2.1 JOB SATISFACTION

Considerable amount of research has been carried out on job satisfaction. Job satisfaction indicates the *inner contentment* or happiness of a person regarding his job. If an individual is contented with the nature of job or the type of work he is engaged in, he derives both satisfaction and pleasure whereas, if the work is not to the liking of an individual, he/she performs the given job half heartedly and never achieves the state of contentment.

Locke (1976) has defined it aptly as a *pleasurable or positive emotional state* resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experience.

In broader terms, job satisfaction is a generalised attitude emerging from many specific attitudes in three areas and they are: *specific job factors, individual characteristics, and group relationships*. It can be understood as the *sum total* of feelings that an individual has about his job. This sum total of feelings cover the nature of job, the pay/emoluments, the promotion prospects, supervision, social relations at the job, organisational climate, work culture, future security etc.

According to Sinha (1972), job satisfaction provides the inner fulfillment derived from being engaged in a piece of work. It is essentially related to human needs and their fulfillment through work. Job satisfaction is generated by an individual's perception of
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how well his job, on the whole, satisfies his various needs.

As early as 1935, Hoppock defined job satisfaction as any combination of physiological, psychological and environmental circumstances that causes a person to truthfully say, I am satisfied with my job.

Job satisfaction is essentially related with the perceived differences between what the worker expects from his service and what he actually experiences.

In the literature of industrial psychology, 1930s is considered with the rise of human relations movement in the industrial set up and job satisfaction was the main topic of research in the developed countries. They expected a satisfied worker to be a productive worker. The causal relationship between job satisfaction and performance has never been firmly established. Researchers associate job satisfaction with turnover, absenteeism, physical and mental health, quality of life and work experience. Studies reveal that satisfaction is negatively related to turnover. The correlation found is stronger than what was found for absenteeism (Brayfield and Crockett, 1955; Mobley, Griffeth, Hand and Meglino, 1979). Whereas the concept of turnover and related variables as in the Indian situation is different and it is only recently i.e., with the entry of multinational companies that these variables have been taken into account.

It is assumed that a satisfied staff stands by the organisation at the time of crisis. Employees who are satisfied with their jobs are less inclined to support hostile unions. Researchers have been increasingly studying the importance of job satisfaction of managers and white collared staff (Schultz, 1964; Porter, 1965; Lahiri and Srivastava, 1967; Ravikumar and Harigopal, 1978; Kumar, Singh and Verma, 1981). The white collared managerial staff plays a
significant role in an organisation, so the various aspects of their job satisfaction cannot be ignored. They are the intermediaries between the top management and the subordinate staff. Decisions are made by the management but they get implemented through the managers. Hence, it is of utmost importance that a manager should be satisfied with the job and the organisation as a whole. Dissatisfaction among employees can be expressed in a number of ways. The employees instead of quitting the job, can start complaining about the present job, be indisciplined, steal organisational property, or be irresponsible about their work.

Thus, once employees are satisfied with their jobs, it improves the organisation's social climate and also provides financial benefit.

2.1.1 Theories of Job Satisfaction

Some of the well known theories of motivation, are also relevant to the concept of job satisfaction and they are very closely related to the behavioural process.

McCormick and Ilgen (1984) have evolved the following theories of job satisfaction and they are –

a) Maslow’s Need Hierarchy Theory (Maslow, 1943, 1954),
b) Herzberg’s Motivator–Hygiene Theory (Herzberg, Mausner and Synderman, 1959),
c) Vroom’s Instrumentality Theory (Vroom, 1964),
d) Equity Theory (Adams, 1965),

(a) Maslow’s Need Hierarchy Theory

Maslow (1943) proposed a theory of Human Motivation which is based on the needs of human beings. The theory is derived
from facts: clinical, observations and experimental. The basic
postulates in Maslow's theory can be grouped into five categories
and they are:–

i) The physiological needs – such as hunger, sex, thirst.

ii) The safety needs – security, stability, dependency,
protection, freedom from fear, anxiety and chaos, need for
structure order, law etc.

iii) The belongingness and love needs or social needs.

iv) The esteem needs – self respect, self esteem, esteem of
others.

v) Need for actualisation – the desire for self-fulfillment and the
tendency to become actualised.

The person's needs are arranged hierarchically. Maslow
suggests that person tries to attain higher needs only when his
basic, lower needs are satisfied i.e., the physiological needs.
According to his model, being lowest in order, these are the most
potent needs. Maslow used the deprivation concept to establish
dominance within the hierarchy of needs. The process of
deprivation-dominance-gratification-activation continues until the
physiological, safety, affiliation and esteem needs have all been
satisfied and the self-actualisation needs have been activated.

Maslow (1954) discussed two additional needs in his earlier
works: Cognitive and Aesthetic. Cognitive needs are the needs to
know and understand e.g., cognitive needs include the need to
satisfy one's curiosity and the desire to learn. Aesthetic needs refer
to the desire to move toward beauty and away from ugliness. These
two needs were not included in Maslow's hierarchical arrangement.

These are lower order needs than self–actualization, which
fall at the lower end of self–actualization needs.
Maslow’s original concern centered around the development of a model which generally elaborates the relation between motivation and personality. Maslow (1965) focused his attention specifically on the motivational problems of the employees in an industrial set up. Applying this theory to the job situation, one can assume that jobs which gratify most of the needs, mentioned by Maslow, would definitely result into greater satisfaction. The implications of this theory, on the managerial part of managerial staff, is to create a right climate in which the employees could contribute their utmost. The right climate could include increasing the opportunities for greater autonomy, variety, responsibility and the employees should be motivated to work towards attaining the maximum required satisfaction.

Although Maslow’s theory has been widely accepted but it has also faced certain criticisms for lack of explicitness and over emphasis on the principle of hierarchy. The major drawbacks lie in the interpretation and operationalisation of the theory and problems of measurement.

b) Herzberg’s Two Factor Theory or Motivator – Hygiene Theory
Herzberg, Mausner and Synderman first published their theory in 1959. Herzberg et al. (1959) proposed that motivators affect job attitudes in a positive direction, and, “...their absence will much less frequently lead to job dissatisfaction” (pp. 81-82). On the other hand, hygenies, “...represent the major job dissatisfiers with little potency to affect job attitudes in a positive direction” (pp. 81-82). Herzberg et al. (1959), identified sixteen job factor categories, through content analysis and grouped it into two general categories, motivators and hygiene [on the basis of logical relationships among the categories]. Herzberg’s major hypothesis is that satisfaction–dissatisfaction (S – DS) is a function of the classes of Motivators (M)
and Hygienes (H). In simple words, it states that people have two different categories that are independent of each other and affect their behaviour in different ways. He found that individuals who were dissatisfied with their job were those who were concerned with the environment they were working in. Whereas, individuals who felt satisfied with their jobs, it had to do with the work itself. Herzberg postulated the first category of needs as Hygiene Factors because they explained people's environment serve as a main factor in preventing dissatisfaction. He named the second category of needs as Motivators as they play an effective role in motivating people to perform in a better way.

The satisfier factors (achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility and advancement) are designated as motivators because they are believed to motivate the employees, to perform with better results. The dissatisfier factors (company policy and administration, working conditions, interpersonal relations, suppression and salary) are amongst the many that are included in the work environment.

The theory suggests that job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are two independent constructs having separate set of determinants. Job context factors such as company policies and administration, supervision, working conditions, interpersonal relation, money, status and security may be considered as hygiene factors. They are not intrinsic part of job, but they form the conditions under which the job may be performed. They can produce dissatisfaction. It is assumed that job content factors like achievement, professional growth and recognition that an individual can experience in his job are capable of producing satisfaction.

A multiple of research studies on Herzberg's theory have been conducted. Research evidence for the theory is of a controversial nature. Many studies support Herzberg's model (Lahiri
and Shrivastva, 1967) while others emphatically question the research methodology underlying the theory (House and Wigdor, 1967; Vroom, 1964; Hinton, 1968).

c) Vroom’s Valence Theory

Vroom (1964) proposed his theory, based on Kurt Lewin’s concept of Valence. According to Vroom, job satisfaction is a function of strength of need. He has equated his theory with valence. He suggests that job satisfaction is a reflection of how desirable a person finds his job. Thus, it is a measure of person’s valence for his work situation.

Valence can be classified as the strength of an individual’s preference for a particular outcome. In order for the valence to be positive, the person must prefer attaining the outcome. Porter and Lawler (1968) refined and extended Vroom’s model. Though it was a motivation model but it also dealt with the relationship between satisfaction and performance. The important aspect of Porter–Lawler model is what happens after the performance. The rewards that follow and how these are perceived will determine satisfaction. Porter–Lawler model indicates that performance leads to satisfaction.

d) Equity Theory

Adams (1963, 1965) postulated that satisfaction is determined by a person’s perceived input-output balance. He further explains that the existence of perceived inequity results into striving to restore equity. This can further lead to satisfaction. According to this theory, either under-reward or over-reward can lead to dissatisfaction. In other words, the theory argues that a major input into job performance and satisfaction is the degree of equity (or inequity) that people perceive in their work situation. Inequity occurs
when a person perceives that the ratio of his or her outcomes to inputs and the ratio of a relevant other’s outcomes to inputs are unequal. Input variables may include age, education, social status, organisational position, qualifications of an employee. It also includes how hard the person works. These are the perceived input variables. Adam’s equity theory has been fairly supported by number of researchers.

