STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The topic "Modernization of industrial workers: a profile of their personality and traits" has been selected for the following reasons. The problem of modernization occupies a special position. It is world-wide. It is a complex process and it is broad as well. It is a complex process in the sense that it is the outcome of intercultural borrowing from different peoples. Ultimately this results in new and blended patterns. This complex process is known as acculturation. It is manifest in the contemporary world. Modernization as acculturation is related to some change in any society. The rate of change, again, is proportionate to the extent of inter-society contact. As a result of this inter-society contact, isolated societies gradually dwindle down.

Moreover, the process of modernization is broad in the sense that different ideas are inherent in the concept. This may be illustrated thus. Modernisation at one time and in one place may mean removal of illiteracy. Again, it may mean distribution of water to urban slums; further it may mean at other times construction of roads or hydro-electric power installations. In other places, emphasis may be laid on capital goods industries. Thus we find that different strands are there in this concept. The term, if analysed thus, means a 'complete' transformation of a traditional society into the advanced society. As Prof. S. N. Ganguly (1977) has said:
"Modernity consists in modifying the existing traditions and creating room for new and better traditions ....... Modernity is not at all a cancellation of everything old - it is a continuous process." So far as India is concerned there is no antithesis between traditionalism and modernity. As Prof. Yogendra Singh (1973) has said: "We may find in India three important ramifications: the traditional, the modern and the traditional-modern. This last ramification is one which is paramount in the processes of cultural change. This constitutes a transitional phase ....... The existence of a 'modern' and a 'transitional' sector in cultural traditions by itself, however, does not connote the nature or pattern of modernization as such; it also does not imply that modernization in each country will have an identical form." Further, it is difficult to separate tradition from modernity. The reason is obvious. The manifestation of the modernity in the traditional society is apparent in a particular culture coupled with its own traditions.

In the twentieth century the problem of modernization has become a critical problem of developing countries and has gained ground there. The creative interest of mine in problems of modernization may not only create an awareness of the problems of contemporary relevance to which psychological research can meaningfully contribute but may also help to reorient the teaching of social psychology. A psychologist can contribute to the analysis of this problem even by means of research.
Bernard Baumrin (1970) in one of his articles has rightly pointed out that any scientific research loses its importance and weight if it is not carried on to "articulable foreseeable consequences with respect to substantial human problem." Thus Baumrin emphatically asserts that any research becomes irrelevant if it does not throw light on concrete facts and problems wherein the human mind finds natural interest.

Besides, Prof. V. K. R. V. Rao (1969) has emphasized "the need to relate our research programmes as far as possible to some of our most urgent social and national problems." The same tone is observed in Prof. D. Sinha (1971) when he has observed: "a social psychologist would be expected to delve deep into the problems that people actually worry about rather than be concerned with those formulated on the basis of his own reading and what may be called 'academic' in the least favourable sense of the word."

Viewed in the above context, any researcher is expected to search for problems which are directly related to the needs of the country and which are social in character. Much emphasis should be put on research for policy. In other words, there should be a clear shifting of emphasis from theoretical and academic research to its social applicability. Thus a modern psychologist should have much concern for this. The topic "modernization of industrial workers: a profile of their personality and traits" has been selected on the above consideration also. Like the Industrial Revolution, the revolution of modernization
is regarded as an irresistible force which started with Western Europe during the Renaissance and the reformation onwards and which is bound to spread in all parts of the world. Further, my purpose is not only to understand the problem of modernization theoretically alone but also to find out practical ways of dealing with it. It will be my attempt to find out its concrete pattern and how it becomes manifested in fields like steel industry of such states as West Bengal and Bihar in India and what ideas must have worked behind the processes.

Thus in the present study I have restricted the word 'modernization' exclusively to industrial modernization in the sense of industrial advancement. To-day much of the world is rich, powerful and highly advanced in industry and technology. This advancement in industry and technology is nothing but a mark of modernization.

