Steers,
Hackman and Oldham (1976) in their job characteristic model explain that high intrinsic motivation is related to absenteeism. Ilgen and Hollenback (1977) also reported from their results that intrinsically motivated individuals would be less likely to have either excused or unexcused absence behaviour because of their positive internal feelings about work.

Steers and Rhodes (1978) in their much publicized attendance model have emphasised on attendance motivation. They suggested that an employee's attendance is largely a function of two important variables: (a) the employee's motivation to attend; (b) an employee's ability to attend. This attendance motivation is result of job situation, satisfaction with job situation and also internal feelings to attend the job. Steers and Rhodes explain that if an employee firmly believes in what the organisation is trying to achieve, he or she is internally motivated to attend and contribute towards those objectives. These results were earlier found by Steers (1977) and Smith (1977) and if an employee's primary commitment lies somewhere else, less internal pressure or internal motivation would be exerted on the employee to attend (Morgan & Herman, 1976).
Mark Fichman (1988) tried to adapt previous motivational theories with absence behaviour by stating that if people seek to satisfy their motives both at work and away from work, if all of an individual's motives can not be best satisfied in one particular setting, and if motives increase in strength if not satisfied, these individuals will switch activities regularly. Absences are by products of switching from one activity to another.

However, Singh and Kumari (1988) found non-significant correlation between intrinsic motivation and absenteeism.

**Perceived Intrinsic Job Characteristics and Absenteeism**

The intrinsic job characteristics are extent to which certain work motivating factors are involved in a job. These are frequently measured in terms of ratings of the presence of job variety, autonomy, task identity, task significance and feedback to the worker (Hackman & Lawler, 1977). The five factors are moderately inter-correlated (median inter factor values of 0.52, 0.20 & 0.42 are reported by Dunham, 1976; Steers & Spencer, 1977; and Saal, 1978; respectively).

Absenteeism has been found to be inversely related to perceived measures of task identity (Hackman & Lawler, 1971; Roussesu, 1978); autonomy (Baumgarte & Sobol, 1959; Brass, 1985;
Hackman and Oldham (1976) gave 'job characteristic model' that explains the relationship between job characteristics and absenteeism. The model explains about five core job characteristics—skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy and feedback. These five job characteristics affect feelings of meaningfulness, feelings of responsibility and knowledge of results (named as critical psychological states) which in turn affect the outcome variables as internal motivation, high job satisfaction and reduced absenteeism and turnover.

Similar results were found in earlier research work of Beer and Huse (1972), Copenhaver (1973), Ford (1963), Hackman, Oldham, Janson and Purdy (1975), Hautaluoma and Gavin (1975), Lawler, Hackman and Kaufman (1973) Locke, Sirota and Wolfson, (1976), Spiegel (1975), Smith (1972), Trist, Higgins, Murray and Pollack (1965) and Wanous (1974). Mowday and Spencer (1981) also found positive relationship between task characteristics and absenteeism.
Several other studies do not find a relationship between enriched jobs (including intrinsic job characteristics) and reduced absenteeism (Davis & Valfer, 1966; Frank & Hackman, 1975; Gomez & Mussie, 1975; King, 1974; Malone, 1975).

Higher Order Need Strength and Absenteeism—

Higher order needs refer to psychological needs. They refer to need for growth and self-actualisation. Measurement of this characteristic has typically been through the items provided by Hackman and Oldham (1975).

Hackman and Lawler (1971) had earlier predicted that the nature of relationship between job characteristics and absenteeism would depend upon the need states of the employees. They also suggested that there are many workers who want to obtain higher order need satisfaction from their work. Work apparently is to be satisfying place for employees and one way they behaviourally demonstrate this is by coming to work regularly. Hackman and Oldham (1976) in their job characteristic model showed that growth need strength works as moderator for the relation between characteristics of job and the outcome of variables. So growth need strength is related to absenteeism (outcome).
Kleinbeck, Schmidt, Donnis and Balli (1983) found significant correlation between absenteeism and achievement oriented motivation (need for achievement infers the existence of higher order need strength – Porter, Stone & Mowday, 1977).

But Singh and Kumari (1988) found in their study that absenteeism is independent of level of need strength. Workers in high need strength group do not differ significantly from those low in their need strength with regard to their absenteeism.

**Job Satisfaction and Absenteeism**

Studies of job satisfaction have taken many different forms since the original work of Hoppock (1935). Some investigators have preferred to obtain overall satisfaction scores, either through single items (e.g. Quinn, Staines & McCullough, 1974) or through aggregate of several items (e.g. Brayfield & Rothe, 1951).

One of the most widely researched topics in Industrial Psychology has been the relationship between job satisfaction and absenteeism. Mann and Baumgartiel (1952) conducted a study to find out a relationship between job satisfaction and absenteeism. The results showed that the two variables are negatively correlated.
Brayfield and Crockett (1955) in their review of previous studies found a negative relationship between overall job satisfaction and absenteeism. Similar results were reported by Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson and Capwell (1957) in their literature review.