All the above mentioned theories are an attempt to explain the process of job satisfaction. Implications of job satisfaction are crucial and weigh on the mind of the employees. The organisations continue to evaluate the implications and evolve remedial measures. This is a continuous exercise taken to create a healthy working relationship between the two. Happy, contented and satisfied employees are the most valuable possession an organisation can ever have.

2.1.2 Measurement of Job Satisfaction

Measurement of job satisfaction has a long history. The most systematic attempt to measure job satisfaction had been made by Hoppock (1935) as he developed an Index of Job Satisfaction. Thereafter Brayfield and Rothe (1951) also developed an Index of Job Satisfaction. It included eighteen items. They applied the Likert scoring system. It consisted of five categories ranging from agreement to disagreement.

Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969) made an attempt to measure job satisfaction with its different facets. They examined the concept for its meaning and measurement technique more extensively.

Hackman and Oldham (1975), designed Job Diagnostic Survey, (JDS). It has its origins in previous methodologies
developed by Turner and Lawrence (1965) and by Hackman and Lawler (1971). The *Job Diagnostic Survey*, (JDS) provides measures of the five core dimensions and they are: *skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, feedback from the job itself, feedback from agents and dealing with others*.

The *Job Diagnostic Survey*, (JDS) provides measures of a number of personal, affective reactions for performing the job. They can be further categorized into *general* and *specific* satisfaction.

**General Satisfaction** - An overall measure of the degree to which the employee is satisfied and happy with the job i.e., Internal work motivation – the degree to which an employee is self-motivated to perform effectively on the job.

**Specific Satisfactions** - A number of short scales provide separate measures of satisfaction with: (a) job security; (b) pay and other compensation; (c) peers and co-workers; (d) supervisor; (e) opportunity for personal growth and development on the job.

Sekran (1980) used *Job Diagnostic Survey* (JDS) on 1135 white collared workers employed in twelve banks, in three metropolitan cities in India. She conducted this study to determine, if the JDS is culture-bound or whether it can be employed as a valid instrument to tap the theorised core job dimensions in the Indian organisational set up. The results of the study indicated that the employees perceived their job along a single dimension of job complexity. She suggested that further research be carried out to identify whether this was a general phenomenon occurring in all the Indian organisations.

As far as the measurement of satisfaction is concerned, the studies suggest that both the overall job satisfaction measures and job facet satisfaction measures are the best way to measure it. It is likely that certain measures, because of the aspect of satisfaction
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they tap, are better related to certain dependent and independent variables than to others. Vroom (1964) maintains that satisfaction with different facets has been shown to have differential correlations with various dependent variables, just as the different ways of measuring satisfaction do.

Another, dominant trend has been to measure satisfaction by a single item. For example, how satisfied are you with your job?, or by several of its derivatives or how satisfied are you with your job, pay, service conditions, working conditions etc.? Sackett and Larsen (1990) state, if the construct being measured is sufficiently narrow or is unambiguous to the respondent, a single-item measure may be sufficient. Scarpello and Campbell (1983) concluded that a single-item measure of overall job satisfaction was preferable to a scale that is based on a sum of specific job facet satisfactions. Wanous, Reichers and Hudy (1997) carried out a meta-analysis (Hunter and Schmidt, 1990) in which single-item measures of overall job satisfaction were correlated with scales measuring overall job satisfaction. The minimum estimated reliability for the single-item measure, close to .70, was reasonable enough. Thus, these are still good reasons to prefer single-item measures as they save respondent and researcher’s time, it is easier to understand, it does not include the extra questions and are just related to the situation. These scales are more focused and are more acceptable.

Though, lot of researchers have criticised it for its reliability and validity. Sinha and Singh (1995) found it too simple to appreciate the complexities of the indices of satisfaction. Future research should be directed toward examining its validity in light of the specific cultures prevailing in the organisations.

From the above mentioned literature, it has been brought
out that job satisfaction is the process of attaining desired things in desired amounts. It can be linked to the principle of Homeostatis, which implies any imbalance in an organism can lead to restlessness and dissatisfaction. In other words, it can be interpreted that job satisfaction is a reflection of the person's satisfaction with his/her work situation. Organisational researchers typically take interest in job satisfaction as it is an important dependent variable. It can be argued that today advanced societies are not just concerned about the quantitative aspect of life but also with its quality (Robinson, 2001). There is little doubt that job satisfaction is a reflection of overall well being of an employee. There is also the possibility that the job satisfaction of the employees contribute to the long term rather than immediate functioning of employees and the organisation.

2.2 JOB PERFORMANCE

During the first world war, it was for the first time, the United States army adopted the *man-to-man* rating system for evaluating their military personnel. In 1920s and 1930s, the relational wage structures for hourly paid workers, wherein wage increments were based on merit, were adopted in the industrial units. These plans were known as *Merit Rating Programs*, and they continued up to mid fifties. Between 1950 and 1980, researchers felt the need of improving the instruments used in making performance ratings. Landy and Farr (1980, 1983) tried to establish the links between research on information processing and cognition and the practical problems often faced by performance appraisal researchers. Feldman (1981) helped, with his review, to introduce a number of concepts from social cognition into research on performance appraisal. In the present day context, performance appraisal has undergone tremendous changes. The concept of “merit rating” is now largely restricted to rating of hourly paid employees. This is
being developed as a criteria for salary adjustments, promotions and transfers. The ideology of performance appraisal lays emphases on the development of individuals in an organisation. Performance appraisal has a vital impact on ongoing changes in the structure and functioning of the organisations.

2.2.1 Definitions of Job Performance

The first and the foremost broad area of performance evaluation research focuses on defining the job performance. Campbell, McCloy, Oppler and Sager (1993) found the job performance as multidimensional in nature. They proposed declarative knowledge, procedural knowledge, skill and motivation as the individual determinants of performance.

Waldman and Spangler (1989) also developed an integrated model of job performance. Their model lays focus on characteristics of the individual (experience, ability) outcomes (feedback, job, security), and the immediate work environment. While, Borman and Brush (1993) developed specification of the taxonomic structure of the job performance. Further psychometric methods were used in developing eighteen factor solution and some of these are—planning, organising, training, coaching, developing subordinates and technical proficiency.

Viswesvarn (1996) suggests that there is a presence of general factor underlying in most of the common performance measures along with two important sub-factors namely task-specific and conscientiousness oriented. On similar lines, Arvey (1986) had earlier drawn the attention that there was possibility of general factor ('P' factor?), which was resulted after factor-analysing job analytic information for a number of petrochemical jobs.

These are few important terms of job performance where researchers have tried to explain it psychometrically, theoretically as
well as with reference to their applicability. When we view performance and its role in a corporate and its employees', area of work seems more amplified. The performance of an organisation grows when all resources are utilised efficiently to achieve corporate goals and objectives derived from external environment. Performance, when considered from a holistic point, seems broader and here it merges almost with productivity. They become interchangeable. Jobs and systems should be redesigned to achieve excellence in organisational performance. This theme is echoed somewhat more clearly by Ilgen and Hollenbeck (1991) who argue that nature of work is changing, thus different definitions of job and job performance are coming up. Managerial job performance is of utmost importance as it is them who motivate the workers to perform better.

Organisations are becoming flatter; more decentralized and are moving from individual based to team based style of productivity.

2.2.2 Types of Job performance

Borman and Motowidlo (1993) in their study have supported the distinction between task performance and contextual performance. Task performance involves behaviour patterns that are directly involved in producing goods or services, or activities that provide indirect support for an organisation's main technical processes. When employees use technical skills and knowledge to accomplish a task, they are engaged in task performance. Contextual performance involves behaviour patterns that support the psychological and social context in which task activities are performed. When employees are coming forth to work with a positive intention, they are engaging in contextual performance. Motowidlo and VanScotter (1994) found cooperativeness,
dependability, internal control and work orientation to be correlated more strongly with contextual performance than with the task performance. Contextual performance seems likely to influence other kinds of decision, such as decisions about recognition of employees and rewards.

Motowidlo and VanScotter (1994) tested the aspect of differentiation between task and contextual performance by using supervisory ratings of over 400 Air Force mechanics. Results revealed, that both task performance and contextual factors contributed independently to the overall performance. It emerged that personality variables were highly correlated with contextual performance. Organ (1988); Smith, Organ and Near (1983) have opined that the concept of contextua performance has been amply borrowed from the concepts of organisational citizenship behaviour and prosocial organisational behaviour (Brief and Motowidlo, 1986).

Borman and Motowidlo (1993) have described five aspects of contextual performance and they are: (a) volunteering for extra activities; (b) persisting with enthusiasm when needed to complete important job requirements; (c) helping and cooperating with others; (d) following the rules and prescribed procedures even when personally inconvenient; (d) openly endorsing, defending and supporting organisational objectives.

Empirically, it has been suggested that performance is dual in nature, task oriented and contextually oriented facets. Several studies suggest that there are differences in the variables that predict task versus contextual performance (Day and Silverman, 1989; McCloy, Campbell and Cudeck, 1994; Rothstein, Paunonen, Rush and King, 1994).

2.2.3 Measurement of Job Performance

A major area of performance evaluation is focused on the
various methods and techniques used to measure the job performance. Performance appraisal is a process, by which an observer, a supervisor or a peer, subordinate or sometimes employee himself/herself rate their job performance. In most of the organisations these are conducted annually or semiannually, for variety of purposes—administrative decisions (raise, promotion), feedback and development, and personnel research/decisions. Professional and trade journals associated with the field of personnel, provide ample evidence concerning the uses of performance appraisals in the organisations. Levine (1986) found that the most common use for performance appraisal was for determining the training needs, the review of merit and review of the emoluments. Rendero (1980) surveyed twenty-four human resource managers and found that the most frequently mentioned uses of appraisals warranted the review of merit, pay and allowances, growth pattern of employees and feedback to the employees regarding their performance. Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler and Weick (1970) after surveying thirty three organisations suggest that the performance appraisals are basically used for the purpose of placement and promotional decisions, evaluation of training requirement, and as a motivational tool.