Of course, this process has not taken place all on a sudden. If we look back over the pages of the history of industrial development, we will find that industry underwent several stages. These stages can be described as follows:- (i) the Medieval phase, (ii) the phase of the industrial revolution and (iii) the modern phase. Each of these phases, according to Lewis Mumford (1934), is characterized by a particular technological complex. The technological complex of the medieval phase is known as 'eotechnic', that of the industrial revolution as 'paleotechnic'. The modern phase is known as neo-technic complex. The medieval phase was a water power and wood complex. The paleotechnic phase was a coal and
iron complex. The neo-technic phase has replaced older water-power and wood complex by electricity and alloy. Technology employed in modern industry is complex, power-driven and gigantic. It differs from the tool and apparatus society of the past. Modern industry depends on extremely complex machine production. According to R. D. Lambert (1966) modernization in the factories usually means the substitution of machineries for workers or an increase in the number of machineries per worker. In this connection Schneider (1967) has said: "The machine altered social relations at work in the other ways; for instance, with the machine process there tended to appear one class of workers who operated the machines, and another class which supervised the operation. As time went on both categories became still further divided; supervisors according to their degree of authority and responsibility and workers into the skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled; . . . ."

The industrial modernity as referred to above is external in the sense that any one can guess it from the sight of big and gigantic machineries installed in the industry. But it is not all. The technology employed in modern industry can never be upheld for long without the workers who are engaged in it and who are to be 'modern' accordingly. Modern industries of to-day are to be studied not simply in terms of the gigantic modern machineries installed in the industry but also to the extent the modern industry has roused enthusiasm in the workers and generated in them a new motive force for better production. Hence it is apparent that modernization of
industry necessarily brings in the issue of the modernization of the workers. In other words, my purpose is to see how far the workers have been able to shake off old work-habits and to adapt themselves to the modernizing effects of industry. Of course, it should be remembered here that industrial workers in India are comparatively poor in number. The workers are to demonstrate a corresponding degree of vigour and determination in them which in fact can sustain and accelerate the momentum of industrial growth.

The modernization of industrial workers has not only a relevance to the industrial development of the country, it has also a relevance to the creation of a new attitude among the workers even. As Schneider (1967) has pointed out: "The early factory workingman, who was accustomed to the more secure, more leisurely, and less rationalized work of the guild system or the putting-out system, at first bitterly resented the discipline and insecurity caused by the machine." J. A. C. Brown (1974) also has said in this connection: "Another aspect of the impact of modern industrial technology upon society has been the break-up of the family as a social unit... In India industrialization has begun to corrode the Hindu caste system: ritual restrictions on proximity and intercourse between castes simply cannot be maintained under factory conditions." The modernization of industry brings with it necessarily the introduction of the machine which again has certain effects on the psychology of the workers. Of course, these effects are not always congenial. For example, the machine tends to reduce
the worker to an appendage of itself, destroying the need for skill in the process. As a result, the worker becomes exposed to the danger of monotony and boredom. But when a worker does a job which is almost entirely automatic, he will not still then be bored provided the situation permits day-dreaming, conversation and social distractions. J. A. C. Brown (1974) has further said: "Each technical invention has an effect on those who use it, or, to say the same thing in another way, each invention becomes an aspect of the material environment to which the society must adjust itself. This process of adjustment happens in three stages: (1) the invention or technique is created and accepted into the society, (2) individuals react towards it, and finally (3) cultural institutions and beliefs are altered to allow for it."

The questions that automatically arise now are: why have I selected industry in particular with reference to the problem of modernization? How is industry related to modernity? How does industry help the growth of modernity? The answer to the first question is obvious. Industrialization is the core of the modernization process that has aided the development of modern large-scale societies. The social scientists have identified a modern large-scale society as a society characterized by the application of technology, by extensive social inter-dependence, by urbanization, literacy, social mobility and such other factors. Modernization has received the greatest impetus from the economies of scale in factory production made possible by the introduction of
Besides, industries are the vehicles of modern life. Rapid technological developments have changed the hue of life and the ways of living. West Bengal is struggling to change from agriculture-oriented province to industry-oriented province. As a result, there are various steel and iron industries in West Bengal. My study of industrial modernization with exclusive reference to modernization of workers in modern steel industry of West Bengal along with cross-cultural comparisons between their modernity and that of workers employed in steel industry of Bihar would clearly bring out the extent of modernity displayed by both groups of workers in the public and private sectors respectively.

Factories and industrial workers have a causal relationship with modernization. In this connection the interdependence between industry and community is noteworthy. To quote Schneider (1967): "Industry is manned by masses of people-workers, engineers, managers, book-keepers, stenographers, salesmen - who bring into industry already formed personalities, with preconceptions, attitudes, prejudices. And industry feeds back into the community people whose personalities reflect their experience at work."

