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Background

Technological innovation is recognized today as a major factor in organizational development, adding new dimensions to old jobs and creating new ones; many skills become obsolete in a short span of time. Under these conditions, training for continual upgradation of workers' performance has emerged as a major function of personnel management. In order to keep pace with these developments and changes, workers have to be effectively oriented by training in new skills so as to prepare them to meet the demands of changing and emerging job requirements and expectations. Training seeks to bring about interaction between managerial and operational work cultures. Training is useful in resolving technological problems such as removal of disparity between quality and quantity, cost control, or building in skills for job analysis and evaluation.
The goal of this inbuilt education, however, is to create a new psychological environment, a new frame of reference, a new attitude in the learner. The nature of the organizational structure – especially its leadership climate – exercises a decisive influence on job attitudes.

The present study has been conducted with the objective of determining the relationship of job satisfaction and job involvement of employees in an organization.

Our work is of academic significance. It is the first research in which both job satisfaction and job involvement have a reference to personality. They have been studied as separate variables, being vital manifestations of job attitudes.

The philosophy of management is related to the understanding of human nature and therefore must change with the advance of technology as the perception of man’s role in industry changes. Till recently, the human factor in industry was viewed almost in mechanical terms and man was assigned a simpler, more routine role in production. Experience, however, has proved that this approach of management
has failed to improve the quality and quantity of production. Meanwhile, emerging theories regarding the essential nature of man, and the possible undesirable repercussions of treating man as machine or simply a tool of production have made it even more counterproductive to think of human beings as constituting a mere quantitative factor in production.

Recent concern with the quality of working life underlines the limitations of industrial organizations in catering to the real life needs of its members. It is considered imperative for an organization to provide for growth of its members even for meeting its production targets.

To what extent an organization is able to achieve its objectives, depends on its ability to make use of the resources at its disposal. In the process of transforming inputs into outputs or of converting raw into finished products, human resources play a vital role. Much more is known about the functioning and behaviour of machines and material than of the man behind the machine. Unlike the machine, man seeks his growth. He has a complex nature with a multiplicity of needs, values and aspirations and reacts accordingly to varying situations around him. Since it is his varied responses
which significantly influence the goal achievement of the organization, their study is important for organizational behaviour.

**Work-Related Attitudes and Job Satisfaction**

The individual's orientation to the organization he works for, comprises of two components of his work life - the nature of his work and the conditions under which he works. These two, the content and context of his work, give rise to a number of attitudinal responses which affect his job performance or at least its behavioural content.

Attitudes towards work relate to satisfaction, motivation and job involvement. Since these are directly related to the work a person does, they are generally termed "job attitudes". Commitment, identification, organizational involvement and company satisfaction are attitudes more related to organizational conditions and can be called "organizational attitudes". This distinction, however, is arbitrary since work related factors may affect organizational attitudes and organizational factors may affect job attitudes.

The term 'need' is defined as, "a condition marked by the feeling of lack or want of something, or of requiring the performance of some action", Drever (1964). The same lexicon
defines attitude as "a more or less stable set or disposition of opinion, interest, or purpose, involving expectancy of a certain kind of experience and readiness with an appropriate response". The goals or purposes to which needs are addressed are technically termed 'incentives'. Needs are fulfilled by attainment of incentives. This fulfilment implies a "simple feeling-state" known as 'satisfaction'. According to Drever (1964), satisfaction is "the end-state in feeling accompanying the attainment by an impulse of its objective". The resultant feeling of satisfaction is a function of the motive (need) strength and the opportunity that environment provides for the attainment of appropriate incentives.

Starting with the human relations movement in 1930s and with the works of Maslow, (1954), Argyris (1957), McGregor (1960), Herzberg (1968) and many others, greater attention was paid to the human factor and to what man seeks from his work. The concepts of job-enlargement and job-enrichment have come from the realization that many of our jobs are bereft of the qualities that make them fuller and meaningful for the job holder. Otherwise, jobs complying with organizational situations alone put restrictions on individuality and creativity, severely limiting a man's involvement in his work and organization.
Strong (1958) has a preference for using job satisfaction with reference to the individual and morale with reference to the group. While discussing the relationship between morale and job satisfaction he states that morale and job satisfaction merely indicate two attitudes towards one's job. From a review of the available literature on the issue it can be gathered that morale and job satisfaction are not synonymous. They differ from each other on at least two important dimensions. The first may be designated as the "individual Vs. group dimensions", the second as the "content dimension". This necessitates an evaluation and consideration of factors, which constitute morale and job satisfaction. Job satisfaction means a state of adjustments with various aspects of one's job profile. These aspects may be small or trivial but they create a certain state of being for an individual worker. Morale stands for a commonly shared attitude of workers towards their jobs and it may be taken as an index of their regard for the organization which employs them.

Sinha (1972) defines job satisfaction as a "reintegra­tion of affect produced by individual's perception of fulfillment of his needs in relation to his work and the situations surrounding it". In order to understand job satisfaction, perhaps the first step should be to demarcate the boundaries
among such terms as attitudes, motivation and morale. These terms are often used for job satisfaction but perhaps not rightly so. Motivation is impelling force determining willingness to work or produce. Satisfaction on the other hand, implies a positive emotional state which may be totally unrelated to productivity. Job satisfaction on the other hand, is an end state of feeling which may influence the subsequent behaviour. In this respect, job attitudes and job satisfaction may have something in common. But if we freeze behaviour; attitude would initiate it; while job satisfaction would result from it.