The important aspect of appraisal process is based in the sets of ratings. Unfortunately, practical utility becomes limited by their proneness to biases, which stems from number of personal, contextual and psychometric factors (e.g., Borman, 1977; Cooper, 1981; Landy and Farr, 1980).

Researchers in the past who have dealt with performance evaluations have tried to eliminate the short comings resulting into biases. They have attempted to improve accuracy by focusing on two major methods i.e., making the rating instrument less prone to bias, and training raters to avoid bias in their appraisals. Raters
play an important role in measuring the performance of a rate. It is imperative that they are made aware of this aspect so that they do not carry any specific biases while evaluating others or themselves.

2.2.4 Types of Performance Ratings

a) Supervisor ratings

Supervisor ratings or superior appraisal is the most commonly used source (Cascio, 1991; Cleveland, Murphy and Williams, 1989). It is assumed that a supervisor has a better realisation of the situation and knows best how the manager's job behaviour contributes to the overall goals of an organisation. From the very beginning, supervisors' judgements comprise the bulk of the ratings generated in industry for appraisal (Campbell et al., 1970). Supervisors rate an employee's job performance on multiple performance criteria (Murphy and Cleveland, 1991). This source of getting performance evaluation is also problematic. It includes susceptibility to rater biases (Landy and Farr, 1980) and political factors (Longnecker, Gioia and Sims, 1987). Researchers, still find the rating by a supervisor as safe, convenient and reliable.

b) Peer rating

The second most important source of rating performance is Peer Rating. Research on peer judgements started in the late forties (Hollander, 1954; Weitz, 1958) and still continues to be popular (Amir, Kovarsky and Sharan, 1970; Gordon and Medland, 1965; Mayfield, 1970, 1972; Borman, White and Dorsey, 1995; Saavedra and Kwun, 1993).

Campbell et al. (1970) found peer rating to be bearing excellent reliabilities and when used as predictors, good validities have been obtained by numerous researchers. Peer rating has also
few drawbacks. In many instances of peer evaluations, a rater may use his or her own performance as a developing internal standards to guide anchoring and adjustment heuristics.

DeNisi and Williams (1988) observed that when a rater is not asked to provide self-evaluation, he/she may use one of the group members as a standard measure. An individual in the group, who is most similar to the rater in terms of performance contributions, may be chosen as one comparison standard (Festinger, 1954). This is considered a drawback of peer rating. Despite these drawbacks, peer rating has many positive points, which has made it the second most popular method of performance rating. Peer rating scales are easy to design, administer, and score, and they are applicable for the purpose of all assessment purposes (Kane and Lawler, 1978). Peer ratings provide a psychometric advantage. When they are amalgamated, they increase reliability and tend to remove the idiosyncratic biases of any particular rater (Kenny and Bermen, 1980; Murphy, 1982). Peer ratings provide information about important dimensions of a group's effectiveness, such as efforts to encourage adequate interpersonal relations or efforts to promote effective work coordination among the members of a group. Landy and Farr (1983); Murphy and Cleveland (1991) suggest that the average rating over a set of peers may provide a true picture of the performance for particular members of a group.

Generally, peer ratings are not well accepted by rater and ratees except when they are used for development purposes (McEvoy and Buller, 1987).

c) Self rating

Measuring an individual performance is like throwing a few pebbles into the water and watching how the ripples interact. One
of the suitable methods of evaluating the performance is Self-Assessment or self rating. The reason to support this method is that the individuals often are in best position to validly evaluate their own abilities and behaviour as they can predict their own conduct (Levine, 1986). Several reviews of empirical literature (Mabe and West, 1982; Mount, 1984; Thornton, 1980) have also offered arguments favourable to self-evaluations. Thornton (1980) found that self-appraisals are less affected by halo effects. Lawler (1967) views self ratings as a relevant method of performance evaluation. According to him an individual’s self-perceptions are important determinants of his future behaviour, and he probably has more information about his own behaviour than anyone else.

Subramony (1979); Sinha, Singh and Shukla (1986) found the high relationship between the self-appraisal and appraisal of performance by a superior. Mathew (1991) carried out a study pertaining to eighty eight middle level managers from sixteen industrial organisations in Southern India. Managerial effectiveness was measured by self and superior rating scales (Mathew, 1989). The results suggested that a high correlation existed between self and superior rating of effectiveness. Mathew (1991) supported that as far as middle level managers are concerned, self rating was a reliable method of performance-evaluations. Self-evaluation for performance evaluation results in a better understanding and helps in cultivating positive atmosphere among managers (Mathew, 1991).

Tusi and Ohlott (1988) observed that superiors tend to exhibit a greater range of restrictions than self, peer or subordinate ratings. Mount’s (1984) report also suggests that superior rating is susceptible to intentional or unintentional bias in the process of rating. Evidence exists wherein halo error (Landy and Farr, 1980) and range restriction is highest in the ratings by a superior. The bias can be eliminated by applying self-evaluation in organisational set
up. Here, the evaluator feels the responsibility of rating one's own effectiveness.

Literature provides evidence that self-evaluation may provide benefits such as increased acceptance of the appraisal system (Latham and Wexley, 1981; Riggio and Cole, 1992), and improved superior-subordinate relationships (Carroll and Schneier, 1982; Fletcher, 1986).

The frequently cited limitations of self-rating is the tendency of self raters to inflate their ratings to project an impressive picture for increasing their chances for promotional avenues (Ashford, 1989). Several studies demonstrate that, there is more tendency to inflate the self rating (Meyer, 1980; Thornton, 1980) and is often unreliable (Steel and Ovalle, 1984). Inflated self rating may be an attempt to project/maintain a positive self-image. Consequently, positive behaviours are disproportionately represented in self-evaluations. Murphy and Cleveland (1991) have suggested that self rating bias may be negatively correlated with performance levels and poor performers may be least credible.

Organisations have historically been reluctant to use peer and self-evaluations for personnel decisions. The reluctance seems to stem from the concern that these sources are prone to certain types of biases, such as friendship for peer ratings (DeNisi and Mitchell, 1978; Kane and Lawler, 1978) and leniency for self-ratings (Thornton, 1980).

Yu and Murphy (1993) examined self-ratings across several samples in China. Chinese workers showed leniency effects in their self-ratings, vis-a-vis to their earlier results wherein they would produce modesty bias or self-rate themselves lower than their peers or supervisors. A meta-analysis of forty three studies of self-
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appraisals of abilities (Mabe and West, 1982) reported that high expectation of validation was associated with high accuracy of self-appraisals. However, as accuracy measure is not necessarily related to leniency measure (cf. Heneman, Wexley and Moore, 1984), the effect of expectation of validation on self-appraisal leniency is hazy and not very clear.

Schrader and Steiner (1996) found that the self raters prefer the multiple and absolute standards of comparison. This aspect suggests that the self raters were willing to have subjective and objective behavioural goals included in their performance appraisals. Research in the past (Heneman, 1986; Mabe and West, 1982) has suggested that self-rater often shy away from providing descriptive portrait of their performance.

Research on social comparison also indicates that individuals engage in defensive comparisons whereby they avoid potentially threatening information regarding the excellent performance of other’s to maintain their self esteem (Friend and Gilbert, 1973; Wilson and Benner, 1971). Fisher (1989) after reviewing the literature on self rating has suggested that individuals when evaluating themselves make use of their internal thoughts and feelings. They consider those internal cognitions to be an important source of information. Self ratings have not shown a well-documented history like other sources of performance measurement. However, they have been used as an important tool in reflecting the data more effective, primarily acting as an adjunct to make the appraisal interviews more effective (Whisler and Harper, 1962).

Several studies (Harris and Schaubroeck, 1988) have downplayed the importance and validity of self ratings in the performance appraisal. With the continued research programs,
revisions and improvements, self-ratings may yet be able to play a pivotal role in performance ratings. It can help organisations to create a bond between the managers and the management.

d) Rating by subordinates

Performance rating undertaken by subordinates, is another type of rating which does not have sufficient research to its credit. Subordinate ratings seem to be the relevant source of measuring job performance as subordinates are able to determine the supervisor’s impact on the job. The subordinate is also in a position to observe more of his superior’s behaviour than either peer or superiors.

The 360-degree is another performance measure which has increased the interest of researchers. Such measures incorporate evaluations from different sources (supervisors, peer, subordinates, self and the customers) and are used for feedback/or personal decisions. London and Smith (1995) developed a model and propagate proposals regarding the impact of such a multi-source system on perceptions of goal accomplishment, re-evaluation of self-image, and changes in the outcome related to performance. However, researchers are beginning to examine the fairness of the appraisal process. The emphasis is to identify the standards of evaluation process and measures to eliminate/eradicate external pressure, corruption or personal biases that may be having an impact on the appraisal.

2.2.5 Rating Accuracy and Rating Error

Rater halo is a concept, wherein the tendency of a rater to allow overall impressions of an individual to influence the judgements of that person’s performance along several quasi independent dimensions of job performance. Rater halo is the
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— persistent problem in the performance evaluation literature

The concept was used extensively in 1960's. Murphy, Jako and Anhalt (1993) reviewed the concept and observed that there was evidence where halo error is not prevalent, the inflated correlations among rating dimensions are not the norm, and whenever halo factors are observed, their occurrence might be influenced by the number of contextual factors.