Talachi (1960) using Science Research Associates' Inventory found a significant inverse relationship between job satisfaction and absenteeism among office workers. In a steel plant, Sinha (1961) found a significant association between the rate of absenteeism and job satisfaction among workers. Vroom (1964) also reported similar results in their literature review.

Sinha and Nair (1965) conducted a study in light engineering plant in South India and noted a close relationship between the index of job satisfaction and absenteeism. Job satisfaction was found to be an important factor governing absenteeism. Lawler and Porter (1967) also reported that job satisfaction has the power to influence both absenteeism and turnover.

Water and Roach (1971) using JDI with clerical workers found significant inverse relationship between job satisfaction and both absenteeism and turnover. Similar results were reported by Muchinsky (1977) and Porter and Steers (1973) and in their literature review concerning these two variables.
Saal (1977) suggested that relationship between job satisfaction and absenteeism may be influenced by job involvement.

Steers and Rhodes (1978) in their attendance model suggested that attendance is influenced by attendance motivation and ability to come. They are also of the view that job satisfaction is an important determinant of attendance motivation.

Fitzgibbons and Moch (1980) in their longitudinal study reported negative relationship between intrinsic job satisfaction and excused absenteeism. Similar results were reported by Cheloha and Farr (1980).

Yucelt (1982) investigated the relationship of absenteeism and job satisfaction and the fulfillment of Maslow's hierarchy of needs and found that inadequate or unsatisfactory promotion opportunities, insecurity, low pay, inefficient supervision etc. were attributes of high absenteeism. Hackett and Guion (1984) also found job satisfaction to be negatively correlated with absenteeism. Similar results were reported by Blau (1985) who found negative relationship between excused personal absenteeism and work satisfaction.

Some studies have reported weak relationship between these two variables. Locke (1976) points out that magnitude of
correlation between dissatisfaction and absenteeism is generally quite low, seldom surpassing \( r = .40 \). Nicholson, Brown and Chadwick-Jones (1976) in their review of 29 such studies concluded that 'at best it seems that job satisfaction and absence from work are tenously related.'

Some empirical studies have not found any relationship between these two variables (Ilgen & Hollenback, 1977; John, 1978; Watson, 1981).

Cheloha and Farr (1980) suggested that one of the problems in this research has been lack of guiding theoretical model. There is little systematic knowledge of why satisfaction influences absenteeism at any level other than commonsense. Moreover, the relationship between two variables is very complex.

**Life satisfaction and Absenteeism**

Certain studies have examined the nature and correlates of life satisfaction usually construing this in terms of peoples' expressed satisfaction with features of their environment and everyday life. Dumazedier (1967) reported in his study that factors outside of work may influence the individual's reactions to the job. Rousseau (1978) showed that absenteeism is related to non-work activities. Feelings and activities off the job may affect life at work (Champboux, 1981; Kabanoff, 1980; Near, Rice
Life satisfaction is the degree to which a person reports satisfaction with salient features of his life or life space (Warr, Cook & Wall, 1979). These salient features of life could be family life, social life, standard of living, utilisation of leisure times etc.

Jackson (1956) found high rate of absenteeism among those who are maladjusted in life. Desai (1961) found that poor health of workers, transportation difficulties, domestic chores, indebtedness seem to be major factors associated with absenteeism in Indian industry.

Bhutani in his article 'Studies in Absenteeism' (1970) says 'absenteeism is a complex socio-economic phenomenon born out of attitudes, circumstances and compulsion. A man may be absent not because he is sick, but his wife or children are constantly sick or his sister or mother is sick at village home. ....... Absences may occur due to drunkenness out of despair or habit ....... Bad nutrition or poor health habits in eating and sleeping may cause absenteeism ........ The employee's customary standard of living also affects his faithfulness to his job. If
his income is in excess of the requirements of a standard of life to which he is used, he may be inclined to prefer the leisure of occasional unscheduled holidays.'

Bhatia (1979) revealed that many of these habitual absentees experience difficulties in adjusting themselves to their domestic and social environment. A major portion of absences could be traced to personal maladjustment. (The Financial Express, New Delhi, 20.6.80). In another study carried out in large organisation, Bhatia (1981) observed that ninety percent of habitual absenteeism was due to factors such as family, personality, emotional, marital and social issues. The employee may be absent because of inadequate housing, transportation, recreational facilities.

Chadwick - Jones, Nicholson and Brown (1982) discussed absenteeism as a 'social exchange' between the individual and organisation. Part of this exchange involves understanding that absenteeism is influenced by outside factors such as individual’s responsibility of his or her family.