Morale and Job Satisfaction

Sinha while distinguishing between job satisfaction and morale holds that morale has been found to be closely related to satisfaction that an employee derives from wages, nature of work, supervision, promotion, mitigation of grievances and other factors that surround work. Job satisfaction is an important ingredient of morale. In fact, some authors have characterized morale as an attitude of satisfaction. The fact that questionnaires or attitude scales that purport to measure workers' morale cover areas that,
to a considerable extent, overlap those covered by job satisfaction measures, has further added to the confusion.

More than two and half decades ago, Seashore (1954) came to the conclusion that there is no definition of morale. It is a condition which exists in a context where people are:

a) motivated towards high productivity
b) want to remain with organization
c) act effectively in crisis
d) accept necessary changes without resentment or resistance
e) actuated to promote the interest of the organization
f) are satisfied with the job.

According to this description of morale, job satisfaction is an important dimension of morale and not morale itself. Morale is a general attitude of a worker and relates to group, while job satisfaction is an individual feeling which could be derived from a variety of factors, including the group. According to Sinha (1958) job satisfaction refers to an attitude towards work of an individual worker. While morale is a group phenomenon which emerges as a result of adherence to group goals and confidence in the desirability of these goals.
In recent years considerable research has been devoted to the study of job satisfaction. Unlike the concept of morale, job satisfaction is more amenable to precise definition. The credit for bringing this term into currency goes to Hoppock. Hoppock (1935) in his classic work, "Job Satisfaction", reviewed 32 studies conducted prior to 1933 and commented that though there was much speculation about job satisfaction, there were only a few factual studies. For him, job satisfaction is "any combination of psychological, and environmental circumstances that cause a person truthfully to say, "I am satisfied with my job". Hoppock in the epilogue to his study enumerates the following six major factors of job satisfaction:

1) The way the individual reacts to unpleasant situations;
2) The facility with which he adjusts himself to other persons;
3) His relative status in the social and economic group with which he identifies himself;
4) The nature of the work in relation to his abilities, interests, and preparation;
5) Security;
6) Loyalty.
In recent years Crites (1969) attempted to distinguish between job satisfaction, vocational satisfaction and morale. He observes that if it is some specific aspect of the job such as duties and tasks or working conditions, then the concept which is defined would be job attitudes. If it is the overall job in which the individual is presently employed, then the concept would be job satisfaction. If it is the type of work in which the individual has been trained and/or has gained experience in several jobs (two or more), then the concept would be vocational satisfaction. And if the reference includes the work group and/or employing organization, as well as job or vocational satisfaction, the concept would be morale. Crites (1969) observes that Harmon's study of 1966 has been the only one which tried to distinguish the vocational from job satisfaction.

Siegel (1962) on the basis of his review of job satisfaction studies, comes to the conclusion that all the results may be "conveniently grouped under two headings on the basis of their relevance to factors (i) intrinsic or (ii) extrinsic to the job itself". Factors intrinsic to job include pay, job security, participation and personal recognition, hours of work and working conditions, and
occupational status. Among factors extrinsic to the job are perceptions about supervision, sex, age, level of intelligence, job experience or length of service, and personal adjustment.

"Job Satisfaction", as suggested by Ghiselli and Brown (1955)\(^{15}\) has many different points of reference, and few workers indeed are satisfied with all aspects of their jobs.

Brayfield and Crockett (1955)\(^{16}\) consider three social systems to be important in worker satisfaction, viz. fellow workers, the company, and the community.

Herzberg and his associates (1957)\(^{17}\) in their review of job attitude studies, revealed ten major factors constituting job satisfaction with nearly 150 specific aspects. Those major factors are as follows:

1) Intrinsic aspects of job
2) Supervision
3) Working conditions
4) Wages
5) Opportunity for advancement
6) Security
7) Company and management
8) Social aspects of job
ix) Communications, and
x) Benefits

The 'motivator-hygiene' theory proposed by Herzberg, Mausner and Synderman in 1959\(^8\) is an important approach to the study of job satisfaction. Traditionally, job satisfaction and dissatisfaction have been considered to be the two extremes of the same attitudinal continuum; they are bipolar. This unidimensionality has almost been taken for granted. Sinha (1972)\(^9\) for the first time asserted that this unidimensionality of the concept can be challenged. He observed that "the factors that appeared prominent while workers were satisfied were not the same when they were not satisfied". His results indicated that "factors like salary, leave, security and so on, which were frequently mentioned by the dissatisfied group, were relatively ignored by the satisfied group of workers. In brief, Herzberg's dual factor theory (1959)\(^{10}\), propounds that job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction operate on two separate dimensions. The hygiene or maintenance factors incl
pay status, work conditions, job security and rela-
tions. The motivating factors are intrinsic ones such as achievement, recognition, responsibility, the content of work and the possibility of personal progress.
These are the factors which contribute to job satis-
faction. The empirical data in support of the theory
present evidence which are partly supportive of the proposition and partly not.

The literature survey on the relationship between satisfaction and productivity as done by Brayfield and Crockett (1955)\(^2\) comes to the conclusion that "... there is little evidence in the available literature that employee attitudes bear any simple or for that matter appreciable relationship to performance on the job".

After reviewing the empirical evidences on Herzberg's theory, Dunnett Campbell and Hackel (mentioned in Lee, 1980)\(^2\) came to the conclusion that the theory is an oversimplification of the relationships between motivation and satisfaction and the sources of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. The distinct and usual categorisation between dissatisfiers and motivators as spelled out by Herzberg cannot claim universal application because personal motivation is often complicated by the concreteness of organizational forces embedded in cultural relativities of a region or a country. It has been found in India, for example, that Herzberg's distinct categories do not measure up to the rigorous tests of empirical research. The interplay between
dissatisfiers and satisfiers does not make it conceivable that these two categories will make distinct entities with separate identities (Lahiri, et al, 1966, 1967)\textsuperscript{23, 24}. Maslow's need hierarchy propositions have gained global interest. The reason may be that the formulation promotes ready understanding besides the elegance it offers in support of normative values. However, it is also known that supportive empirical base for the theory is weak. Maslow himself stated in 1970 that "(the theory) seems, for most people, to have a direct personal subjective plausibility. Yet it still lacks experimental verification and support; I have not yet been able to think of a good way of putting it to the best ...." Maslow (1970)\textsuperscript{25}.