Lance, LaPointe, Stewart (1994), after testing the concept of halo, state that the type of halo that occurs varies as a function of rating context and found that halo is best considered as a unitary phenomenon and should be defined as the influence of rater's general impression on ratings of specific rater qualities.

To eliminate the halo error, researchers have suggested the development of multi-dimensional measures of job performance (Guion, 1965). To eliminate the rater-bias in the performance appraisals, literature on performance rating suggests that one should gather rating from several judges. At times it may have to be collected from all the major three or four sources i.e., supervisor, peer, self, subordinates or field evaluators (Kavanaugh, Mackinney and Wolens, 1971; Lawler, 1967; Klimoski and London, 1974)

Reliability of job performance ratings is also another important concern in organisational science. Viswesvaran, Ones and Schmidt (1996) have revealed the results of a meta-analysis of the inter-rater and intra-rater reliabilities of job performance ratings. Their findings indicated that supervisory ratings appear to have higher inter-rater reliabilities than those of the ratings by the peer (m = .52, for supervisory rating, m = .42 for peers). The intra-rater estimates of reliability tend to be higher than inter-rater estimates. Their findings suggest, that the contextual performance factors such
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as communication, competence and interpersonal competence might be less reliably rated dimensions of performance as compared to more task-specific factors as productivity or quality.

A thorough study of performance literature indicates that the research on performance evaluation is an active part of organisational literature. The perception that job performance is more than just the execution of specific tasks and it covers the wide arena of organisational activities has important implications in understanding the measurement of job performance. Along with supervisory ratings, there is a trend for other subjective appraisals, which emphasises that subjectivity does not by itself translate into rater error or bias. Moreover, the ratings are providing more valid and true picture of an employees’ performance. The subjective appraisal represent low-cost rating systems for evaluating employees. The concepts like constant error, central tendency, halo and others on which ample research has been carried out, are now considered to be (Arvey and Murphy, 1998) relatively trivial.

The latest trends in performance appraisal (e.g.,360°C systems and self rating) indicate that as Meyer (1991) has suggested that traditional top down approach is no longer consistent with organisations that are moving toward involvement oriented climates. It can be attained by allowing the employees to perform self-appraisals and allowing them to participate in the development of the appraisal system (Cawley, Keeping and Levy, 1998). In other words, employee participation can be positively related to various desirable variables such as job performance, job satisfaction and organisational commitment.

2.3 ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

Organisational commitment has been extensively attracting
the attention of the organisational behaviour researchers. The concern with organisational commitment is understandable as it has utility as a predictor of important behavioural outcomes like performance (Mowday, Porter, and Dubin, 1974), absenteeism (Steers, 1977), turnover (Porter et al., 1974) and job satisfaction (Bateman and Strasser, 1984). Employees who are committed to the organisation are less likely to leave their jobs than those who are uncommitted. Individuals who are committed to an organisation tend to perform better and also tend to remain in the organisation, thus decreasing the turnover. Sheldon (1971) defined commitment as "an attitude or orientation toward the organisation which links or attaches the identity of the person to the organisation" (p.143).

Commitment has been defined and measured in different ways and it has opened new vistas for research. It continues to draw criticism for lack of precision and for some degree of redundancy (Morrow, 1983). Stevens, Beyer, and Trice (1978) have suggested that organisational commitment can be conceptualised in two ways i.e., the exchange approach and the psychological approach.

2.3.1 Exchange Approach

The exchange approach views commitment as an outcome of inducement/contribution transactions between the organisation and the member. The emphasis being explicit on the maintenance of membership, which is the main determinant of the member's accrual of advantage or disadvantage as a process of exchange.

This approach lays emphasis on the fact that an employee is more committed to an organisation, if according to his perspective the organisation is providing adequate facilities/benefits.

Becker (1960) proposed the idea of side bets, wherein individuals staked some unrelated aspect of their lives on continued
organisational membership. For instance, people may continue working in an organisation for the fear that they will be perceived as job hoppers. Becker (1960) states, “commitments come into being when a person, by making a side-bet links extraneous interests with a consistent line of activity” (p. 32). He further adds that by making a side–bet, “…the committed person has acted in such a way as to involve other interests of his, originally extraneous to the action he is engaged in, directly in that action” (Becker, 1960, p. 35).

The side-bets are investments, which assure an employee pension plans, provident funds, medical security, and other benefits. This type of commitment is known as side-bet theory or the exchange approach or the structural approach or the calculative organisational commitment.

This approach and a variation of it has been used by Alutto, Hrebiniax and Alonso (1973), Farrell and Rusbult (1981), Grusky (1966), Hrebiniax and Alutto (1972), Rusbult and Farrell (1983), and Sheldon (1971). Hrebiniax and Alutto (1972) provided empirical support to the structural approach. They defined organisational commitment as, “a structural phenomenon which occurs as a result of individual-organisational transactions and alterations in side-bets or investments over time” (p. 556). Measures developed under this approach have indexed commitment exclusively as the likelihood that respondents would leave the organisation if the same perks or emoluments were available in another similar job. All the same it has limitations. Such measures may provide information regarding the member’s intentions to leave the organisation, but it is difficult to predict the factual position.

A second limitation of such measures is that they are found lacking in providing evidence of the particular, ongoing related behavioural pattern within an organisation. Researchers have most
frequently used a scale developed by Hrebiniak and Alutto (1972) to measure this form of organisational commitment.

2.3.2 The Psychological Approach

This approach views commitment in terms of a strong identification with, and involvement in an organisation, brought about by various factors. This approach, also known as identification approach, considers commitment in term of attitudinal concept. The identification approach views commitment to be an attitudinal construct, mediating between certain antecedents and outcomes in an organisation. The attitudinal process was considered primarily to be affective, rather than as cognitive – calculative.

The concept of attitudinal commitment was brought forward, when Ritzer and Trice (1969) did not find any empirical evidence regarding the conceptual measures of exchange theory. They stated that commitment was "...basically a social psychological phenomenon" (p.178).

Buchanan's (1974) definition is typical where he defined commitment as:

...a partisan, affective attachment to the goals and values of an organisation, to one’s role in relation to goals and values, and to the organisation for its own sake, apart from its purely instrumental worth (p.533).

This process of accepting organisational goals and values and integrating them into a system of personal goals and values is conceptualised by few researchers as the process of being adjusted with an organisation.
2.3.3 The Integrated Approach

Tokunaga and Staw (1986) presented an integrated approach to study organisational commitment, which is a blend of exchange approach and psychological approach. In the integrated model they refer to “…the obligation of a future course of action which results in a strengthening of the link between an employee and the organisation” (p.22).

Here, an individual, because of his/her previous behaviour responds to pressures from both internal and external sources. Actions which provoke an individual’s tendency to maintain investments in the organisation are considered to reflect higher commitment. Thus, this model illustrates altruistic behaviour as a potential moderator of commitment.

Integrated model is an exception which explains commitment to be falling between the side-bet and the psychological approach (O’ Reilly and Caldwell, 1981; Tokunaga and Staw, 1986). Otherwise, most of the approaches explained commitment, either from the point of view of organisational behaviour approach or a social psychological approach. Such lines of demarcation are quite evident in Porter et al. (1974) concept of organisational commitment. Recently, Mowday et al. (1982) suggested that the development of commitment can be studied as a subtle interplay between attitudes and behaviours.

2.3.4 Unidimensional and Multidimensional Approach to Commitment

Porter et al. (1974) maintained that organisational commitment is the process of identification and the dedication of one’s own energies to the organisation’s goals and values. They have developed one of the most popular measure of organisational commitment, the Organisational Commitment Questionnaire, which
reflects an individual’s willingness to work towards and accept organisation’s goals.

Attitudinal organisation commitment is defined by Mowday et al. (1982) as the relative strength of an individual’s identification and involvement in a particular organisation. Conceptually, it can be characterised by at least three factors:

a) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organisation’s goals and values,

b) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organisation,

c) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organisation.

Organisational commitment, when define in this manner means that:

...represents something beyond mere passive loyalty to an organization. It involves an active relationship with the organisation such that individuals are willing to give something of themselves in order to contribute to the organisation’s well being (Mowday et al., 1982, p. 27).

Mowday et al. (1982) has proposed that getting a greater understanding of the process related to organisational commitment has implications for employees, organisations and society as a whole. This concept visualised the three stages in the development of organisational commitment; (a) anticipation or influence of job choice on commitment, (b) initiation or the development of commitment during the first few months of employment (c) entrenchment or the continuing development of commitment through mid and later career stages.

Mowday et al. (1982) distinguished between commitment as
an attitude and commitment as a behaviour. Attitudinal commitment deals with the individuals identification with organisational goals and his/her willingness to work towards them. Attitudinal commitment is similar to organisational commitment and is measured by Organisational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ), While behavioural commitment is represented by attributional approaches to commitment, and it is an outcome of the binding of individuals to behavioural acts. Mowday et al. (1982) maintain that there is a cyclical relationship between the two types of commitment.

Mathieu and Zajac (1990) suggest that the two concepts i.e., attitudinal and calculative – may become more closely linked over a time as the measurement of each contains the elements of the other. An individual may be drawn initially to an organisation because of exchange relationships yet develop attitudes consistent with maintaining membership.

