How are we to understand that the workers are modern in so far as they adapt to the industrial environment? In other words, what is the indicator of their adaptive behaviour? Instead of using direct questioning and interviewing for determining the nature and extent of adaptive behaviour, job-satisfaction is here taken to be the index of adaptive behaviour. One of the common criticisms against the method of direct questioning and interviewing is that the respondent if he likes can conceal his real motives. As Professor D. Sinha (1969) says: "Even if he (the respondent) is completely honest, questions asked may not be able to probe his deeper layers of motives and he may give surface responses."

Adaptive behaviour of the workers under study is a motivational state which among other things is characterised here by job-satisfaction.

As has already been pointed out adaptive behaviour on the part of the workers is nothing but social behaviour. This behaviour here refers to the interaction between the workers and their work-environment. Work-environment in the industry is thus the unit which affects human behaviour viz. behaviour of the workers. This process is called adaptation. The interrelationship between adaptive behaviour and job-satisfaction can easily be understood if we know the meaning of these expressions.
Seashore (1954) in his study of the company manufacturing heavy machinery talked of group cohesiveness. By means of this he wanted to show how the workers felt themselves to be a part of their group, how they stayed in the group and how much they helped each other. But my idea of the adaptive behaviour is wider than the group cohesiveness. Seashore talked of a group of workers united together among themselves for a definite purpose. But here by adaptive behaviour I mean workers' active participation in all the activities of the industrial organization in unison not only with their fellow workers but also with their superiors. The workers thus form a bigger team - a team committed to work towards the common goal of optimizing production as well as to the place of work. Thus in my opinion, the concept of adaptive behaviour is wider than the concept of group cohesiveness.

Thus workers' participation is a behaviour in which the management and the workers pull their weight together as a team.

Again, Seashore studied the effect of work-group cohesiveness on productivity. But in the present study the impact of adaptive behaviour on the motivation of the workers has been traced out.

Now if job-satisfaction means "overall liking for the job-situation as well as intrinsic job-satisfaction deriving from the content of the work process" in the language of Daniel Katz and R. L. Kahn (1966) it becomes obviously the index of adaptive behaviour. Here job-satisfaction has been used as a means for
determining the extent of adaptive behaviour.

We have already seen before that the modernity of the industrial worker is a behavioural modernity as distinguished from attitudinal modernity. This behaviour as has already been said, is a goal-directed behaviour on the part of the workers. The workers' goal is their specific job allotted to them. How are we to know that they are pursuing their goal? Simply by relying on phenomenal data. In the present study, however, the workers' aspiration on the job has been ascertained simply by asking them to give priority to certain job-factors. This sort of technique is, no doubt, indicative but not conclusive as evidence. Somewhat more valid is evidence derived from observation if the activity level of the workers is rising higher when they are moving toward the object and is diminishing when the object is unavailable. But in reality this is not possible.

In the present investigation, therefore, the technique of determining job-satisfaction by ranking of job-factors has been designed.

In the language of Professor A. L. Kollegaragh (1977) job-satisfaction may be defined as "an overall affective orientation on the part of individuals toward work-roles which they are presently occupying." According to J. C. Taylor (1977) there are methodological problems in measuring and interpreting measurement of satisfaction. For example, he holds that satisfaction can be treated as a function of one's
ability to adjust to a given work situation. As he has said:

"Workers may report satisfaction with a job to which they have
adjusted their needs or requirements irrespective of the real
quality of that job or of their working life. If these
employees see no avenues of escape and if they have made a
suitable adjustment, then they could well see their work
(whatever it is) as satisfactory."

Further, different scholars have suggested different
explanations to account for the variation in the job-satisfa-
tion of the workers. For example, Vroom (1964) holds that
there is a relationship between measures of adjustment or
neuroticism and job-satisfaction. Again some industrial socio-
logists have tried to determine job-satisfaction by analysing
the meanings the workers impute to their job. They have
attempted to establish empirically the ways in which the wants
and expectations that people attach to their job actually shape
the attitudinal and behavioural pattern of their working lives
as a whole. Again, some scholars think that variation in job-
satisfaction is due to the nature of the jobs people perform.
For example, some studies pursued by Hoppock (1935) view that
the more challenging and varied tasks are, higher is worker's
gratification than less skilled, routine jobs. Herzberg's two-
factor theory considers job-satisfaction to be a "structural
one" in the sense that the attitudes of workers are seen as a
direct one to one reflection of the structure of the work-place.
Following the line pursued by such industrial sociologists as
Gold, Russell I have presented eight job-factors to the workers
employed in a Govt.-managed Steel Industry in West Bengal (India) and those in some privately managed steel industry in Bihar (India). The practice of presenting job-factors to the industrial workers and eliciting their responses is an old one in the Western countries and it has been followed even in India.