Attempt by D. T. Hall, et al, (1963)\textsuperscript{26} to establish the relevance of the Maslow model indicates that the need strength was more often correlated with need satisfaction and not with the next higher level of needs as predicted. The authors conclude with the following words; "-..... no strong relationships were found to support the hierarchy of needs we hypothesised. Furthermore, none of the correlations between needs and satisfaction levels was high enough to support the existence of a hierarchical order...."."
The theory suggests that job satisfaction and dissatisfaction constitute two independent dimensions having separate set of determinants. Job content factors are capable of producing satisfaction but not dissatisfaction whereas job context factors can produce dissatisfaction but not satisfaction. Elaborating his theory further, Herzberg (1968) postulates two sets of basic human needs. The first set, he designates as Animal-Adam needs, which are mainly concerned with the human individual's attempt to avoid pain, stemming from the environment; the psychological environment is the major source of this pain. The second set of needs, he designates as Human-Abraham needs. These are mainly concerned with self actualization, self-fulfilment and psychological growth through task accomplishment.

From the foregoing discussion, it can be observed that job satisfaction, like morale, is multi-dimensional. All theories of job satisfaction emphasize the need to identify and study its constituent factors.

The attitude of work alienation or job involvement has been considered as very central to work motivation (Katz and Khan, 1951; Seeman, 1971).
and yet very few studies have been done to explore the relationship between job involvement as well as patterns of perceived needs on the one hand and job satisfaction on the other.

Most theories of human motivation for example those by Alderfer (1972)\textsuperscript{30}, Herzberg (1966)\textsuperscript{31} and Maslow (1954)\textsuperscript{32} direct their efforts at identifying the strength of various categories of needs and suggest that job behaviour is primarily determined by the strength and satisfaction of those needs of the employees. The relationship between job satisfaction and job performance has been investigated extensively over the past several decades. The present study attempts to explore the relationship of job involvement to personality factors education and job satisfaction. The attitude of job involvement or its opposite, job alienation, particularly in textile industry, refers to the degree to which the total job situation is thought of as being central to one's life or self-concept. The goals of an organization and the needs of an individual may converge. The more an individual's role helps the convergence of the goals of the organization and the needs of the individual, higher the integration of the individual within the organization and the more effective the individual and the organization are likely to be. An involved employee expects his work to be intrinsically rewarding because he thinks work
provides him with an opportunity for self-expression. From a psychological point of view, the specific attitude of job involvement is different from and independent of both the actual feelings of need satisfaction experienced by the employee on the job and the expectations of need satisfaction from a job. It appears, an employee's ego involvement in, or commitment to his job, is a by-product of his background and personal experience in the past and is often carried by him from job to job.

This introductory chapter describes various job and organization related attitudes and reviews the findings of studies to explore the antecedents and outcomes of these attitudes. Since the study is focussed on job involvement, and its relation to job satisfaction within the organization, attempt will be made to define the concepts and propose a model showing the possible relationship of job involvement to nature of job, personality and organization related variables, and the job behaviour that is affected by involvement and satisfaction. The job involvement depends on the internalization within one's self of the values about the goodness or the importance of work (Lodahl and Kejner, 1965).
The attitude of job satisfaction on the other hand, is much more a transient state of the employee. It is determined by the degree of fulfilment of an employee's needs on the job due to the presence or absence of certain factors or outcomes such as salary, independence, etc. Thus, while the job involvement dimension varies from complete identification (attitude of belongingness) to lack of any relation (don't care attitude) with the job, the job satisfaction dimension varies from specific need-fulfilment to need frustration on the job depending upon the attainment of desired goals through job activity. It is quite conceivable that an employee may be highly satisfied but not involved, or highly involved but not satisfied.

The concept of job satisfaction relates to a man's liking for his job that comes from an overall evaluation of the situations and factors present on the job.

It has been argued that job-involvement is positively related to job-satisfaction, at least in
the area of Herzberg's motivators, and therefore the former can be predicted from the knowledge of the latter. Weissenberg and Gruenfeld (1968). It is doubtful whether this relationship is a stable one.

Since job involvement is more of an individual difference type variable dependent on past specialization of the employee and job satisfaction is more of job or situational differences type variable dependent on presence or absence of job factors, the relationship between the two is expected to be variable.

Empirical research by Hunt and Hill (1969) and Heneman and Schwab (1972) on expectancy indicates that despite the promise of the Vroom model there are a number of unanswered questions such as our lack of knowledge of the variety of goals carrying positive value in work situations for different factors as also the differences in strength which lead to the choice of one goal over another. Lawler believes that motivation to perform is conditioned by the perceived consequences of good performance and also by the person's estimate of the probability that effort can be converted into successful performance.
Thus at one place they emphasize "psychological identification" whereas at another they emphasize "performance self esteem" contingency. This has led to a controversy over the definition. The latter definition brings the concept of job involvement close to the concept of intrinsic motivation. In some studies on job involvement, psychological identification is the basic theme (e.g., Lawler and Hall 1970) whereas in others emphasis is laid on the performance self esteem contingency e.g. Gurin Veroff and Feld (1969). There are still other studies which choose a middle path by accepting both the performance self esteem relationship and psychological identification in dealing with job involvement.