With an increasing attention given to commitment, there have been many important developments in both theory and research. It has become increasingly apparent that commitment is a complex and multifaceted construct.

Earlier a commensurate effort had not been made to develop a systematic multidimensional conceptualisation of commitment that can be applied across domains. This has become important as attention is being focused on the impact of dual or multiple commitments (e.g., Becker, 1992; Reichers, 1986; Darden, Hampton, and Howell, 1989; Steffy and Jones, 1988). Meyer and Allen (1991) have conceptualised a three-component model of commitment. The three components being: affective component, continuance component and normative component.

The affective component of organisational commitment
implies the employees emotional attachment, identification with, and involvement in the organisation. The continuance component refers to commitment based on the cost that the employee associates with leaving the organisation. The normative component denotes an employee’s feelings of obligation to remain with the organisation.

Employees who have strong affective commitment remain with the organisation because they are attached to the organisation. They are the strongly committed individuals who identify with, are involved in, and enjoy membership in the organisation.

Dunham, Grube and Castaneda (1994) examined the psychometric characteristics of Allen and Meyer’s (1990) scales and compared them with those of the organisational commitment questionnaire (Mowday et al., 1979). They conducted confirmatory factor analyses which concluded that organisational commitment questionnaire converges with affective commitment (the correlations between the organisational commitment questionnaire and affective commitment ranged from .77 to .87) and diverges from normative commitment. This suggests that organisational commitment questionnaire and the Allen and Meyer’s affective commitment provides basically the same information.

This also shows that organisational commitment questionnaire which measures attitudinal commitment only is also expected to measure the other two forms of commitment.

Employees with strong continuance commitment remain with an organisation because they need to. They are aware of the costs associated with leaving an organisation. Becker’s (1960) side–bet theory has stimulated much research into behavioural commitment. Becker’s view is psychological because he has put more emphasis on the awareness of costs.
Employees who hold strong normative commitment stay with an organisation because they feel they ought to do so. The normative component refers to commitment based on a moral belief or obligation that “it is the right and moral thing” to remain with an organisation (Weiner, 1982) or through the receipt of benefits like skills training, that create in employee a sense of obligation to reciprocate (Scholl, 1981).

Thus it can be summarized that two views of commitment have dominated the literature. The first sees commitment as affective or attitudinal and the second view of organisational commitment known as side-bet theory evolved from the work of Becker (1960), which regarded commitment as behavioural rather than attitudinal. With the increased attention given to commitment there have been many important developments in both theory and research. Earlier, researchers view commitment as a unidimensional construct. Recently, it has become increasingly apparent that commitment is a complex and multifaceted construct. It is now acknowledged that commitment can take different forms.

2.4 WORK VALUES

2.4.1 Values

For decades, the study of values has been central to work place relations and organisational literature. The emerging interest in organisational culture has revitalised the concept of values. Literally, values mean the ideals, customs, institution etc. of a society towards which people of the group have an affective regard. Values can be defined as" a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence which is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence" (Rokeach, 1973, p.5).
This shows that values comprise of judgemental elements in which they carry an idea as to what is right, good, or desirable. The content attribute reflects that a mode of conduct or end-state of existence is important. The intensity attribute specifies how important it is. Rokeach's values system suggests that values are hierarchical in nature. This hierarchy is identified by the relative importance assigned to such values as freedom, pleasure, self-respect, honesty, obedience and equality.

Rokeach (1973) has stated that:

I consider values to be a type of belief, centrally located within one's total belief system, about how one ought or ought not to behave, or about some end-state of existence worth or not worth attaining. Values are thus abstract ideals, positive or negative, not tied to any specific attitude object or situation, representing a person's beliefs about ideal modes of conduct and ideal terminal goals... (p. 124).

Feather (1992, 1995) treats values not only as generalized beliefs about what is or is not desirable, but also as motives. Needs and values, can influence an individual's cognitive appraisal of situation in relation to both means and ends.

The relationship between values, attitudes, and behaviour can be understood by considering two key issues; viz., observability and applicability. Behavior is the most readily observable, with attitudes and values being successively inferential (Connor and Becker, 1994; Feather, 1995). Values underlie and affect attitudes, which in turn underlie and affect behavior. Attitudes are the resultant of application of values to concrete objects or situations. Whereas applicability is concerned, values are conceived as global, transcending all situations, whereas attitudes applied to specific objects, persons, institutions, and situations.
Values are formed in the cradle. In brief, when value start developing in the childhood, the child is defenseless and exposed to parental and other social influences. Every society indoctrinates the acceptable norms and behaviors to its new entrants. Usually this is done through parent-child and teacher-pupil interaction.

The role of values in an individual's place of work probes that why they behave in the way they do in their jobs (Posner and Munson, 1979; Sikula, 1971). Becker and Connor, (1986) stated that values are the key determinants of attitudes, which in turn affect work-related (and all other) behavior. Values are considered as needs in the work on job satisfaction (Rokeach, 1969). Values also play a role in the decision-making practices of managers (Connor and Becker, 1994, 1995; Posner and Munson, 1979; Ravlin and Meglino, 1987).

Studies pertaining to values have been carried out at the global level. Investigators and researchers have examined the value structure of managers, and workers from different countries as a means of understanding the differential meanings of work (England and Lee, 1974; Hofstede, 1980; Schwartz and Blinky, 1987, 1990).

2.4.2 Work Values

An important issue of major contention in the value literature has to do with a distinction between values and work values. Most definitions and conceptions of work values, are broadly consistent with most general definitions of values, but their main focus is on work, work behavior and work-related outcomes (Wollack, Goodale, Wijting and Smith, 1971). Work values can be defined as sets of values that govern work behavior, in all of its forms.

Work values share a close relationship with the ideology of Protestant work ethic. According to it, work is to be valued as it is
the best utilisation of man’s time, not merely because it provides external rewards, but also because one can attain satisfaction while doing it.

Nord, Brief, Atieh and Doherty (1988) state “we define work values as the end states people desire and feel they ought to be able to realize through working” (p.2).

A typical definition on work values has been provided by Pine and Innis (1987), who conceive work values as “an individual’s needs, priorities and consequent personal dispositions and orientations to work roles that have the perceived capacity to satisfy those needs and priorities” (p.280).

Thus, work values are shared feelings about work and work experiences. It refers to what is worthwhile, precious, attractive or suitable in a job. It can be called as the general attitude toward work.

The prevalence of multiple-value-system (work values, family values, personal values) suggest that the value system a person constructs in any given situation is very much dependent on the context in which he/she is asked to do so.

While considering the work values of an individual, one comes to know about the values of his social strata. When we consider the work values of an Indian manager, it is gaining information about the values of middle strata in India.

Soares, Valecha and Venktaraman (1981) examined the values of Indian managers from various parts of India. Managers subscribed the highest priority to work ethics, which included a good, honest approach to work, being prompt and true to oneself, upright, dedicated and sincere, loyal and truthful in the sphere of
work activity. They allot second priority to maintaining social relations.

Singh (1979) also found that managers gave low priority to goals, such as, security and money.

2.4.3 Changeability of Values

The management literature suggests that organisation is hierachical, in which a personal value system is conceptualised as consisting of rank ordering of individual values. Rokeach and Ball-Rokeach (1989) in this context maintain that:

>A hierarchical conception directs our attention to the idea that although the number of values that individuals and societies possess is relatively limited, values are capable of being weighed and arranged against one another to lead to a very large number of permutations and combinations of value hierarchies (p. 775).

Thus, it suggests that strict adherence to this view may have limited the understanding of values (Stackman, Pinder and Connor, 2000). Ravlin and Meglino’s (1989) work on the transitivity of values, led them to conclude that value hierarchies do seem to exist; however, these hierarchies are flexible when the values in question are of equal or nearly equal importance. Chusmir and Parker (1991) proposed that individuals might have two different hierarchies of values, one for personal/family life and another for work life. In his research, Schwartz (1992, 1994) had applied a rating and not a ranking method when studying values. He argued that rating did not force respondents "to discriminate among equally important values or to compare directly values they may experience as incommensurable because one expresses personal, and other social, goals" (Schwartz, 1994, p.26).
Borrowing from Hunt (1991, pp.220–224), Stackman et al. (2000) liken the value system to a peeled onion. This concept shows that values depicted near the center are hypothesized to be more important than those closer to the periphery. This suggests that instead of a rank ordering of one value relative to others, value systems may be conceptualized as an ordering of value sets in relation to other value sets. This shows that it is probable that there is a set of core values for any individual that is more important—more deeply held—than another set of values. People have strong feeling about their central values (Feather, 1995). It can be opined that those values composing the central value system are less changeable in relation to values residing at layers further from the core. If values do change in importance, then values would move from layer to layer, either outward or inward. The value itself would not change, but its importance in relation to other values would.

Armon (1993) conducted a longitudinal study related to structural development approach to values—one that envisions how people’s values are multi-dimensional, containing both moral and non-moral qualities. Armon’s focus was on the question, “What is good work?” She followed her respondents and assessed their views four times over a period of 12-years. She found that many of the participants matured through a five-stage developmental sequence in which what they valued in work became less visceral, less instrumental, and more heavily directed toward the pursuit of such values as ethical conduct, assistance to other individuals, and having a positive net impact on the world at large. Furthermore, she also found that participants who advanced toward less selfish, more worldly values were more highly educated than those who did not.

Hence, Armon’s research constitutes a rare longitudinal investigation of the natural development of the values. It is also remarkable that there is inadequate literature on the meaning and
process of change in a given value for a particular person.