The growth of industry has a direct bearing on the mind of the people. Technological changes in industry initiate changes in the potentialities of the people. The patterns of human behaviour even become modified greatly by the changes
that take place in the industry owing to widespread use of machinery. People are to adopt new behavioural patterns. New technology helps workers to be modern. New levels of reason develop for planning. In this connection we may easily think of the mutual relation between industry and progress. The word 'progress' means advancement towards some ideal or a cherished end. The same word has some other connotation.

However, when we speak of social progress, we have in mind the idea of an ideal society. Many thinkers opine that a society can be called progressive if it achieves some level of advancement in industry and technology. These thinkers take material progress to be the only criterion of social progress. In this connection we are carried back to the words of Will Durant (1966): "They (machines) could produce the necessaries, and some of the luxuries, of life at unprecedented speed and in undreamed-of quantity; it was only a matter of time when all vital needs would be met, and poverty would disappear."

The industrial revolution of the nineteenth century, for example, ushered in a new era of some remarkable changes in the then prevailing economic system. This system was replaced by capitalism marked by introduction of machines and large-scale production. But this new system brought in its train a good deal of exploitation of the workers. The working conditions and the wages were highly deplorable. This attracted the attention of Karl Marx who showed his accusing finger at Capitalism. According to him industrialisation alone cannot bring plenty and prosperity. On the contrary, the prosperity
of the workers can come only by a class-war and by the workers seizing political power and the means of production from the capitalists. Thus in the words of D. Katz and R. L. Khan (1970) we may say: "The Marxian theory proposed that the major determinant of ideas and values was not economic status as such but key economic roles, the way in which man related to his fellows in the productive process through selling his labour or some other commodity or buying the labour of others." But the greatest weakness of the Marxian theory was his attempt to narrow role setting to the one type of role relationship he considered primary, viz., the social relations of production and the resulting class-conflict.

The answer to the remaining two questions cannot be given in the absence of a proper attempt at defining the term modernity. Here however the terms 'modernity' and 'modernization' have been shown to be closely related to each other. Before we survey the field let us see what it means and to which it applies. The concept of modernization has been understood to be a process which moves in different directions and which involves change in all areas of human thought and activity. Its principal aspects are, however, urbanization, industrialization, secularization, democratisation, education and media participation. These elements are highly associated with one another. Even we may speak of growth of rationality and secularism as marks of modernization in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Sometimes, it is used to mean even changes in attitudes. There is a vast body of literature
The term modernity has been defined in the dictionary as the state of being modernized. As has already been said, modernity and the impulse to it constitute a common feature of most of the developing countries. All these countries, however, do not feel an equal urge to be modern. The impulse to modernization is not equally present in the developing countries. History testifies to this truth. For example, there are countries which do not try to be modern. They are not caught in the web of modernity. They do not take off into rapid economic and social growth. They stand still or decline. Conversely, there are countries which try to be modern. If we look back over the pages of Greek history, we will find that ancient city-states of Greece spread their culture across their own country. Why were these states inspired to begin expanding? Why did Japan take off economically, but not China? Why have the Russian and the American scientists been inspired to achieve a very high level of scientific and technological advancement? We need not multiply examples endlessly. All these examples point to some moot questions. What is the impulse that produces modernization? What is it and whence has it come? Now, when we speak of modernization of any country, we find that the impulse to modernization is a drive on the part of any developing country for a change towards economic growth. In the book "Modernization: the dynamics of growth" (edited by Myron Weiner, Voice of America, 1966), D. C. McClelland has presented a vigorous and empiri-
cally founded viewpoint; he has pointed out in his article ('the impulse to modernization') that a particular mode of thinking named \( \eta \) Ach ('short for need for Achievement') played a vital role in the field of economic growth. According to him it is a mental preoccupation which finds its expression in fanciful thinking, day-dreaming, stories and other projective materials. He opined that nations higher in \( \eta \) Ach developed faster. His bias clearly is that efficiency can be expected only of persons with high \( \eta \) Ach. Of course, much criticism has been levelled against the way McClelland has tried to analyse the concept. Klinger and McNelly (1969), for example, opined that \( \eta \) Ach fantasy is associated with behavioural expectations under which an individual operates. For example, if an individual starts thinking that he is to thrive in achieving behaviour, it will be found in the long run that he believes himself to be of achieving type.