Nicholson and Payne (1987) found that absence was usually caused by serious or minor illnesses, domestic problems and difficulties in getting up on time.
Happiness and Absenteeism

It is another perspective to psychological well being (Warr et al, 1979). A measure which has been often employed in national surveys (Quinn & Shepard, 1974) is an expression of personal happiness on a 3-point scale.

George (1989) in his paper states that positive mood may be termed as active, elated (happy) and enthusiastic. He showed in his study that positive mood at work was found to be significantly and negatively associated with absenteeism. But Bhatia (1979) in an earlier study at Bharat Heavy Electrical Limited had found that absenteeism behaviour is independent of happiness.

Self Rated Anxiety and Absenteeism

Research into anxiety has been directed towards measures of trait anxiety, neuroticism etc. (Warr et al. 1979). Bradburn (1969) and Warr (1978) developed short indices of self rated anxiety.

Frasers (1947) administered a neurotic personality inventory on 8000 male and female workers and found positive correlation between neurotic scores and absences. This proves
that neuroticism is an important factor determining absenteeism. Melbin (1961) found that increased anxiety level leads to increased absenteeism and low anxiety is followed by low absenteeism.

Sinha (1963) also found that workers with high manifest anxiety tended to be absent for great number of days from their work. Dubey (1979) also found positive relationship between anxiety and absenteeism. Higher anxiety scores are followed by higher rate of absences. Similar results were reported by Trivedi, Srivastava and Kumar (1981).

Bhatia and Valecha (1981) have expressed that worker absenteeism is associated with personal factors such as family size, travel distance to work, anxiety and accident frequency. So they also reported about the effect of anxiety on absenteeism.

Spector and Jex (1991) also found that job satisfaction, frustration and anxiety are moderately correlated, they are also related to absenteeism one or the other way.

Though these eight components of quality of working are related to absenteeism directly or indirectly, they are also related to each other. This interrelationship is being demonstrated by the following studies.
Work involvement is related to job satisfaction especially intrinsic features of job (Weisenberg & Gruerfield, 1968).

Lawler and Hall (1970) concluded from their study that job satisfaction and job involvement are related but separate constructs. Schuler (1975) also found positive relationship between job involvement and job satisfaction. Further support for the view that job satisfaction is related to job involvement is found in theoretical model of Saal (1977).

Robinowitz and Hall (1977) consider job involvement as a feedback variable. Involvement may be high because a person is satisfied with or motivated by his job or a person may experience high job satisfaction or job motivation because job involvement is high.

Brief and Aldaq (1977) also reported that high job involved individuals are also satisfied with their jobs. Similar results were found by Knoop (1986), Parasuraman and Alutto (1984), Santhanmani (1983), Singh and Misra (1984), Singh and Pestonjee (1990).

Job involvement also works as a moderator for job satisfaction and absenteeism relationship (Cheloha & Farr, 1980; Saal, 1977).
Saleh (1981) also emphasized the role of job involvement as moderator for the relationship between motivation and job satisfaction.

Earlier, Patchen (1970) had reported a relationship between job involvement and intrinsic motivation. He reported that the job involved person is highly motivated and feels a sense of pride in his work. Similar results were reported by Knoop (1986), Newman (1975) and Saal (1978).

Brief and Aldag (1975), Hackman and Lawler (1971), Saal (1978), Seigal and Ruh (1973) reported relationship between job involvement and intrinsic job characteristics. Robinowitz and Hall (1977) revealed that job scope [linear sum of Hackman & Lawler's (1971) measure of four job characteristics: variety, autonomy, task identity and feedback] as predictors of job involvement level. They also found relationship between job involvement and higher order needs.

Hall, Schneider and Nygren (1978) suggested that job involvement is significantly related to satisfaction of autonomy and self fulfillment needs. Lefkowitz, Somers and Weinberg (1984) found that higher order need satisfaction correlated significantly with work involvement.
Sinha and Kumari (1988) showed that job involvement was positively related to intrinsic motivation and job satisfaction. But they also found that job involvement and intrinsic motivation are independent of need strengths. Similar results were reported by Dolke and Shrivastava (1980) in an earlier study who provided fairly strong evidence for treating need satisfaction, job involvement and intrinsic motivation as distinct, separate and independent variables. However, Maslow (1954) in his study had reported a relationship between intrinsic motivation and growth or self-actualisation, higher or highest order needs.

Scores on 'internal motivation scale' (developed by Hackman & Oldham, 1975, 1976) have been found to be significantly and positively associated with aspects of job satisfaction and certain perceived job characteristics (Warr, et al., 1979).

Hackman and Oldham (1976) in their job characteristic model have reported that job characteristics are related to job satisfaction and intrinsic motivation. Growth need strength works as a moderator for this relationship.