England, Dhingra and Agarwal (1974) had undertaken the study with regard to the value system of Indian managers and identified sixty-six concepts as relevant. To mention a few, Indian managers were found to value: stable organisations with minimal or steady change, organisational efficiency, productivity, job satisfaction, stability, success, prestige, dignity and security.

England et al. (1974) have also tried to observe the values of managers from different types of organisations. They have revealed that: (a) managers from patrimonial organisations take more risks and place high importance to compliance, employee welfare and morale; (b) managers in the private sector are more moralistic; and bureaucratic managers give greater importance to organisational involvement in human resources development.

Literature suggests that value orientation of managers underlie managerial behavior. The way a manager plans, organises and controls the behavior of individuals, groups, and organisations, reflects his own value system.

Singh (1979) also examined the occupational goal values of Indian managers. The results indicated that high value is placed on freedom (freedom from supervision and subordination), autonomy, challenges, adventurous experiences, use of special ability/talent, creativity and originality. Desire for economic gains, stability and security, and exercise of power, however, occupied comparatively low priority. Indian managers give more preference to intrinsic occupational goals than extrinsic goals. It becomes very important in the organisational set up, to know what kind of work values the manager holds. The types of values a manager implements has a direct bearing on organisational climate (Gies and Leonard, 1971;

Jayawardane (1995) in his study suggests that individuals who attach importance to work values such as, prestige, participation, relationship with superiors independence, variety, achievement and a less value on economic returns would get highly involved when the organisation provide a meaningful job.

Trade unions, also keep a constant watch regarding the approach adopted by the chief executive/managing director to gauge the problems, his own values and how much sacrifical attitude he has for the organisation. They also track whether his work values are revolving around money and power or he is using his status for personal achievements and comfort. The chief executive and the other senior manager will not be able to get the unions or the employees to accept any declared value system, if they and their middle managers can not demonstrate the positive work values (Menon, 1989).

By and large India’s industrial set up is growing with the transparent liberalisation policies of the Government. The work values have also redefined their image, and they have become more important than ever before because industries all over the world are adopting a more humanized approach in management which is basic to Indian ethos. Indian management must try to implement the ancient values which are embedded in almost every Indian, and strengthen these through training and development programs. Honesty, fairness, equity, and impartiality are the age old values which have been encoded in the Ramayana and the Mahabhartha, and thus can be made to play a meaningful role.
Malhotra (1985) has discussed the aspect in his study on the decaying value culture of Indian organisations. He states that most Indian organisations have shown a remarkable insensitivity to the attitudes and values of their people. On one hand they have tried to impose upon them organisational models borrowed from the western social context, and on the other, they have made no attempt to equip their people with the attitudes and values required in these modern organisations. The lack of congruence between the Indian ethos and the requirement of modern organisation, and the absence of the conscious attempts to bridge this gap has already caused considerable havoc. It has not merely prevented the people from using the positive elements in their psycho-cultural heritage, but on the contrary led them to a situation of value-erosion, alienation and loss of commitment.

There is no denying that value-erosion in our organisations is a serious issue. It can be dealt with by reshaping the philosophies in our work values.

2.4.4 Value Congruence

Individuals with congruent values should have greater agreement about what behaviors are important in the place of work (Schein, 1985). Value congruence also enhances interpersonal relations at the place of work because individuals with congruent values perceive and interpret similarly the environment stimuli. Such shared perceptions can remove important sources of disagreement between the employees and further facilitate their interpersonal interaction. It can be brought out that value congruence of managers and the organisation have affected a number of individual level outcomes, such as personal success, intention to remain with an organisation.
2.4.5 Measurement of Values

Values as motivational elements are generally conceptualised in two ways and reflected by different measurement methods. The first approach defines values being hierarchical in nature (Locke, 1976, Rokeach, 1973) and their measurement requires a within-subject ipsative design. This approach implies that individuals have a preference for ordering or ranking of values to which they refer in making behavioral choice. Allport, Vernon, and Lindzey (1960) and Rokeach (1973) have used this ipsative approach in which values are measured at the expense of others. Such ipsative measures are subject to substantial analytic limitations that reduce their flexibility in making between-subject comparisons (Hicks, 1970).

The second approach does not conceptualize the hierarchical nature of values. This view allows for variance in the importance of individual values, and also in the importance of full array of values held, or total importance of values to a person. England’s (1975) Personal Value Questionnaire (PVQ) measures the values by taking this concept into account.

Rokeach (1973) has developed a theoretical perspective on the nature of values in a cognitive framework, and an instrument for measuring values. The utility of the instrument is widely accepted by psychologists, political scientists, economists, and other interested in understanding what values are, what people value, and what is the ultimate function or purpose of values. The Rokeach value survey (1973) comprises of eighteen terminal and eighteen instrumental values. The values are arranged alphabetically. Terminal values are concerned with the end states of existence and instrumental values are concerned with modes of conduct. Schwartz (1997); Sagiv and Schwartz (1995) have extended Rokeach’s list by
expanding the number of value types, sharpening some of the definitions of value types, and specifying the content of the values within categories.

All the same Rokeach has contributed in the value literature a lot. The current management literature gets influenced by his view that the organisation is hierarchical, in which personal value system is conceptualized. To elaborate, it brings to fore that it is consisting of a rank ordering of individual values. A few scales have been constructed for the purpose of measuring work values (Super, 1957) and occupational values (Kilpatrick, Cummings and Jennenza, 1964; Rosenberg, 1957). Recently, Ravlin and Meglino (1987) have also developed the Comparative Emphasis Scale to measure work values.

The Survey of Work Values by Wollack, Goodale, Wijting, (1971) is another popular measurement instrument of work values. Survey of Work Values is directed toward separate areas of values and is limited to the construct of secularised protestant ethic with which work values share a very close relation. Weber (1930) described the principal aspects of Protestant ethic as individualism, asceticism, and industriousness. Protestant ethic, is also known to deal with the intrinsic aspect of the work. Employees with high protestant ethic are presumed to prefer working than sitting idle. Wollack et al. (1971) selected three dimensions of protestant ethic that cover the intrinsic aspects of work: pride in work, job involvement, activity preference, attitude toward earning, social status of job, upward striving, and responsibility to work. Six work values which are measured by the Survey of Work Values are discriminably different from one another and the items only represent the construct that they are intended to measure.

Rosenberg (1957) developed the Rosenberg Occupational
Value Scale. The scale presents ten statements relating to different possible characteristics of job such as, "permit me to be creative and original", "give me a chance to exercise leadership", "provide me with a chance to earn a good deal of money". The respondent is required to rate the importance (high, medium, or low) of each characteristic for his own "ideal" job.

Ravlin and Meglino (1987) have developed the Comparative Emphasis Scale, which measures four work values, viz., achievement, helping and concern for others, fairness, and honesty. These particular values were selected on the basis of prior analysis of the critical incident responses to an open-ended survey administered to employees in the United States (Cornelius, Ullman, Meglino, Czajka and McNeely, 1985). The Comparative Emphasis Scale (CES) produces a purely ipsative rank ordering of the four values for each subject. Traditional, parametric, statistics were not appropriate for making value comparisons (Hicks, 1970).

The Comparative Emphasis Scale provides specific descriptions of socially desirable behavior, yet exhibits no significant social desirability bias. The measure uses a forced-choice format to eliminate the tendency for respondents to inflate responses to socially desirable Likert-type items. Ravlin and Meglino's (1989) work on the transitivity of values indicates that value hierarchies do seem to exist. However, these hierarchies are flexible when the values in question are of equal or nearly equal importance.

Meglino, Ravlin and Adkins (1989) are among many theorists who believe that values (or shared values) are the sine qua non of cultures and in the organisational culture. As per them organisational culture can be defined in terms of values and the concepts of strong culture in terms of value congruence among organisational members (Meglino, Ravlin and Adkins, 1989, 1991)
An organisation is said to have strong culture to the extent that there is a high degree of consistency among its members. This is in terms of their shared belief structure, values and norms.

2.5 ORGANISATIONAL CLIMATE

Organisational climate is the most important factor in understanding experiences of group associates in an organisation. How these experiences are perceived at an individual level and how these experiences have an influence at an individual level and at what level they influence their behaviour and success of an organization, comes under the domain of organizational climate.

Theoretically, the concept of organisational climate can be traced back to Tolman’s (1926) description of cognitive maps of the environment, wherein he brings out as to how individual’s schematise to know their surroundings. Lewin (1951) in his field theory, conceptulises the relationship between the individuals and their psychological environment. Lewin expressed his basic formulation in terms of the famous equation, $B = f (P, E)$.

In this equation, $B$= behaviour, $E$= the environment, and $P$ = the person. The climate literature has its roots in the field theory of Lewin (1951). He suggested that climate of any group could be defined as the shared perceptions of the individuals belonging to that group. Though, the computation of such an equation had unending complexities, still Lewin’s framework has had a strong influence on the study of organisational climate.

In 1968, Taguiri and Litwin presented collection of essays that discussed various approaches, ranging from climate as an objective set of organisational conditions, to climate as the subjective interpretation of individual and organisational characteristics. During that period, a number of reviews have
reported diverse and intensive efforts put into conceptualizing and practically utilizing the organisational climate construct (Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler and Weick, 1970; Glick, 1985; Hellriegel and Slocum, 1974; James and Jones, 1974; Payne and Pugh, 1976; Powell and Butterfield, 1978; Schneider, 1975; Schneider and Reichers, 1983). Litwin and Stringer (1968), have focused on the implications of organisational climate on individual motivation, thus supporting the general idea that climate consists of both organisational conditions and individual reactions. They have attempted to define organisational environments in terms of nine climate dimensions, viz., structure, responsibility, reward, risk, warmth, support, standards, conflict, and identity.