In a recent review of organizational research on job involvement, Rabinowitz and Hall (1977) concluded that job involvement is related to a number of personal situational and work outcome factors.

Job Involvement Job Satisfaction:

In a developing economy like ours where capital and technological resources are scarce a study of job attitudes and job involvement acquires added
significance. Our only asset is man-power.
Development of the economy at a higher growth rate requires the best possible use of men and material. Industrial strife or harmony are but the overt manifestation of job attitudes. It is necessary thus to obtain a proper understanding of job life, Singh (1982)\(^{40}\), Ideally management should make conscious efforts to enrich jobs at all levels of the organizations because job enrichment produces role enrichment which, in turn, brings about growth and self-actualization for workers. Every exercise in job enrichment aims at encouragement of 'natural motivation' and with a feeling of motivation, work performance also records qualitative and quantitative improvement. As a result, both the worker and the organization benefit from better performance, enhanced job satisfaction and opportunities "to participate in all life roles more effectively.

Most countries of the world have become increasingly progressive and their future material and cultural welfare and progress, even their survival, depend upon the wise use of the potentialities of their people. It is futile to think about
the progress of a country simply by erecting skyscrapers, giant factories, dams and big science laboratories without making its labour force achievement oriented to make the best use of these modern temples of progress.

A number of research studies analysing employee attitudes and quality of working life confirm that primary cause of employee dissatisfaction is the nature of their work and the quality of their working life. It has been found that blue-collar workers, in particular, would work more sincerely and effectively if their jobs are enriched and expanded giving them greater control over their work and more autonomy from supervision. Lawler and Hackman (1972) discovered five core dimensions of a job which determine whether a job is sufficiently enriched or not. These core dimensions are:

(i) task identity, i.e. identification with the task by allowing the employee to perform a complete piece of work,
(ii) task significance, i.e. perception of the worker about significance of the task,
(iii) autonomy,
(iv) variety (in the job), and
(v) feedback (on performance).

Modern science and
technology with its emphasis on specialization and division of labour do not have much scope for this.

Every nation has its own share of talented people. But this is not sufficient. They should be identified and inspired to achieve excellence in the area which befit their physical and mental capabilities. This cream of the country should be saved from withering away without making its due contribution to the progress of the nation. They should be imbied with achievement motivation which may not only bring progress and prosperity to their country but also give self-satisfaction to them.

If we want to compete with such developed countries of the world as the U.S.A. or the U.S.S.R. in the textile sphere we should develop achievement ideology in our countrymen, at least as strong as theirs. We must foster entrepreneurial spirit in them and not be contented with only providing them with huge foreign capital, or borrowed material resources. Businessmen always know that it is not the hardware ("the size and slickness of the success of the plant or the money in the back") that counts
for the success of the business in the long run. "The company assets may melt like snow in hot sun, without the proper satisfaction of workers in the company". What is true of a business is true of a country also. China was politically free under Chiang-Kai-Shek but it lacked the dynamics of a really self-sacrificing achievement effort till that government was overthrown by a new political power. There is thus the need to develop this drive for achievement to avoid political conflict and upheaval. With such less material aid than what India has received from various countries, present day China has shown a more remarkable progress in the economic field and is still maintaining this trend. Within two decades, it has made vast strides and emerged as a very powerful force in the world. Instead of merely importing material resources from the developed world it would be more advantageous for us to import achievement dynamics from them.

"Men can shape their own destiny. External difficulties and pressure are not necessarily so important in shaping history as some people have
argued. What matters is how people respond to their challenges. And how they respond in turn depends upon how strong is their striving for achievement. So the question of what happens to our civilization and to our business community depends on how much time thousands of millions of us spend thinking about achievement". This remark of McClelland (1964) is equally true for India.

Need achievement concept of McClelland et. al. is yet another popular theory. McClelland is of the view that human beings do display affection for affiliation, power and achievement. He also distinguishes between social power and personal power depending upon the intention of and the purpose for the use of power. He has sought to establish that the strength of need achievement is the consequence of appropriate entrepreneurial efforts and, as such, such efforts have a direct correlation with economic development. While examining the data presented by McClelland (1971) and his colleagues in support of the theory, Lee (1980) has quoted with approval from Atkinson et. al. (1974) that "no work situation is optimal for everyone, no type of personality is the most productive in all situations (and) no single
generalization about the effects of the strength of motivation will apply to all tasks. It means, more specifically, that for every particular occupational role (a combination of task and work situation), there is a different kind of most productive personality. And for every personality ....... there is a particular role which offers an opportunity for relatively greater productivity and greater contribution than others as a solid foundation for individual's self-esteem".

If achievement orientation is such an important factor in the economic development of a country, the logical question is how to tap this valuable source or how to develop this need in the workers.

Organisational Structures:

To begin with one may ask, what is an organisation? This is a question before all social scientists who deal with problem of group structure and membership.

"Organization" has been defined in a number of ways. Lansburg and Spriegal define organization as the dynamic structural relationship between various factors - men, materials, and management - in an enterprise. These factors are combined to
achieve their major and minor objectives in a changing environment. Hodge and Johnson (1970) think of an organization "as a complex of relationships among human and physical resources and work connected together into a network of systems". Typical of such systems is the communication system, which supplies information necessary to maintain the organization and its operations. Moreover, any system is a part of some broader system, and therefore, is a sub-system. An organization then is a complex system in that it is a complex of relationships within some relevant framework. It is a dependent system, however, in that it cannot exist without the support of such other framework.