Let us see how the social scientists have viewed it. It is a well-recognised concept among them. They have viewed the term from their own perspectives; as a result they are not unanimous. For the economist, for example, the very application of modern and improved technical know-how, machinery and process in order to bring about greater output is modernity. The sociologists, again, have studied the term under such different names as social change, industrialization and the like. The sociologists conceive it as the process of societal differentiation. Modern societies are differentiated in the sense that societies are highly specialised with respect
to individual activities. The most important aspect of this societal differentiation in all the major institutional spheres is the separation between the different roles held by an individual especially among the occupational and political roles. In the economic sphere proper, for example, there has been a marked development of a very high level of technology fostered by the systematic application of knowledge. To the political scientist, again, the problem of nation and government is a modernization process.

All these point to the fact that modernity is a feature relative to society. Now a question arises: Does it belong to society as a whole or the individual or both? The psychologist views it as something lying not only in the character of society but also in the character of the individual as well. Thus for the psychologist modernity is both subjective and objective.

Here I shall represent an attempt to look at modernization purely from the psychological perspective. At the psychological level modernization involves a fundamental shift in values, attitudes and expectations. Thus a modern man has inner readiness to openness and newer experiences. He has a disposition to hold bold opinion over a large number of views. A traditional man, on the other hand, has interest in fewer things. A modern man has interest in distant things. He feels that man can be master over nature. A traditional man has narrow outlook and believes that God is the creator. He is thus prone to mysticism. Now, if we take modernity to be
something lying in the character of the individual in the sense of the psychologist's use of the term, we find that industry is the best field what the character of the individual is much influenced by modernization. The growth of industrial work-force subsequently destroys traditional ties in the society; as a result new structures of social relationships emerge. In this connection B. R. Sharma (1974) has rightly pointed out: "In the industrial community as noted by Kerr and his associates, new relationships based upon employment and occupation come to replace attachments to the family and the village."

Much light has been thrown on modernization by the psychologists in the West as well as in the East. But all of them have thrown light on dimensions of modernity as related to the attitude-value system. For example, while surveying number of Africans in various countries, Prof. Leonard Doob (1967) pointed out eight factors in modernization - (1) time emphasis on future, (2) positive attitude towards government activities, (3) confidence (control over one's destiny), (4) optimism, (5) belief in science and determinism, (6) trusting conception of people, (7) positive attitude towards the country's leaders and their policies and (8) de-emphasis on traditional beliefs.

By positive attitude towards government activities and the country's leaders we may mention democratic right of the citizen to rise and respect for the elected government. These
are all political and social elements inherent in modernity.

Prof. Dawson (1963) also surveyed African tribes and established correlation between modernity of attitude and work effectiveness. He found that the more traditional the attitudes, the less likely they were to be considered effective workers and the more likely they were to quit their jobs. He developed a scale with eighteen types of attitudes. Among other things, it considered attitude towards parental authority, ethical obligations and giving of gifts.

The Inkles group of Harvard University (Smith and Inkles, 1966) conducted a survey in and around Jamshedpur in Bihar in order to find out how industrialisation brings modernization in the attitudinal domain of the workers. The survey produced enough data for developing a modernization scale. They have developed the famous cross-cultural O-M (overall modernity) scale and have found wonderful similarity in thoughts, perceptions and values in six developing countries - Argentina, Chile, India, Israel, Nigeria and Pakistan in which the attitude was studied. This scale is concerned with the following nine patterns of values and attitudes:

a) openness to new experiences, innovations and change,
b) disposition to form opinion over a large number of issues,
c) independence from parental authority,
d) involvement in civic affairs,
e) concern with time perspective (doing, planning, keeping up with the news),
f) efficacy,
g) dignity,
h) faith in science and technology,
i) distributive justice

In 1967 Prof. Inkles gave a talk at Cornell University and mentioned therein his research finding arrived at by way of industrial research in Pakistan. He reported that factory employment or industrial structuring of experiences is the significant cause of modernity of outlook.

Prof. A. K. Singh (1971) considered the transformation of attitudes to be the result of exposure to factory experience. He concluded that factory experience had a modernizing effect on the attitudes of individuals even in the absence of an urban environment. He found that workers from the factory located in rural area were more modern than farmers. Further, factory experience in organized urban environment was more modernizing than in an unorganized semi-urban environment.