The workers were asked to rank the said factors in order of their importance to them as job-satisfiers. The purpose was to see the needs which the workers consider to be most important that their jobs shall be able to satisfy and thereby to have an idea of their adaptive behaviour.

A sample of 373 workers in the Govt.-managed Steel Industry in West Bengal was presented eight job-factors. They are as follows:-

1. Regular participation in the work,
2. Co-operation of the boss,
3. Freedom to exercise own idea,
4. High pay,
5. Team-spirit,
6. Good working conditions,
7. Social relationship with the management and
8. A need for a good industrial leader.

Some of these concepts were not intelligible to the workers. They were made clear to them. Some of the workers even denied to be interviewed. However, after a careful persuasion, they were made relaxed and put to a test.
Some of the job-factors referred to above have been utilised by certain psychologists and sociologists in the West as well as in the East in the matter of determining workers' aspirations on the job. The working conditions in the context of which the said social scientists in the West tried to determine the workers' aspirations are more or less the same as those in the developing country like ours barring the disadvantages of developing countries. This is why I have selected certain identical job-factors. At the same time I have introduced in my study certain new job-factors (viz., team spirit and need for an industrial leader). In the European countries workers have definitely political affiliation; but there the political difference is not acute. Hence in those countries they have an integrated team spirit whereas in our country the team spirit is relatively degenerated in the sense that workers have acute political differences. Hence under the circumstances it is of prime importance to see whether the workers think it worth while to ascribe any importance to a factor like team spirit. Since the workers have loyalty to different political ideologies, they become divided in their mind; they become confused. They become victims to outward coercion. Under the circumstances need for an industrial leader is significant. Any one among the workers can be an industrial leader who can guide the fellow-workers. A leader from among the workers is quite able to understand the needs of other workers. Hence in the present study an attempt has been made to see whether the workers attach any importance to a factor like need for an
industrial leader. Moreover, the hypothesis that the workers become modern to the extent that they have adaptive behaviour is not an empty hypothesis. It is a hypothesis which needs to be verified. And in order to get it verified on the basis of empirical evidence the alternative left open to me is to fall back upon certain job-factors in the way other psychologists and sociologists did.

Among the eight factors mentioned above co-operation of the boss, team spirit and social relationship with the management highlight workers' aspirations for social relationship. The social relationship with the management specially reflects social effects beyond the shop floor. Again, regular participation in the work, high pay and good working conditions reflect workers' aspirations for job security. Since the work in an industrial plant is dependent upon the co-operation of a large number of workers, punctuality of attendance is highly required for the smooth operation of the plant. Regular attendance means coming regularly to the plant and minding the job the workers are engaged in. The remaining factors viz. freedom to exercise own ideas and a need for a good industrial leader highlight workers' aspirations for individuality. In other words, all these factors taken together reflect workers' love for work and their job-satisfaction. Thus these factors have some face validity on the criterion of relevance to adaptive behaviour.

If they love work, their motivation will get revealed in their total behaviour. An analysis of the total behaviour in
the context of what the workers aspire to is likely to yield a fairly reliable measure of the adaptive behaviour of the workers. With this end in view the above eight factors were selected.

So far adaptive behaviour has been regarded in the present study as the core of modernity of the industrial workers. Adaptive behaviour also has been discussed in some details. To reiterate it may be said that adaptive behaviour here implies adaptation in behaviour and thought. The workers work in an environment where they come not only in contact with their fellow-workers but also other superiors. Hence this adaptive behaviour is in relation to the tools they use as well as superiors. The workers are expected to adjust to the conditions of the privileges provided to them. A pertinent question arises here: what is the extent of their adaptive behaviour? Are they totally committed to their work?

Overview of literature:

Many studies in India have highlighted the fact that Indian industrial workers are not committed to industrial work and way of life. They are pushed into their career rather than following it willingly. With the advent of newly emergent characteristics of advanced industrial societies the question of major cultural adjustments arises and it is found that there may be situations where many of the industrial workers still do not want full absorption into the industrial proletariat. O. A. Oranti (1955), a famous student of industrialisation in India,
observes: "Whatever their reasons for leaving the village, Indian workers are not interested in factory work, they resist adjustment to the type of life which goes with industrial employment." Hoselitz (1960) held that the socio-economic development involves conflict between traditional and modern ways of life. This conflict has a tremendous influence upon the industrial workers. In this context W. B. Moore (1948) has observed "...the various influences that make primitive and peasant peoples cling to their occupational ways of life or feel indifferent toward new ways tend to make them look backward toward family and native village rather than actively seeking new roots in the new system."

The above contentions of Hoselitz, Moore and Kerr have however been challeged by modern researchers. They hold that workers in developing societies rapidly adapt to factory employment.