Head and Sorenson (1985) also tested Hackman and Oldham's model in different sites and found moderate to strong correlation between overall job characteristics and effective outcomes of internal motivation and general satisfaction with work.
Positive associations between presence of job characteristics and job satisfaction have been reported earlier by Dubinsky and Skinner, 1984; Vaydanoff, 1980; Wall, 1978.

Loher, Noe, Moeller and Fitzgerald (1985) have shown a relationship between job characteristics and job satisfaction. Correlation between job characteristics and job satisfaction is about .39. The relation between each of task characteristics and job satisfaction ranges from .32 to .46. Growth need strength (GNS) works as a moderator for this relationship. For people high on GNS, the correlation between job characteristics and job satisfaction is .68 and .38 for those low on GNS.

The work of GNS as a moderator for the relationship between job characteristics and job satisfaction has been earlier reported by Brief and Aldag (1975), Griffin (1982) Hackman and Lawler (1971), Jackson, Paul and Wall (1981) and Wanous (1974).

Some studies have also shown an approach in which job satisfaction is related to higher order need strength (Blum & Naylor, 1968; Stern, 1970; Stern, Stein & Bloom, 1956).

Hackman, et. al. (1975) in their study point out that individuals with higher order need strength (HONS) would respond
more favourably to job enriched activities whereas individuals with low HONS would have adjustment problems with job enriched activities.

Singh and Kumari (1988) found HONS to be positively related to job satisfaction. HONS people are usually satisfied with their jobs. Efraty and Sirgy (1990) also showed that the more higher order needs are satisfied, the more individuals are satisfied with their jobs and the more individuals are involved in their jobs.

Studies conducted to find out the relationship between job satisfaction and motivation confirm the presence of positive relationship (Argyris, 1957; Herzberg, Mausner & Snyderman, 1959). McGregor (1960) emphasised the importance of intrinsic factor in contributing to work satisfaction. According to Vroom (1960), satisfaction is assumed to be function of the motives of the individual. Lawler (1970) suggest that satisfaction is an indicator of an employee’s motivation to come to work.

Many studies have been conducted to find out a relationship between job satisfaction and life satisfaction.

Kornhauser (1965) studied autoworkers in Detroit area and concluded that favourable and unfavourable feelings of the job
carry over to life. Iris and Barrett (1972) studied two groups of first line supervisors and found positive relationships between facets of job satisfaction and life satisfaction.

The relationship between job satisfaction and life satisfaction has been found to be consistently positive. The range of correlational analysis has been as low as .27 (Quinn, Seashore, Mangione, Campbell, Staines & McCullough, 1971) and as high as .47 (Quinn & Shepard, 1974).

Hall (1976) reported correlation of .42 between two variables in a British sample and London, Crandall and Seals (1977) reported correlation of .21 in American sample.

Rousseau (1978) used a diverse sample from an electronic firm and radio station and job satisfaction and life satisfaction have been found to be positively correlated. Orpen (1978) also found that job satisfaction had a stronger effect on life satisfaction.

In their analysis of data Hunt, Near, Rice, Graham and Gutteridge (1977), Near, Rice and Hunt (1978) found a correlation of .30 between one item measure of job and life satisfaction. The job satisfaction question asked: 'On the whole, how satisfied
are you with your work? The life satisfaction question was stated as follows, 'Taking everything into consideration how satisfied are you with life in general all this time?'

Just as feelings of job carry over to life, feelings and activities off the job may affect life at work (Champoux, 1981, Kabanoff, 1980; Near et. al. 1980; Staines, 1980). Dumazedier (1967) had also earlier reported that factors outside of work may influence the individual’s reactions to the job.

Schmitt and Mellon (1981) found that life satisfaction leads to job satisfaction for both men and women.

Keon and McDonald (1982) suggest that job satisfaction and life satisfaction are jointly determined. Job satisfaction may be seen as a major impactor of life satisfaction. Salary and position that attribute to job satisfaction can carry over to make life a more fulfilling experience. On the other hand, major contributors of life satisfaction such as marital problems may directly affect one’s job performance and job perceptions.

Life satisfaction is also related to other job related variables. Rousseau (1978) showed a positive relationship between job characteristics and life satisfaction. Romzek (1989) suggested that the higher levels of involvement in organisational work
resulted in higher non-work satisfaction.

Studies have shown positive relationship between life satisfaction and other parts of psychological well being as Bradburn (1969) and Warr (1978) reported a relationship between life satisfaction and mental health and Rice (1984) reported a relationship between life satisfaction and happiness (how happy things are these days).

These other two parts of psychological well being are also related to job satisfaction. Warr et al. (1979) and Schell and Loeb (1986) showed that general happiness level is positively related to job satisfaction. Self-rated anxiety on the other hand is negatively related to job satisfaction (Sah & Ojha, 1989).

With this theoretical background we may now pass on to the next chapter dealing with problem and hypotheses.