Prof. D. Sinha (1969) pointed out certain motivational facets of modernity. He conducted a survey on villagers. He observed that villagers from more modern villages had clearer concept of their needs and aspirations, were more practical and could verbalize their needs. Clarity, reality orientation and verbalization of needs were considered to be characteristics of modernity. So we can safely say that the above psychologists both of the West and of the East were mainly concerned with attitudinal modernity.
However, let us see what modernity of the industrial workers means in the present study. By workers here I mean skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled workers below the supervising staff. If we are to understand the relationship between the workers and the industrial environment where they belong to, it is the degree of congruence which is specially important in my study. Thus in the ultimate analysis modernization of the industrial worker here refers to the adaptive behaviour. In the adaptive behaviour of the worker his satisfaction is there. Emotional imbalance is destroyed. The worker tries to identify himself as a human being. He reacts to other workers as if they are a part of himself. Thus participative spirit entails identification through active participation. It is not only in relation to the tools the worker uses; it is also in relation to his fellow-workers and superiors. This in turn means workers' loyalty to factory discipline. As Prof. R.K.Das (1923) has said: "A factory requires the co-operation of a large number of workers. For the economic use of machinery and mechanical power, it is necessary that the work of all labourers should be co-ordinated at a certain time and place. Under the factory system, each worker is a cog in the whole productive machine, including both men and machinery. Thus, the success of a factory depends, to a large extent, upon the co-ordination of all workers in relation to one another and to the machinery. The organization of men and machinery into a successful system of production is largely a question of discipline."
In the adaptive behaviour of the worker what becomes prominent according to me is their regular participation in the work. This means coming regularly to the plant and minding the job they are engaged in. The participation means being active in pursuit of a goal. It is becoming more and more important as an incentive for improving production and for causing job satisfaction.

Allport (1945) has explained the psychology of participation from the side of the management. He has shown that if the industrial worker is made to feel that he is a member of the group as a whole and if he is given a chance to play his role, he will have a sense of participation. But in the present study an attempt has been made to show that the spirit of participation of the worker depends on his adaptive behaviour. Satisfactory adaptation is the basis of participation.

Through cooperation in work it is possible that individual limitations can be overcome by interactions which produce new integrations. Further, if the workers are adapted to their work, they can be said to be committed to their work. Commitment to work again remains incomplete without commitment to the place of work. This means adaptation in behaviour and thought which are crucial to modernization.

The workers must have an aptitude for the kind of work they undertake and must adapt themselves to new industrial conditions. But the physical and social environment in which the workers are born and brought up does not enable them to
take to factory life. Besides, the most of the Indian industrial workers have an agricultural background. As Walter Galenson (1959) has said: "The adjustment process is not an easy one and is often cited as a major obstacle to development."

Thus modernization of the industrial workers is here taken to be behaviour-modernity as evinced in their adaptive behaviour. This view has been based on my findings arrived at by data on the industrial workers in steel plants of West Bengal and Bihar. At this point a question may crop up whether I have really deviated in my exposition from the interpretation of modernity given by the psychologists mentioned above. Hence pertinent questions may arise - Is behaviour-modernity really something different from attitudinal modernity as referred to earlier by the psychologists? Is behaviour completely independent of attitudes? Does not attitude help the formation of behaviour? Wicker (1979) concluded his comprehensive review of the attitude behaviour relation with the suggestion: "It is considerably more likely that attitudes will be unrelated or only slightly related to overt behaviours than that attitude will be closely related to actions." Thus Wicker and others (e.g., Deutscher, Ehrlich, Meguise) have shown interest in the relationship between attitude and action. Wicker however makes a difference between a behaviour and an action.