According to Ehle (1949) organizing is a "process of (i) determining what must be done if a given aim is to be achieved; (ii) dividing the necessary activities into segments small enough to be performed by one person; and (iii) providing means of coordination so that there is no wasted effort and the members of the organization do not get in each other's way". Organization is not an end in itself but a means to an end. It is a means of getting people to act together for a purpose, particularly for business purpose.
Roger Falk (1961) considers organization in dynamic term, as "the process of identifying and grouping activities for the most effective achievement of the policy of an undertaking". Harbison (1959) suggests organization to be "a shorthand expression for the integrated aggregation of those persons who are primarily involved in managing risk and uncertainty bearing planning and innovation, co-ordination administration and control and routine supervision of an enterprise".

Stogdill (1950) considers organization as a 'special kind of group' which may be defined as "a social group in which the members are differentiated as to their responsibilities for the task of achieving a common goal". Stogdill observes that the attributes of an organization include formal as well as informal interaction variables. The former relate to "persons to whom and for whom the members are accountable as well as others with whom they are expected to cooperate in the discharge of their responsibilities". The latter refer to "persons with whom the members actually work and cooperate in the performance of their tasks".

Devis (1940) is of the view that development of organization is largely a problem of division of
responsibility. This entails grouping of similar functions to form various elements of an organization in a manner that will promote effective cooperation and determining proper relationships between functional groups and organizational elements, with a view of promoting both cooperation and effective executive leadership.

Ganguli (1964) has deducted four factors which he considers common to all organizations. These are (i) organizational goal; (ii) set of individual offices; (iii) more or less clearly differentiated responsibilities for its members; and (iv) structure or system of coordinative relationships. This shows that all organizations are based on differentiation of functions and the whole structure is a neat arrangement of the "Hierarchy of Power". This hierarchy of power is formalized by the organization chart. Thus we find that the organizational structure or the "industrial hierarchy", as suggested by Brown (1954) "consists of several layers of authority from the chairman of the board of directors or president to the vice president, managers, chiefs of divisions, chiefs of departments, foremen and workers". This is a linear pattern in which, except for the top and
the bottom layers everyone has a boss and is in turn a boss over others.

Keith and Gubelini (1958) call organizational structure "the backbone of the business concern". They are of the opinion that the organizational structure seeks to bind the structural parts of the enterprise with links of authority and responsibility which best provide the desired results.

It has been rightly averred that the formal organizational structure seeks to bind the structural parts of the enterprise with links of authority and responsibility which best provide the desired results. This is made possible by determining, (i) the authority relations or the relative superordinate positions of different offices in the organization (ii) the responsibility that one office or group has towards others, (iii) the specific functions which an office is required to perform and (iv) who reports what to whom, or the communication system of the structure (Miller and Form, 1964).

All formal organizational structures have a few common characteristics (Pestonjee 1973).
These may be enumerated as below:

1) The structure manifests a chain-of-command relationship based upon the principle of super-subordination.

2) It is possible to divide the structure into two mutually supportive systems. The higher structure is mainly concerned with executive functions or policy and planning whereas the lower structure functions to translate policies into practice and action. It is the lower structure which is directly responsible for output.

3) The formal structure codifies all specific individual relationships, all rights, duties, privileges, and all regulations required for meeting the ends of the organization.

4) The formal organizations are impersonal in nature in that they specify status and roles—not individuals. The members occupying given status or roles are expected to bear an 'ideal' relationship with one another.

5) The codified relationships and expectations may either be translated into an organizational chart or may be left as formal expectations commensurate with work roles.
There are three recognized types of formal organizational structures based upon the concept of hierarchy of power. These are:

i) Line organization

ii) Functional organization

iii) Staff and Service organization

The line organization is the most basic and clear-cut pattern of organizational structure. It represents a basic division of work structure. Keith and Gubellini (1958) explain, "is descriptive in that there exists a direct flow, or direct line of authority through specific channels, and in that a flow of responsibility returns through these same channels". This type of structure is ideal for small organizations where the extent of personal contact is within reason.

In case of functional organization the business activities are divided into narrowly defined areas and these areas are assigned to specialists. This type of structure is highly complex as compared to the line type of organizational structure. Ganguli (1964) observes that under a functional structure, "..... the individual employee is supervised not by one man but
many, each usually a specialist in his own area. He is not supervised as a person but it is his functions that are supervised by these experts: the personnel man, the design engineer, the time and motion engineer, the training specialist, the medical man, etc. Within each area, the quality of advice and direction is of the best ..."

Since, in a functional structure, it is the 'functions,' rather than the 'individuals,' who are supervised, a complex maze of interrelationships emerges where a specialist tends to supervise functions of not only his own but of several different departments.

The combination of the best features of the 'line' and the 'functional' types has led to the evolution of a third type of organizational structure known as the 'staff-and-service' or 'line-and-staff' type. In this form the flow of authority proceeds along fixed lines from the top of the organization to the bottom. The need for specialists is addressed by the creation of divisions as in the functional type of structure. Here, however, the resemblance ceases, for the authority given to the specialist is usually restricted to his own department. Any
officer-in-charge of a unit or department may seek the advice of the specialist. The specialists function as advisers and also as researchers who initiate improvements in the areas with which they are concerned. These specialists then convey their recommendations or views to the officer-in-charge of the unit or the department. Thus, he is relieved of the responsibility of solving the many specialized problems which crop up from time to time in his department. Freedom from tackling these special problems allows him more time for maintenance of discipline and control which are necessary for proper and efficient functioning of the department.

Modern organization theory, however, recognize that the "hierarchy of power" or "chain of command" approach is not the only approach to the study of organizational structures.

