Now this term 'Personality' is used in various senses. For example, to the Philosopher it refers to the person possessed of a rational nature. In this sense Personality means everything belonging to the individual. Again, the term as used in general Psychology, is a limited concept. Personality is the means by which the organism becomes related to other aspects of the world. But which view of Personality are we to accept here and why?

Adaptive behaviour or social behaviour on the part of the workers is our focal concept in the present study. It means as we have already seen before, interrelationship between the workers and their work-environment. In the light of my finding which hints at such interrelationship the term Personality is to be understood. And this is the view of the social Psychologists in general and in this study I have attempted to view it from the social Psychologist's standpoint. As Professor Akolkar (1960) has said: "present-day social Psychologists are displaying increasing interest in the problem of personality also because of the fact that the individual's personality is not a ready-made thing or a finished product at the time of birth. It is a development and in a sense an achievement."

Professor Akolkar does not accept the notion that personality when it is taken in its etymological sense refers to the way a person appears and affects. This sense would be too external
a view of the nature of personality. So Professor Akolkar
opines that we must take an internal view of Personality. In
this connection he (1960) further observes: "Personality is
a complex organization of the individual's way of thinking of
adjustment to life situations and his emotional reactions."
The same tone is observed in Chris Argyris (1960). According
to him Personality is conceptualized among other things, as
seeking internal balance (usually called adjustment) and
external balance (usually called adaption). My view of perso-
nality in the present study is closely akin to that of Professor
Akolkar and Argyris. R. K. Merton (1945) also suggests the
samething when he says, that personality signifies a relation
between certain stimuli and the characteristic responses to
them. It is a stable response pattern.

While we describe the personality of an individual we use
certain adjectives each referring to his or her stable aspects.
A trait of a personality is such a stable aspect. In the words
of Akolkar it means a group of characteristic reaction. Various
Psychologists have listed different heads under which they
bring various personality traits. For example, under the head
of self-expression we may mention a large number of traits,
e.g., introversion, extraversion or reclusion and so on. But
in the present study I have mentioned one particular trait of
personality viz., adaptability.

But again, it is true that all the workers under study
are not equally adaptive. Some of them are more adaptive than
others. So we may arrange them along the line that extends from extreme adaptiveness to extreme unadaptiveness. A scale such as this along which workers may be arranged we call a dimension of personality in the language of Guilford (1971).

Now if we go back to our earlier discussion we will find that workers' aspirations on the job have been evinced neatly in their ranking of job-factors. This also indicates various traits of their personality. Thus it may be said workers have tactful or practical intelligence as revealed in the workers' act of giving preference to 'regular participation in the work' and 'good working conditions'.

Further, we may talk of sociableness as revealed in the workers' act of giving preference to such factors as co-operation of the boss, social relationship with the management. Now, a question may arise - why have these different traits been grouped together under one common head viz. adaptive behaviour? Traits like practical intelligence and sociableness are the delicate fabrics into which adaptability is woven. So instead of talking of different ramifications of adaptability I have chosen to talk of adaptability as such. Practical intelligence and sociableness are the most important elements that combine together to make adaptability.

When we talk of the personality of an individual, we have certain things in our mind. The industrial worker, however, has been conceived here in the context of a particular environment to which he is put in. Unlike the ordinary indi-
individual the worker has stresses and strains, projects his own ideas and aspirations into the work, expects something from the management. In short, his own mental make-up is fashioned not only by himself but also by his work-environment. So the personality of the industrial worker is the complex product of both. The upshot of the entire discussion in my study becomes now clear. The workers under study have developed an adequate personality through adaptive behaviour in industry. By adequate personality I mean a type of personality which is most suited to the industrial development. The workers have displayed such a personality as finds expression in their higher job-satisfaction, their endeavour to unite together and last but not the least their adaptation to the industrial environment. In other words, they are modern to the extent they are adaptive. If this is so, why do we still find industrial unrest? In this context we are carried back to B. Kuppuswamy (1961) who succinctly says: "It is impossible to assert that there will be industrial peace as a permanent condition in any or all of the industrial units. Nevertheless it is true to state that under certain conditions a state of tension and conflict will exist between the workers and the management, whereas under certain other conditions this state of tension will be reduced considerably." It is often found that the workers go on protests, strikes, etc. The strike is not due to one particular problem. In every industry there are two parties — workers on the one side and the management on the other side. When the workers go on strikes, it is to be presumed that the mutual
purposes and goals among the workers as well as the management are not properly understood. In this connection we should further remember that both the parties start negotiations late. As a result, they have recourse to lockout or strike.