There is an extensive literature that attempts to bring out the integration of climate with the other developing fields, like job satisfaction and organisational structure. Johannesson (1973) perceived organisational climate and equated it with job satisfaction. Organisational theorists (Guion, 1973; Payne, Fineman and Wall, 1976; Schneider and Snyder, 1975) also attempted to distinguish climate from individual satisfaction. Guion (1973) has gone to the extent of considering this concept to be fuzzy at best and synonymous with job satisfaction at the worst.

The integration of organisational climate with organisational structure is also criticised (Drexler, 1977; James, 1982; Lawler, Hall and Oldham, 1974; Payne and Pugh, 1976) by many organisational theorists. During the same period, organisational climate (Hellriegel and Slocum, 1974; James and Jones, 1974; Payne and Pugh, 1976) studies were also undertaken under three distinct approaches as under:

(a) The perceptual measurement of individual attributes; (b) the perceptual measurement of organisational attributes; (c) the
multiple measurement of organisational attributes.

These perspectives were distinguished by characterising the first as psychological climate and the second and the third perspective as organisational climate.

James and Jones (1974) made distinction between psychological climate and organisational climate, thereby, proposing two different units of theory, viz., individual and organizational.

Although the distinction between psychological climate and organizational climate is generally accepted (James, 1982; Powell and Butterfield, 1978; Schneider and Reichers, 1983), yet conceptual and methodological problems are not fully resolved.

The present prevailing status of organisational climate has been conceptualized under a) the structural approach, and b) the perceptual approach.

2.5.1 The Structural Approach to Organisational Climate

The structural approach includes all the characteristics of an organisation or of the group that constitutes the set up. Objective aspects of the work context such as size, technology used, rules and policies, the number of levels in the organisational hierarchy, comprised the climate of an organisation (Payne and Pugh, 1976). Here, organisational climate becomes almost synonymous with organisation structure. Since these characteristics can be collectively termed as organisational structure, therefore this approach is termed as a structural approach. This approach gets reflected in the definition given by Forehand and Gilmer (1964) which state:

... organisation climate is the set of characteristic that describe an organisation and that (a) distinguish one
organisation from another, (b) are relatively enduring over a period of time, and (c) influence the behaviour of people in the organization” (p. 362).

This approach has been used by number of researches (Katz and Kahn, 1966; Porter and Lawler, 1965; Pugh, Hickson, Hinnings and Turner, 1968). It has still been pointed out for having two main short-comings, viz., empirical and conceptual.

Empirically, the relationships between structural variables and climates have failed to show consistency (Berger and Cummings, 1979). Conceptually, structural approach has not been able to explain the differences arising in climates across work groups within the same organisations. The reason may be that the work groups within an organisation are subjected to the same structural influences, therefore differences in work group climate cannot be explained on the basis of structural properties of an organisation.

2.5.2 The Perceptual Approach to Organisational Climate

The perceptual approach to an organisational climate has been discussed by number of researchers. In this approach, climate is seen as a psychological process determined by the situations, in which the variables of organisational climate are considered to be either causative or moderator factors for performance and attitudes. This approach has been used by (Campbell et al., 1970; Litwin and Stringer, 1968) and criticized (Glick and Roberts, 1984; James, 1982) by a number of researchers.

Campbell et al. (1970) has discussed four dimensions of organisational climate and they are:

i) Structure of an Organisation: degree to which supervisors establish communication related to job’s objectives,
ii) Consideration, Warmth, Support: degree to which managerial support is extended to the subordinates,

iii) Autonomy: degree to which an employee can have decision making power on his own,

iv) Reward: degree to which there is a prevalence of achievement promotion oriented climate.

Jame and Jones (1974) proposed, an organisational attribute-perceptual measurement approach. They have included variables such as leadership and autonomy, and examined variables, like size, and span of control.

Schneider (1972, 1975); Schneider and Bartlett, (1968, 1970); Schneider and Hall (1972) have proposed another viewpoint regarding the perceptual approach to organisational climate. Here an individual is viewed as an information processor who forms a perception about his organisational climate. This concept is based on certain assumptions which are associated with the Gestalt School of Psychology and School of Functionalism.

Schneider (1975) has quoted evidence from various studies that people, in general, adjust to or try to adapt to the climate in a given situation. They also do so to achieve a kind of homeostatic balance within the prevailing psychological environment.

Scheider and Bartlett (1970) had shown a concern for new employees' general satisfaction, managerial structure, managerial support and conflicts, as the core elements of organisational climate. Here, it is clear that they considered perceived organisational climate as a function of individual and situational characteristics.

Hence, the climate of an organisation is a construct which
comprises of shared experiences among workers and the influence of these experiences on an individual’s perceptions, their behaviour and success of the team. In the 1980s, climate researchers attempted to explore the answer of a more basic question, *where does organisation climate come from?*

Schneider and Reichers (1983) have discussed two theories based on perceptual approach: (a) Selection–Attraction–Attrition theory; and (b) Symbolic Interactionist theory.

The *Selection–Attraction–Attrition* theory proposes that the organisational processes, such as selection into the organisation and individual processes, such as, attraction to the organisation and attrition from the organisation combine to produce relatively homogenous memberships in one organisation. Organisation members, have same perceptions for organisational events because they are (members) in some ways similar to each other (Schneider and Reichers, 1983, pp. 26–27). Whereas Symbolic Interactionist Theory by Schneider and Reichers postulate:

... the same process that act to socialize newcomers into the settings also give rise to climates. Specifically, social interactions in the work place help newcomers understand the meaning of various aspects of the work context and it is through social interactions that individuals in the work place come to have similar perceptions of the context (p. 31).

The Selection-Attraction-Attrition (SAA) theory is quite evident in the recent work of Lindell and Brandt (2000). They proposed that:

climate arises from the types of people attracted, selected and retained by an organisation; its work processes, physical layout, and method of communication, the shared values and norms of its members; the exercise of authority; and the history of internal and external struggles (p. 331).
In other words, *Symbolic Interactions Theory*, means that, social interactions among new entrants and other job associates at the place of work help them to understand the meaning of many aspects of the work context and these social interactions lead the individuals to have similar perceptions of the context.

Katz and Kahn (1978) have described climates as a distinctive pattern of collective belief that are passed on to new group members through the social structure or socialisation process. They are further enhanced through member’s interaction with their physical and social environments.

Upadhyay (1983) in his study has visualised the importance of *external* and *internal* factors which influence an organisation’s climate. The internal factors proposed by him are: (a) managerial policy and its practice; (b) personal policy and its practice; (c) availability among various groups, particularly industrial relations climate; (d) setting up of performance standards and acceptance of these standards; (f) work culture and work ethics reflecting a sense of responsibility about the task assigned to groups and individuals; (g) physical facilities and resources of work, and (h) the pattern of compensation, recognition and rewards.

The above mentioned internal factors enable an organisation to thrive and establish its existence. The people have great level of acceptance, satisfaction and they work hard to fulfill an organisation’s goals as well as their personal goals.

External factors, such as cultural/social system, political government and administrative systems influence an organisation’s climate, externally. Similarly, national trade unions with political influences also affect the climate of an organisation.

An organisation is just one unit of the society. To amplify this
Theoretical Orientation...

there are number of organisations which constitute a part of the large unit—the society. The influences either way can not be ignored because they have a direct bearing on the idealogical goals, political system, and economic growth of nations. It is therefore imperative that the influences as discussed above be taken as determinants of organisational climate, during the course of study.

2.5.3 Climate and Culture

Several authors have attempted to compare the literature of organisational climate and organisational culture and explore areas of integration (Pettigrew, 1990; Reichers and Schneider, 1990; Schneider, 1985; 1990) by the similarities and differences between culture, and climate research. Generally they have been neglected in the discussions on the aspect of cultural perspective (Schein, 1990; Smircich, 1983; Trice and Beyer, 1992).

The distinction between culture and climate was quite clear at the beginning of former’s evolution. Schwartz and Davis (1981) has put across in simple words that, whatever culture is, it is not a climate. The study of culture requires qualitative research methods and an appreciation for the unique aspects of individual social settings. Whereas, studying organisational climate, requires quantitative methods as well as generalisation across the social settings, being the primary objective of the research (Dennison, 1996).

The most enduring difference between culture and climate has originated from their respective theoretical backgrounds. But when viewed in depth, it becomes evident that the distinction between two phenomena starts disappearing. Both of them deal with the variation and influence of social contexts in the organisations.
Schein (1985; 1992); Tagiuri and Litwin (1968) have discussed culture and climate. They have attempted to bring out the holistic nature of social contexts in the organisations, the durability of these organisational contexts over a period of time, and the root of these contexts in the organisations systems of belief, values and assumptions.

2.5.4 Measurement of Organisational Climate

Most measures of organisational climate are based on perceptions of the members of an organisation. After an extensive review of literature, Payne and Pugh (1976) have proposed that organisational climate can be measured through objective and subjective measurement techniques. Objective measurement of an organisation is a direct assessment of organisational properties without any conceptual transformation. Whereas subjective measurement implies an indirect assessment of organisational properties which measure group perceptions.

There are numerous ways of measuring climate. One method is termed as categorical, which attempts to classify the organisations into pre-existing theoretical types. This method is less popular and the success rate is also not very high. The other way is dimensional and attempts to classify organisations using a set of pre-established dimensions aimed to capture or fully describe the organisational climate.