Siegel (1962) taking the lead from Jasinki (1959) has observed that "the realization that organizations are generally characterized by an informal structure super-imposed upon the formal 'charted' structure has led to abandonment of the
traditional view in favour of a more dynamic one. In addition to the usual vertical or 'chain of command' relationships, current literature recognize the existence and importance of 'horizontal' relationships between workers at the same hierarchical level and 'diagonal' relationships cutting across functional divisions. Siegel, keeping in view the modern trends, suggests five aspects of organizational structures. They are:

1) Size of organization
2) Participation
3) Communication
4) Structure of the group
5) Leadership

Modern organization theory mainly deals with characteristics of organizational structures and their relation to organizational effectiveness. "In a broader sense", observed Anatesi (1964) the term is also used to encompass all managerial practices, since these are so intimately bound up with organizational structure. Psychologists have used different models to analyse and understand the problems concerning organizations and their structures. Cartwright (1958) has adopted mathe-
matical models to analyse linkage systems in organizations. Shartle (1956) and Hare (1959) on the other hand, utilize biological models to conceptualise the growth of organizations. Still others have focused on qualitative descriptions of organizational climate using such concepts as group conformity versus individual freedom, autocratic versus democratic supervision, cooperation versus competition, and permissiveness versus rigidity, Lewin et al (1938, 1939); Likert (1958, 1961); Smith (1955). The latter approach has been found to be more acceptable to psychologists and a number of empirical research investigations have been conducted to study the organizational climate.

The fact that social forces influence worker's satisfaction and productivity was recognized only after the Hawthorne studies. Influences of leadership upon group performance - an accidental outcome of Hawthorne studies - were first experimentally tackled by Lewin, Lippitt and White (1939). The concept of "climate" is based upon the assumption that all organizations have an 'aura all their own' which influences the attitude and activities of individuals belonging to them. Smith (1955) draws
an analogy between social climate and physical (environmental) climate. He observes that "the differences in organizational climate have important effects upon the way men behave .... The attitudes of employees in a company with the same formal organization and the same personnel may be very different when the organizational climate changes".

Nelson (1950) has taken the lead in the study of social climates in industrial settings. Recent investigations conducted by Stanton (1960) and Vroom and Mann (1960) represent significant advances in the same direction.

Nelson (1950) has suggested four types of organizational climates namely: bureaucratic, autocratic, idiocratic, and democratic. These four climates differ in (i) what is perceived as the source of authority, (ii) the major goal of the organizational efforts (iii) the demands made upon the workers, and (iv) the motivation of the supervisor. He evolved a scale which could gauge the prevalent climate of an organization. His scale yields an index of a supervisor's characteristic style of leadership. With the help of this scale, Nelson was successful in identifying companies with different organizational structures or climates........
In recent years there has been a great spurt in studies and investigations about industrial leadership and how it influence worker's perceptions, attitudes, and productivity. Amongst the better known studies can be mentioned those of Fleishman (1953, 1955), Bass (1958), Likert (1958), Stanton (1960), Vroom and Mann (1960) and Kahn and Katz (1953). In the next chapter a review of some of the relevant studies on this problem is presented.

Organizational structure signifies a network of relationship between various positions and the position holders. Organizational structures vary greatly from one enterprise to another. However, there are some basic similarities that permit a generalized analysis of structure. The broad base of the structure reveals that at the worker level the number of individuals tends to be very large. The individuals at this level are responsible for their own tasks and nothing more. However, there may be individuals at this level who are called semi-supervisors. Managerial group includes all levels above that of the workers. In fact, the one
quality which distinguishes supervisors and other higher managers from the workers is the managerial ability - the ability to manage men, money, machines and materials. Apparently there are three principal managerial levels each of which has its own purpose, structural and behavioural characteristics: Top management, middle management and supervisory management. Supervisory management represents the connecting level between middle and top management and the worker.

**Supervisor and his Problems**

Supervisors form a significant link in the hierarchical chain of an organization. Their performance is not only responsible for bringing about an interaction between managerial culture and the culture of the workers but is also a major determinant of organizational effectiveness.

The word, "supervisor" stems from two Latin words 'over' and 'see'; hence a supervisor is one who oversees or is an overseer. In early American history, overseers were over slaves, and for many years industrial supervisors were autocratic. Today however, autocracy in supervision is being moderated
by democratic "human relations" approach. According to Peter Drucker, the supervisor's job grew out of the lead man who formerly was in charge of a group of towrope pullers or ditch diggers. Literally, he was the "foreman". His authority consisted mainly of chanting the "one, two, three, up" which set the pace for the rest of the workers. In Germany, the supervisor is frequently called a "Vorarbeiter" - a foreworker; in England, the term, "Change-hand" is used. Both the terms suggest the position of a man in the lead. Interestingly enough, the term "supervisor" has its roots in the word "master"; carrying the same meaning as in the phrase, 'master craftsman' of olden days. The master often assumed autocratic power. Today's supervisor, Drucker observes combines some of the qualities of both the foreman and the master.

According to Olsen, supervision means, "setting objectives and standards for people; making goals clear; spending time so that people grasp all parts of their job completely; assigning work and checking the authority; training; disciplining; settling grievances; stimulating people to greater effort; installing new methods; developing
men; and calling account". Any one who does not perform all these tasks and many more not included here is not a supervisor.

According to Sartain and Baker, the term, "supervisor" designates the fundamental duties of the job at the very bottom, or the first level of the management hierarchy including the formally assigned authority and responsibility for planning and controlling the activities of subordinates, usually on a direct face to face basis.

In fact the supervisor is the immediate contact man with workers. He is the head who deals with and directs the efforts of individual workers. He is the one who must get work done by workers, and deal with each individual worker who may be careless moody hot tempered, resentful or anything else, good or bad that human being may be or do while at work. He is the front-line manager.