The above review of literature suggests that various attempts have been made to show the extent of workers' adaptive behaviour. In the present study let us examine the following contentions: (a) job-satisfaction is the indicator of workers' adaptive behaviour (b) the more the workers are satisfied with the job, the more adaptive they are; consequently, they are modern. They develop an attitude of acceptance of modern life. (c) further they become possessed with balanced personality.
Section B: job-satisfaction

The social scientists are highly interested in the concept; they have discussed it from different points of view. This concept is highly ambiguous. Thus it is viewed as the quality of working life and industrial humanism. Again, it is a general attitude comprising of attitudes relating to three areas, viz. specific factors, individual characteristic and group relationships outside the job. Sometimes, it has been viewed as a function of the match between the rewards offered by the work environment and the individual's pattern of needs for these rewards. Thus divergences of opinion are found among them as to the nature of and variation in job-satisfaction.

Further, this concept has been used by different social scientists for different purposes. For example, Professor D. Sinha and Professor P. Singh (1961) have studied job-satisfaction in relation to absenteeism. Professor Sinha and Mr. Singh have found a relationship between absenteeism and job-satisfaction in one of the departments of Indian Steel Company. Blauner found that job-satisfaction (which he seems to use interchangeably with aspiration) varies greatly with level of occupation. Thus job-satisfaction is the highest among skilled workers and the lowest among semi-skilled workers and those working on the assembly line. A similar difference between aspirations of the skilled and un-skilled workers is noted by Chinoy (1955).

In the present study, however, an attempt has been made to show that job-satisfaction is an index of adaptive behaviour of the
workers and it is also the indicator of some kind of motivation responsible for the growth of some type of personality.

In the case of self-conscious workers it is definitely an indicator; but in the case of other workers it may not be a factor. Job-satisfaction means feeling happy with the job. In such a state the workers feel that they have a certain goal to be reached. But the goal is not an aspirational goal. It is a durable feature on the part of the workers. It is dependent upon various interrelated factors. By means of statistical techniques the relative importance of these factors to job-satisfaction can easily be detected.

Conclusion:

In the course of my investigation I was guided by other researchers. The eight job-factors which I selected for the samples were expected to be related to job-satisfaction of the workers. With the help of statistical analysis of data I have been able to detect the factor to which workers ascribed the highest importance.

Thus it is found from the tables 1, 2 and 3 in the annexure that when 373 steel workers in the Govt.-managed steel industry were asked to arrange eight items in order of importance, regular participation in the work came first in the list, co-operation of the boss second, good working conditions third, freedom to exercise own ideas fourth, social relationship with the management fifth, need for a good industrial leader sixth, team spirit seventh and high pay eighth.
Similar attempt was launched in a privately managed steel industry in India to determine workers' gratification. In the said industry 360 workers were asked to rank the same eight factors as were given to the workers in the Govt.-managed steel industry. The findings have been shown in tables 4, 5 and 6 in the annexure.

It is found from the tables that regular participation in the work came first in the list, good working conditions second, freedom to exercise own ideas third, co-operation of the boss fourth, team spirit fifth, high pay sixth, social relationship with management seventh and need for a good industrial leader eighth.

An attempt has been made to calculate correlation co-efficient in order 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. That is reported in table 7 in the annexure.
Since the rank correlation co-efficient is highly positive, the order of preference is towards the same direction. The association of ranking of factors is more or less close. Thus more or less a striking similarity in respect of motivation and gratification was noticed between the workers in the Govt.-managed steel industry and privately managed steel industry. The findings reveal no fundamental difference in the pattern of adaptive behaviour. Among the workers from the Govt.-managed industry and privately managed steel industry. Adaptation largely centres on job-satisfaction.

Similar studies are found in the West. When in a British factory 325 women workers were asked to arrange 10 (ten) items in order of importance, steady work came first in the list, good working conditions second and high pay sixth (1937). Ranking of 10 (ten) items in order of importance by 325 factory workers:

1. Steady work
2. Comfortable working conditions
3. Good working companions
4. Good boss
5. Opportunity for advancement
6. High pay
7. Opportunity to sell your ideas
8. Opportunity to learn a job
9. Good hours
10. Easy work

The studies so far made are generally concerned with determining the perceived importance and ranks of different
incentive factors. In this connection J. A. C. Brown (1974) observes: "There is no ideal incentive. Incentives vary from one culture to another, from one firm to another and from one individual to another."

In H. C. Ganguly's (1961) *Industrial productivity and motivation* we get his researches on the relative importance of different incentive factors. He has compared the same with studies made in the West. But most of the studies never bother about the relationship between the general level of aspirations displayed by the workers in performing a task and setting of specific aspirational goals by means of ranking of factors. Here I have attempted to draw such a relation.