Further in the public sector undertakings in India people belonging to the management thrive in a particular mode of thinking that they are the 'bosses' and not the leaders. As a result, there has developed a big gap between the management and the workers. If we look at the government to-day we will find that it is big business in the real sense of the term. But surprisingly enough, "leadership" is conspicuous by its absence there. Thus it is found that the question of industrial unrest does not run counter to personality which is formed and obtained by the workers through adaptive behaviour. The industrial unrest is the cumulative effect of the shortcomings of both the parties - the workers and the management. Some writers in the West, for example, Blauner (1970) have held the view that the industrial technology employed in the industrial organization under capitalism makes the work dehumanised. As a result, the workers' personality remains stunted and impoverished. This results in higher degree of worker absenteeism, turnover, strikes and poor mental health of the worker. H. C. Ganguly (1968) in the East in his survey of mental health in industry has found the incidence of psychotic and neurotic disorders in India to be similar to those from the more advanced and industrialised countries in the West.
Further, the industrial unrest is due to other reason as well. The capitalistic economy puts the individual entirely on his own feet. The success or the failure of the individual is completely the affair of the individual. The individual becomes completely served from his fellow men. This isolation is the crux wherein lies the problem of industrial unrest.

Again, it is true that industrial peace is extremely essential to rapid economic development and also to the unity and cohesion of the country in the new political context. Of late, a new scheme viz. workers' participation in management has been introduced in both public and private sector industries to tide over industrial unrest.

Further, what is required in our country which calls for a quick economic development is the willingness on the part of the workers to be completely immersed in the interests of the industrial organizations where they belong to. They are to forget their own interests for the greater good of society. According to one writer (1978) the establishment of workers' councils on German or Yugoslavian patterns will make the participative movement effective. According to him participation has been greatly thwarted by unhealthy trade union movement. This author believes that Workers' Council paves the way of internal leadership which will be interested in Workers' Cause. But the relation between trade unionism and politics is a peculiar one in our country and even in the emergence of a leadership the influence of politics upon trade unions will not dwindle down.
In view of the industrial unrest, workers' strikes, protests and so on, questions may naturally crop up at this stage: Is the concept of personality as delineated in the present study an ideal one? Have the modern workers attained some aspects of the ideal? If not what should be the proper strategy for motivating industrial workers? The present study, as we have already seen, clearly demonstrates that the workers under study have developed a sense of belonging to the industrial organization and its goals. But it is true at the same time that mere balanced personality though adaptation is no remedy to the industrial unrest. The role of a leader in an organization is no less important. As Professor Jai B. P. Sinha (1970) has said: "There are many aspects of the organization through which new expectancies can be introduced. But the most important of them, no doubt is the leader. He heads the communication network, remits rewards and punishments, and thus sets and maintains the climate which either can facilitate or hinder growth-oriented activities." The same tone is observed in Professor Raj Nandy (1982). He says: "It might sound a little but it is true that in India we fill most managerial positions with "bosses" not "leaders". In fact we seem to suffer from the fallacy that once a man has been promoted as head of a unit, leadership qualities would come about magically. The concept of "leadership" as conterminous with "leadership" has been over-emphasized for too long ......

If nothing else, at least those who already do a reasonable day's work under "bosses" will work better once they have "leader" to lead them."
The worker must be treated with consideration and respect; he must be made to feel that his contributions are valued; he must be encouraged both to offer suggestions and to seek advice in case of need; and his supervisors must be leaders rather than 'bosses'. In other words, what seems to be essential is that the worker be dealt with as an entire person rather than as a pair of hands.

Conclusion - Prerequisites of adaptive behaviour

The term modernization is an elusive one. Still scholars persist in using the term because it is a part of popular speech. It is used in various senses. But only one particular aspect of modernization viz. industrial modernization has been studied here. The disquieting consequence of industrial modernization is manifested in human alienation and dehumanization. In the context of this the problem of workers' adaptation to the industrial environment becomes very much prominent. Hence in the present study an attempt has been made to determine the measure of adaptive behaviour of the workers. The findings of the investigations reported earlier reveal no fundamental difference in the pattern of adaptive behaviour among the workers engaged in govt.-managed steel industry and privately managed steel industry. Adaptive behaviour largely centres on how the workers feel satisfied with their job.

On the results of the present investigations it is difficult to decide whether job-satisfaction is the sole measure of adaptive behaviour. It is felt that human adaptation is a
highly complex phenomenon. It is the result of a very complicated interaction of a number of variables, economic, social and psychological. To ignore one and emphasize the other would be taking a rather one-sided view of the human nature and development. One of the most important necessities for easier adaptive behaviour on the part of the industrial workers in the modern steel industry in our country is to bring a sense of confidence and security among the workers by establishing an atmosphere free from the rivalry of warring trade unions. And that too depends upon the policy of the management and the industrial policy of the government.
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