The supervisor occupies a key position in any industrial organization. He stands at the point where plans and policies of those who direct the enterprise are transformed into practical results through the efforts of individuals who work on the
job. In fact, supervision is the keystone of any enterprise. There is no substitute for it. Inspite of the utmost importance of the supervision, it is relevant to mention. that the supervisor may be at the heart of many problems. Higher management is often dissatisfied with supervisory performance and supervisors are in turn, frequently dissatisfied with the treatment they get from the higher levels of management. In general, the supervisors feel that their decision-making powers and authority remain severely curtailed; while their responsibilities always enhanced.

**Behaviour from the Individual Point**

Modern industry presents an interesting contrast. On the one hand, tremendous advances have been made in the application of science and technology to industry. Scientific controls have been introduced to promote the practical purposes of industrial organization. Operations are logically organized to achieve more efficient ends. Many of these advances are undertaken in the name of efficiency and to its development. On the other hand, nothing comparable to this advance has gone in the area
of human relations. Our capacity to work together has not improved with our advance in per capita material production. Matters of morale and cooperation in our modern factories have shown no great improvement. The striking contrast between technical efficiency on the one hand and matters of human cooperation on the other, presents the number one problem of our present day industrial situation.

It is obvious that we know a great deal more about machine than about people. The technical skills of modern technology can be made explicit and communicated, to them science has been applied. Our social skills on the other hand, are largely personal, empirical and anticipative. They are so rooted in tradition that they cannot be made explicit. To them science has hardly been applied.

There is a widely held notion that people at work are primarily motivated by economic interest and that in their pursuit of economic gain they are essentially logical. According to this version the major inducement to cooperate is monetary return. Wherever and whenever this assumption has been seriously investigated, its universal validity has
been seriously questioned. Far from being the prime and sole mover of human activity in business, economic interest has been far behind in the list of incentives that make men willing to work. While it would be incorrect to say that this over-simplified version of economic motivation of people at work has been completely discarded, in the past twenty-five years another picture has emerged to compete with it. According to this view, people at work are not too different from people in many other walks of life. Wherever they work at the top or middle or bottom of an organization, they are not entirely creatures of logic; they have their feelings. For example, they like to be praised rather than blamed; they do not like to have to admit their mistakes at least not publicly. They like to feel important and to have their work recognized as important. They like to feel emotionally secure and independent in their relations with their supervisors. They like to be listened to and to have their feelings and points of view taken into account.

According to this version, the man at work is an individual with a social orientation as well as an "economic man". He has personal and social as
well as economic needs. Work provides him with a way of life as well as a means of livelihood. To understand his satisfaction and dissatisfaction at work one has to understand the social as well as the physical and economic setting in which his work takes place. One has to understand the kinds of relationships he has developed or can develop with his superiors, his subordinates, his co-workers as well as with other people and groups in the organization. One has to understand the opportunity for social and personal development and for the satisfaction of needs that these relationships afford. Within these relationships can his basic social and emotional needs be satisfied?

Socio Economic Values

The problem of adequate uncovering and proper evaluation of socio psychological factors in the area of organizational effectiveness constitutes a major aspect of current thinking and research. The variable of productivity is one criterion of organizational effectiveness. According to this position, the performance of people in organizations may be considered as reflecting the relative attainment of important organizational objectives and its
unfolding could contribute to our understanding of human behaviour. The human relations' movement, with its emphasis on good interpersonal relations, job satisfaction and importance of informal groups provides an important initial stimulant for the study of job attitudes and their relationship to human behaviour in organization.

As Brayfield and Crockett have pointed out, a common assumption that employee satisfaction directly affects performance permeates most of the writings about the topic that appeared during the last two decades. Statements such as the following characterise this literature: "Morale is not an abstraction; rather it is concrete in the sense that it directly affects the quantity and quality of an individual's output"; and "Employee morale ... cuts down absenteeism and tradition lifts production". It is not hard to see how the assumption that high job satisfaction leads to high performance came to be popularly accepted.

The question is why some workers tend to be high producers or why persons of largely similar background who are engaged in the same activity under comparable conditions exhibit considerable
variability in output. Specifically what determines high productivity? In attempting to resolve this problem previous studies have explored the relationship of several factors to productivity employing various approaches. The present study is an attempt to explore the relationship of job involvement to their job satisfaction and work performance. Productivity is the resultant of a complex of factors both individual and situational like job involvement and job satisfaction.

Managements too often complain that they do not get the best out of their investment on human resources and would like to know the measures that could be adopted to improve the motivation of employees. This refers to the feelings of an individual towards his work as perceived and reported by the individual. The experience of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with one's work or aspects of it is in a large part the consequence of the extent of one's positive or negative job attitudes. While it is theoretically possible to conceive of job attitude and job satisfaction as two different things in practice the two terms are used interchangeably and equivalently while reporting on an individual's verbal responses to his
job. It is obvious that there is a relationship between job satisfaction and performance on the job. While there is some empirical evidence to indicate a positive relationship, it must be admitted that this evidence is not conclusive. Some Indian studies have on the whole reported a positive relationship between job satisfaction and productivity. The importance of job satisfaction, is not only for its possible association with productivity. There is a difference among the views of scholars on the question of the relationship between job satisfaction and mental health. It is generally agreed that poor job satisfaction (negative job attitudes) is more often accompanied by poor mental health and may manifest in a number of conditions ranging from anxiety and headache to depressions, from the loss of appetite to psychosomatic states such as acute hyperacidity. It has been suggested by a leading school of research that industrialization creates work roles that are basically unsuited to the normal adult, matured personality and that in order to make a satisfactory adjustment to the demands of these roles we need to overcome a variety of psychological stresses.
The investigation of job attitudes has posed several methodological problems. For instance how does one go about ascertaining a person's attitudes without putting ideas into his head? How do we know that the expression of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with one aspect of the job (say the boss) does not influence the expression regarding another (say responsibility)? How do we find out whether some aspects are more important and more pertinent than others? Over three decades ago psychologists grappled with these and similar problems. Many of the difficulties were overcome with experimental designs; and refinements in the two major instruments used; interview and questionnaire. A technique that appeared on the scene later was the critical incident technique; this has proved very useful in the study of job attitudes. Almost at the same time in research in political science, the technique of content analysis emerged. The two techniques were so complimentary that it was inevitable that some researchers would use them together. Fredrick Herzberg stepped in and an entirely fresh approach to the study of job attitudes was opened up. The work of Herzberg and his associates yielded not only a fresh approach but a fresh hypothesis regarding
job satisfaction. While researchers had traditionally conceived of different aspects of the work environment as being more or less responsible for satisfaction, Herzberg suggested factors responsible for dissatisfaction.