So far we have studied the characteristic reaction of the industrial workers towards their job, work situation and the people with whom they come in contact in the industrial organization. In short, we have studied job-satisfaction of the steel workers. Now, there are two major approaches to this problem. The first is to do with the adaptation of the workers. The second is concerned with the modification of the job itself or the job environment. These two approaches represent the two main areas of industrial psychology. The first approach may be regarded as the industrial relations area which emphasizes the adjustment of the workers to their job and job environment and interpersonal relationships. This line of thinking has been followed in my study. All this implies an emphasis upon human beings. It calls for an emphasis
upon the people who work rather than upon the product they make. This emphasis upon the human element particularly the adaptive behaviour is the keynote of my present study.

Section 'C' - Adaptive behaviour on an itemized rating scale

In addition to job-satisfaction another tool for measuring the extent of adaptive behaviour of the workers in the present study is the method of itemized rating scale. Rating scales are of different types; they differ among themselves in the fineness and the procedure involved in assigning persons or objects to positions. But there is one common feature to all types of rating scales. The rather places the person or object being rated at some point along a continuum or in one of an ordered series of categories. For example, we may mention graphic rating scales, itemized rating scales, comparative rating scales and self-rating scales.

In the present study self-rating scale has been adopted. In most of the investigations for want of raters who are familiar with the rates and also where information in some non-observable behaviour is required, self-rating technique is used. In the case of self-rating technique the individual himself gives ratings on the attribute measured. This technique has definitely some advantages as well as disadvantages like self-reporting technique. In spite of its limitations this technique has been adopted in the present study to measure the extent of workers' adaptive behaviour which is non-observable. The workers are in a better position to report their beliefs,
feelings and so on. A 4-category scale was constructed by me to measure a sample of 265 industrial workers in the said Govt.-managed steel industry for the adaptive behaviour. They were asked to rate themselves on the above scale. Rating was as follows:

4-category phrase for adaptive behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Too easily dissociated</th>
<th>Usually well-identified</th>
<th>Exceptionally well-identified</th>
<th>Unresponsive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Of 265 workers in the said Govt.-managed steel industry 156 workers placed themselves on the descriptive phrase viz., "usually well identified", 84 workers placed themselves on "exceptionally well identified", 19 workers placed themselves on "unresponsive" and 6 workers placed themselves on "too easily dissociated.

The same technique was applied to a sample of 187 industrial workers in the said privately managed steel industry for their adaptive behaviour. Rating was as follows: 148 workers placed themselves on "exceptionally well-identified", 34 workers placed themselves on "usually well-identified", 5 workers placed themselves on "unresponsive" and 5 workers placed themselves on "too easily dissociated. The data produced by the above technique in both the cases were the verbatim records of verbal responses made by the two samples.

Thus it is found that workers in both public and private sectors of steel industry displayed wonderful adaptability.
Thus in the sequel of analysis we find that the motivation of the workers or the amount of effort they put forth to obtain their goal is here determined by a particular factor. The factor is the amount of incentive value or satisfaction they attach to the achievement of a particular goal. The more this factor is present, the higher is their motivation. Further, it might be suggested that since the workers under study were highly gratified, they were highly adaptive in their behaviour. Possessed of highly adaptive behaviour they had balanced personality.

The emphasis on adaptation as the core of personality is important in the present study because the workers shuttle back and forth between the family and work organization. In other words, my purpose is to show how the industrial worker becomes adaptive by releasing tension of work in his familial relations and community and his family tensions at work. This means a wonderful flexibility which lies at the root of adaptive behaviour of the workers. Here by flexibility I mean a trait of behaviour of the workers. It is nothing but a mode of accepting things very easily and thereby making oneself adapted to the environing situation. Thus in the light of my findings it is quite clear that the personality of the workers is neither the cause nor the effect of anything else; rather it is an immediate reaction of the workers. It is an actional behaviour. It is actually evoked or called up in the industrial set-up. It is thus an integrated set of responses of the workers to their job and work situation. In this connection J.A.C. Brown
(1974) has observed: "Since the individual's personality is an integrated set of responses to life as he has experienced it - is in short a form of adaptation, however, inadequate - he feels a need to maintain it, and therefore the more deep-rooted aspects of behaviour are not easily changed."

To sum up, the modernity of the steel workers under study lies in one particular mode of behaviour; the behaviour in this particular case is the total structure of what they do. In other words, their behaviour refers to their reaction to their job, job situation and the person with whom they come in contact. It is a way of accepting the industrial way of life. It is, in short, an adaptive behaviour. This behaviour, again, is a social behaviour because the workers display it in the industry which is a social situation. So to think of modernity of the workers in terms of their adaptive behaviour in a social situation like industry, we are ultimately led to the question of personality because it is the dynamo of the social situation. To quote Curtis (1960) personality refers to "the total organization of the individual's tendencies to behave in social situation."
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