In so far as attitudes are mere predispositions to think and perform, they are different to some extent from actual responses regarding directions set. An attitude refers to the
direction of the behaviour and not to the behaviour itself. But again attitudes proper cannot exist in vacuum and they have definitely some objective orientation. This objective orientation refers to the interests and values of the subject in the social environment. These interests and values of the subject become manifested in actual behaviour. Further, attitudes undergo change and can be modified through training. Thus attitudes are merely an undifferentiated aggregate of behaviour tendencies. They have reference to behaviour. When attitude is referred to as behaviour the term behaviour is a response which is the outcome of some innate tendencies. But in the delineation of the modernity of the industrial workers as behavioural modernity, the behaviour refers to participating behaviour. This behaviour is an immediate reaction actually evoked or called up in the industrial environment. It is not the outcome of preconceived ideas and thoughts. It is not a simple stimulus response process; but it exists as a complex of causes and a complex of consequences. It implies some motive. This motive finds expression in certain activities on the part of the workers like working for an objective, striving for a goal, vigour and persistence.

In the long run, this behaviour of the workers is their social behaviour if we can say so. The adaptive behaviour of the workers is social in the sense of reciprocal interplay of personalities. As G. C. Homans (1961) has said: "In social behaviour some social exchange is definitionally sentiment
communication because it consists of exchanged activities and some activities are sentiment. Further, since industry is a social situation and since the workers come and work together, the adaptive behaviour on their part is a social behaviour. As Schneider (1967) has pointed out: "The process of production is not only material, it is also social. Our system of production demands the most intricate forms of social cooperation. The worker in a given industry is related, directly or indirectly, to almost every other person in the plant from top to bottom and from bottom to top. But in any case the worker is involved in a process of social interaction."

Now, if we are to understand the participating behaviour of the worker, we are to consider the following questions. What is the nature of reaction of the workers to the industrial technology? How far have they themselves been 'modern' so that they can adapt themselves to the growing industrial complexity? Before we answer these questions we are to see once again that my emphasis on behavioural facet of modernity becomes crucial in view of the fact that workers are placed in a modern complex industry in a developing country like ours to which multi-union situation is peculiar. Again, competition for workers' loyalties amongst the unions is also there. Besides, as James Burnham (1942) has said: "the division of labour is minute and myriad; and the turning out of the final product is possible only through the technical co-ordination of a vast number of separate tasks."
The impact of modernization of industry is such that skill and intelligence have been shifted from the man to the machine. This again has resulted in the degradation of labour. The relationship between the worker and the industrial environment of to-day is such that adjustment is a necessary condition for the survival of both. This idea of adjustment is very much present even in the thought of C. E. Black (1966). As he has said: "If a definition is necessary 'modernization' may be defined as the process by which historically evolved institutions are adapted to the rapidly changing functions that reflect the unprecedented increase in man's knowledge permitting control over his environment that accompanied the scientific revolution. This process of adaptation had its origin and initial influence in the societies of Western Europe." This process of adaptation does apply to the industrial worker as well. He is to adapt to the situation arising out of modernization of industry. He must know how to perform his role and he must experience a degree of emotional satisfaction in performing his role in order to fit himself into the industry. In the language of Sergent (1951) "A person's role is a pattern or type of social behaviour which stands situationally appropriate to him in terms of the demands and expectations of these in the group." Thus the role of the worker is an aspect of social interaction. It has a definite meaning in so far as each worker reacts to the other workers in the industrial set-up. In this connection F. H. Allport (1962) has talked of partial inclusion and potency of involvement. The industrial
worker on the assembly line has limited responsibility which can be met while much of his mental energy is directed elsewhere. The concept of partial inclusion is the segmental involvement of the people in social groupings. In the language of Katz and Kahn (1970) we may say: "Related to the concept of partial inclusion is the potency of involvement of individuals in any given structure. The correlation between inclusion and potency is positive but not perfect."

The present study is thus a psychological study of the Indian industrial workers. It is based on the data collected by way of an empirical study and the literature on the subject. The objectives of the study can now briefly be studied as follows:

1. to study the extent of the modernity of the industrial workers with reference to steel workers only and
2. to study the relationship between the modernity of the industrial workers and their personality.

The simple random sampling technique has been utilised in the present study to select the respondents. The primary data relating to the industrial workers' adaptive behaviour have been collected by the interview method. The analysis of the data thus collected has been made according to strict statistical method for compilation of tables. The statistical principles that have been utilised for the analysis of the data include the following: -
a) to study job-satisfaction of the workers (which has been taken as the indicator of the adaptive behaviour of the workers) composite mean score has been calculated, and

b) to study the relationship between job-satisfaction of the workers of the Govt. managed steel industry and that of the workers of the privately managed steel industry the correlation co-efficient has been calculated.
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