A simple illustration should help. The traditional view would relate "working conditions" with job satisfaction and it might be claimed that working conditions were relatively more or less important than any other factor, say, recognition on the job. Herzberg's view would be that the absence of good working conditions would produce dissatisfaction, but their presence might not produce satisfaction; similarly, recognition on the job would produce satisfaction, but its absence might not produce dissatisfaction. In other words, the idea of a number of factors, each "bidirectional" in its capacity to produce satisfaction or dissatisfaction, was replaced by the idea of two sets of "unidirectional" factors: the 'satisfiers' and the 'dissatisfiers' capable of producing satisfaction and dissatisfaction. The categorization of factors into satisfiers and dissatisfiers led to another important discovery. Herzberg found that the factors emerging as satisfiers had something in common. They were all concerned with the job itself. The
factors that emerged dissatisfiers were, on the other hand, concerned with the job context; i.e., "with conditions that surround the doing of the job." He called the latter 'hygiene' factors, borrowing the term from medical hygiene to indicate their preventive rather than curative value. The former are called 'motivation' factors.

Theoretical Background

Schein\(^3\) has made a selective survey of motivational theories and while doing so he has emphasized the complexity of human nature. In other words he has promised his concept of motivation on the 'complex man' paradigm and like Handy\(^4\) emphasized the psychological contract as propounded by Argyris (1960)\(^5\) and Levinston (1962)\(^6\). In Schein's language "the notion of psychological contract implies that there is an unwritten set of expectations operating at all times between every member of an organization and the various managers and others in that organization". It implies that the various elements of motivation that the proponents from Maslow onwards have proposed are more or less relevant to Schein's comprehensive but not so specific concept of motivation. While propounding
the complex man model Schein opts for a contingency theory of motivation. However he does not deny the role of broad cultural factors as well as political factors in the motivational paradigm, because these aspects have not been probed.

Lawler, Schein and Sandler have presented compelling arguments for the case that future theories research and application in industrial and organizational psychology should not look exclusively towards either individual differences or organizational and job characteristics as the primary determinants of employee's responses to the job. According to these authors, a more fruitful approach should emphasize interactions between individual differences and organizational and job characteristics. Schein, for example, argued in favour of his "complex man" perspective on the interaction between the individual and the organization, a perspective from which individual needs are viewed as complex and variable both between individuals and within individuals over a period of time. Specifically. Schein has discussed the possibility that employee responds to higher order need gratification provided by the job - a primary variable in the theories of several prominent organizational psychologists. Argyris, Herzberg,
Likert\textsuperscript{93}. Schein\textsuperscript{94} hypothesized that higher order need gratification may positively be related to employee responses in the case of highly educated individuals. Similarly, Lawler\textsuperscript{95} argued both against trying to fit individuals into organizations and jobs and against prescribing more participation and job enrichment for all people under all circumstances. According to him, a more fruitful approach would consist of "individualizing organizations" to fit the differing needs, values, and expectations of different employees. More specifically, Lawler argued that participative management and job enrichment should be applied selectively to those individuals, who, according to their needs, values, and expectations, would be expected to respond "positively" to such approaches. Sandler\textsuperscript{96} presented basically the same argument but broadened it to include additional dimensions of the organizational situation. However, as Lawler pointed out, research on the individual difference variables relevant to this approach is not at an advanced stage. Although measures of occupationally relevant abilities and skills have been devised, little empirical work has been done on work-related needs, values, and expectations.
Schein\textsuperscript{97}, for example, was unable to cite any research which directly investigated his hypothesis concerning the relationships among education, the extent of higher order need gratification provided by the job, and employee responses to the job. Lawler\textsuperscript{98} also was unable to cite any studies as supporting his emphasis on interactions among individual differences and job design and leadership style.

In addition, previous research on the effects of individual differences on the relationships between job characteristics and employee responses to the job has yielded ambiguous and conflicting results. Tosi\textsuperscript{99}, for example, was unable to replicate the results of Vroom's\textsuperscript{100} classic study on the effects of authoritarianism and the need for independence on employee responses to participation in decision making. That is Tosi's results indicated that employee authoritarianism and employee need for independence did not influence the relationships between participation and satisfaction or performance. Victor Vroom (1970)\textsuperscript{101} is a prominent exponent of expectancy/path theory. His proposition is that a highly motivated producer would desire a
reward he visualises as a result of effort put in and that if he had worked hard enough to produce the result he would have received the reward expected. In this model, extrinsic and intrinsic rewards are not differentiated. Closely related to Vroom's theory is Lawler's motivational model. According to him, the motivation to perform at a key level is determined by the person's belief concerning the probability that if he puts effort into performing at that level he will be able to perform at that level. This belief is conditioned by the person's self-esteem as well as by his previous personal and observed experience in similar and identical situations. In other words the higher the person's self-esteem and the more he has been able to perform effectively in similar situations the higher will be his performance.
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