Sinha (1980) states that organizational climate may be as varied as one's perceptual domain could be. He further suggests that dimensions to be included should depend upon the purpose of investigation.

As the purpose of the present study is to study the role of organisational climate on the managers attitudinal variables,
Pareek's (1989) framework entitled, *Motivational Analysis of Climate* (MAO-C) was selected. The instrument is tailored while keeping in mind the Indian organisational set up. This framework resembles to Litwin and Stringer's (1968) framework, which facilitates analysis of the connection between motivation and organisational climate.

### 2.6 ATTITUDE TOWARD MANUAL WORK

#### 2.6.1 What work means

Work has an important position in one’s life. Few activities are as meaningful in society as individuals at work. Work is one of the main basis underpinning a great many economic and social institutions as it is a force behind industrial development and a source of social cohesion. Work is a main activity that links the people to the broader social world, and the major way by which individuals are positioned in society (Kalleberg and Berg, 1987).

In other words, it can be put forth that work can be a symbol of personal value, provide status, economic reward, and a potential (Wilson, 1999).

Throughout the history of mankind, it appears that there has been an underlying element of tedium in work. The word 'Labour' derives from a Latin word signifying trouble, distress, and difficulty. Similarly, occupation emerges from the Latin 'occupare', to seize, hold of or grapple with.

Work can also be regarded as punishment (Wilson, 1999).

A perfect Greek man is considered to be a nobleman, who participates in war, is spirituality bound and generally enjoys leisure. It is well known, that a Greek individual does not engage himself in labor (Misumi, 1983).
Attitude towards work and workers has undergone a change. The change is complemented by the application of technology to the labor process, which further has contributed in deskilling and degrading the labor class. Watanabe (1990) describes the labor to be deskilled in the Japanese banking sector. This shows that the change with respect to manual work is not so pronounced.

Shears, Stevens and Lokan (1979), have identified a strong hedonistic orientation among Australians, which co-exists with work oriented values.

Japanese, according to Misumi ((1983), find life worth living through their work. The Japanese work harder than others but they do not start their life as workaholics. It is an established fact, that a Japanese student concentrates on his studies at the school level but enjoys the college life. The importance of work starts increasing once a Japanese joins an organization. Over a period, they have been found to be much more committed to work as compared to their American counterparts. However, European community report (1979) indicates that values attached to manual work in Japan are weaker than those related to intellectual work.

Men have long dreamed of an egalitarian society—a society in which all members are equal. In such a society no one will be ranked in terms of prestige. No one will boast of occupying a high social status; no one will suffer the indignity of being allotted to a position which commands little respect. Clearly, such a society remains a dream. All human societies from the simplest to the most complex have some form of social inequality. In particular, power and prestige are unequally distributed between individuals and social groups. Power refers to the degree to which individuals or groups can impose their will on others. Prestige relates to the
amount of esteem or honour associated with social positions (Haralambos and Heald, 1980).

The inequality in society based on caste becomes clear when it is analysed from the Indian point of view. In India, the society was divided into four 'varnas' or castes and the work was accordingly allocated on the basis of the castes. While the Brahmins were engaged in intellectual, religious, and spiritual work, the Rajputs protected the community against the invasions. The Vaishyas managed trade and commerce, and other intermediate castes were involved in farming while the lower castes were called upon to serve the upper class. All the same, during that period manual work was considered to be inferior to mental work (Sinha, 1990).

Thus, the discrimination on the basis of caste, colour and work brings out that social stratification involves a hierarchy of social groups. Furthermore, this hierarchy of social groups has been replaced by a hierarchy of individuals.

Number of theories have been propagated by numerous sociologists related to this viewpoint. Some of them are important to be mentioned, as they form the base of the ideology behind the identification of manual working class.

2.6.2 Theoretical Orientation

In the early nineteenth century the class struggle was the reason for social change. The class struggle had been between minorities e.g., capitalism developed from the struggle between the feudal class and the emerging capitalist class. Both groups in numerical terms form a minority of the population. It can be summarized as follows: Capital may be defined as money used to finance the production of commodities for private gain. In a capitalist
economy – goods and labour power, raw materials and machinery used to produce them – are given a monetary value. The capitalist used to invest his capital in the production of goods. Capital was accumulated by selling those goods at a value greater than their cost of production. Capitalism, therefore, involves the investment of capital in the production of commodities with the aim of maximizing profit (Bottommore and Rubel, 1963).

2.6.3 Marxian Perspective

However, in Marx's view, (Bottommore and Rubel, 1963) the capital is gained from the exploitation of the mass of the population, the working class. Marx argued that capital, as such, produces nothing. Only labour produces wealth. Yet the wages paid to the workers for their labour are much below the value of the goods they produce. The difference between the value of wages and commodities is known as 'surplus value'. This surplus value is appropriated in the form of profit by the capitalists. Since they are non-producers, the Bourgeoisie are therefore exploiting the Proletariat, the real producers of wealth. Marx maintained that in all class societies, the ruling class exploits and oppresses the subject class. From a Marxian perspective political power derives from economic power. The power of the ruling class therefore stems from its ownership and control of the forces of production.

Bottommore and Rubel, (1963) explained that according to the Marxian perspective, western society had developed through four main epochs: primitive communism, ancient society, feudal society and capitalist society. Primitive communism is represented by the societies of prehistory and provides the only example of a classless society. From there on, all societies are divided into two major classes: masters and slaves in ancient society, lords and serfs in feudal society and capitalists and wage labourers in
capitalist society. During each historical epoch, the labour power required for production was supplied by the subject class, that is by slaves, serfs and wage labourers, respectively.

The subject class is made up of majority of the population whereas the ruling or dominant class forms a minority.

2.6.4 Weberian Perspective

Like Marx, Weber (Gerth and Mills, 1953) sees class in economic terms. Weber maintains that the major class division is between those who own the forces of production and those who do not.

Weber, further classified ‘class’ into four main groups, viz., (i) the propertyed upper class, (ii) the propertyless white-collar workers, (iii) the petty bourgeoisie, and the manual working class.

Weber argues that these above-mentioned groups form because their members share a similar ‘status situation’. He further, elaborates that whereas class refers to the unequal distribution of economic rewards, status refers to the unequal distribution of ‘social honour’. A status group is made up of individuals who are awarded a similar amount of social honour and therefore share the same status situation. Weber brings to fore that status groups reach their most developed form in the caste system of traditional Hindu society in India. He opines that status distinctions are the basis of group formation in caste societies.

Giddens (1973) a British sociologist identifies three major classes. *Upper class* which is based on the ownership of property in the means of production, a *middle class* based on the possession of educational or technical qualifications and a lower working class based on the possession of *manual labour-power*. These classes are distinguished by their differing relationship to the forces of
production and by their particular strategies for obtaining economic reward in a capitalist economy.

Thus, manual working class comprises the major part of the social stratification literature. The society is classified into two classes, the managerial or administrative class and the manual working class. Again, the manual working class is further, subdivided into (i) skilled manual; (ii) semi-skilled manual and; (iii) unskilled manual. Thus, skilled craftsman enjoys good wages, valuable fringe benefits, greater job security and higher prestige than semi-skilled and unskilled workers. The manual worker tends to perceive the social order as sharply divided into us and them. On one side are the bosses, managers and white-collar workers who have power, and on the other, the relatively powerless manual workers. There is seen to be little opportunity for individual members of the working class to cross the divide separating them from the rest of society (Harlambos and Heald, 1980).

2.6.5 Gandhian Ideology

Various thinkers and philosophers have also presented their views on the manual labour. Gandhiji, in the first half of the twentieth century, propagated a new thought—'Bread labor'. This thought was a resultant after making the critical reviews of Ruskin, Milton, and Tolstoy. Gandhiji, (1947) while advocating on manual labour opines that intellectual labour is for the soul and has its own satisfaction, whereas it is the 'Bread labor' which facilitates the human beings to produce their crops and generate food production.

Gandhiji further elaborated that a millionaire could soon get tired of his life, if he remained inactive whole of the day and he will not even felt like eating food. Such people had to exercise to digest the food they eat. If they had to take exercise then they should do it in a productive way, i.e., Bread Labour. No one asked the cultivator to take...
breathing exercise or to work out their muscles. They still felt happier, healthier and more peaceful. According to Gandhiji, Bread Labour means that every healthy individual must labour enough for his food and his intellectual faculties must be exercised not in order to obtain a living or amass a fortune but only in the service of mankind. If this principle is observed everywhere, all men would be equal, none would starve and the world would be saved from many a sin.

Hence, the positive attitude toward the manual work, of managerial class, can improve the quality of job and working conditions. Work attitude can be gauged from the degree of productivity and organizational effectiveness and it is evidently linked to one's job satisfaction and commitment.

All over the world, labour control is intensified and the labour conditions deteriorate. There is a demarcation between physical and mental labour. Under such circumstances, it can be expected that attitude toward manual work of managerial class plays an important role. The status consciousness prevailing in supervisors and managers is manifested in their dislike of manual work. They are averse to undertake physical work. This attitude over a period of time, influences the working class, which results in demoralising and lessening the enthusiasm among the team members. The vision of a manager should be wide and any type of work should be complemented. This can enhance the productivity as well as the satisfaction level of employees.

This ideology is the beginning toward a new thought process. The managers having such ideology can boost up the morale of the workers as well as make the place of work an unforgettable pleasurable experience.