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INTRODUCTION

1.1 INTRODUCTION:

Human life is not a bed of roses. It is full of thorns. Ups and downs are its characteristic. Life is full of happiness and enjoyment. With all this there are difficulties and sufferings in life. Human wants are unlimited and means to satisfy them are scarce. Human life can become easy going is all wishes are fulfilled. Many hardies and obstacles are there in fulfilling human wants. Due to all this difficulties man cannot achieve his goal. He experiences mental stress due to delay in fulfillment of needs, failures, loss, unavailability, illness, and various duties. Mental stress creates the problems of adjustment.

In human life many situations arise which are caused by stress of daily routine life. Right path, right solution has got to be searched for. Some of the problems can be solved and certain problems remain unsolved, one has to bear them. All people cannot face difficulties. Some people can meet the challenge. Some people are shaken in difficulties. As a result they lose their health. The main cause is stress.

The duty of Professional persons is very hard and challenging in modern times. Beside their work in job they have to perform other job too. It affects their home life and personal life. They are sometimes too busy to look after their own selves. They cannot spare time for themselves. It affects their social life and mental well-being. As a result they experience too much stress. They cannot maintain themselves psychologically. They experience many psychological problems. Here it is very much important and essential to
measure their Job stress as a result in the present study job stress and job satisfaction is included.

1.2 MEANING OF STRESS:

When immediate solution of a problem is not found and the mental condition arises which is called stress.

A situation occurs in man’s life when his physical and mental health is in danger and an individual is under the condition of stress.

There are many reasons for occurrence of stress. When a problem arises all of a sudden, then stress is created. Such all of a sudden difficulty creates obstacle in routine life and man suffers from stress. When a child or wife falls ill some persons feel stress. Sometimes very small trifle incidents create stress. Man feels stress due to many occurrences such as he is scolded in service, wife or child does not obey him, love failure quarrel without any genuine reason, probability of loss, guest on the last days of the month, etc. Man feels stress due to social unacceptance and danger of safety of life. In modern days man finds himself under stress due to his financial condition, which worries him, the most. He gets irritated very soon he loses mental health. He makes many mistakes in his job, feels restless and stammers.

Each person interprets stress in different manner. It is not easy to define stress in universally accepted terms. Stress is like fuel to fire. It performs as catalyst. It is the cause of tension worry and stress. It creates stress in as for work. Uncertainty of modern life, vocational insecurity, atomic war etc. increases our life stress. People respond to the same stress in various manners. Their reactions vary from person to person. Many obstacles arise in the fulfillment of their wishes. As a result he suffers failure which
leads to depression and ultimately frustration. Person is scattered and shattered by the conflict going on in his own mind. Conflict between good and evil thoughts, conflict between moral and immoral desires, and conflict between one’s own ability, nature and strength of one’s own character create stress. Stress is observed because of inner conflict which every person experiences in life.

We have observed that many obstacles arise in the way to fulfill desires. It creates failure, which is the main cause of worry and stress. Some people adopt indirect and harmful means to avoid tension and stress. Stress in more observed among women. Working women has to fight on both the fronts at home and in the office. She performs double duty efficiently. She has to face many situations and as a result she bears more stress than housewives.

Stress is a multifaceted notion. Various branches of education define stress according to its own viewpoint. Dizchuized (1982) defined stress in various ways. Yet no specific definition of stress can be given. According to Dizchuized there are more than 40 definitions of stress. Various scholars have defined stress in different manner according to their own thoughts.

As per the first approach stress is considered as response. Psychologist Sal (1976) has defined stress, “Stress is a specific reaction on body caused by any type of desire”. This type of definition enlightens the physical reaction is the chief aim of the researchers who accept this definition.

As per another approach stress is observed as catalyst. The best example of this is that of Kahan and others, a question is asked in this study, “What type of fear is caused by characteristics of work environment”? Here
work place environment is considered as stress catalyst. Another example is the study of Grief (1974), According to Grief stress co-relates with such environmental factors which create individual reactions. Many such factors as conflict of roles, excessive work, irrelevancy etc. are related to stress. This concept is considered as a supporter of the first approach. How the atmosphere affects individuals is observed here.

Third approach is based on perception. Lezarus (1966) has given the approach of perception. According to Lezarus “When an individual perceives the event as stress then only a specific event turns into stress. He has mentioned stress as social aspect. It includes the total even of cataclysm, central variables, reactions etc. This concept is accepted by many researchers’ specially social psychologists and vocational psychologists. Keeping this concept in mind Kahan (1981) studied how environmental factors cause stress and how this relation to an individual and institution. All these three concepts define stress as per their own ideology.

It is known from other definitions of researches’ that stress means vague situation of feelings in which individuals constantly feels uncertainty and threat. When a person is unable to achieve fixed goal, he feels specific type of compulsion which is called stress. Stress is a combined impact of adjustment of conflict and compulsion experienced due to stress.

Researches conducted on stress are studied through various viewpoints.

**Definitions :**

(1) “Stress means threat, frustration and the situation of conflict which is very heavy on individual’s physical and mental ability.” – Atkinson
Stress is the psychological emotional and physiological reaction to threatening events” – **Bayron and Byron**

“Our body and mind react to cope up with the treats and danger created by our lifestyle and this situation is called stress” – **Kahan and Others**

Stress is caused by our lifestyle. The accepted definition of stress is as under.

When due to change in our outer or inner socio-physiological environment which demands adjustment that is beyond our capacity. It is threatening and dangerous for us. To cope up with this situation our body and mind react which is called stress.

The following points are derived from the above definition.

1. Every person feels stress. It is an integral part of life.
2. Individual himself is responsible for stress. Reaction against stress is variable from person to person. There can be various reactions regarding the same situation. Stress emerges as per individuals’ perception of stress.
3. The same changes emerge in body when the needs are not satisfied, and stress is experienced. E.g. anger is the outcome of stress. A child cries or makes mischief or feels offended. In this way there are various reactions of stress:

1. **Life Stress:** Every person tries his best to get adjustment in his routine life. He constantly makes attempts to satisfy his physical and
psychological needs. To gratify his needs he becomes a member of social organization. He interacts in various roles with other members of society. Various events occur in this context during lifetime, it creates stress in him. e.g. sudden death of a spouse, sudden winning a lottery, becoming a prey of serious illness are known as a life event stress. Its impact is very serious.

(2) **Daily Hardship** : Too much attempts we have to make for adjustment when obstacles occur respectably in our daily routine life. At that time we experience stress e.g. We leave for office at right time but cannot reach at right time due to traffic and we experience stress. Working women experience stress because of storage of time. Person is always under stress when he has to search for vehicle to reach the workplace. Factor causing such type of stress are called Daily hardship. In modern time, especially regarding working women such studies are conducted. In 1982 N.K. Radha has studies regarding stress, anxiety and work performance.

(3) **Job Stress** : Job stress is known as occupational stress or work stress. Person feels job stress due to specific job factors. According to Arnold and Feldman (1986) “Stress means person’s reaction towards new or threatful factors in the atmosphere of work”. In reference to the above factors the study is conducted in May 1986 regarding the impact of employees job stress on their job satisfaction.

1.3 **TYPE OF STRESS** :

(A) **Negative Types** : The stress which are harmful is called negative stress. e.g. Due to stress a person gets excited and quarrels and fights.
- **Acute stress**: High degree of negative stress creates acute stress. At this point of person’s capacity of adjustment fails. Person is victimized of psychosomatic disorder and gets perverted. He suffers from mental disorders. When the sources of income come to an end big and small issues occur in the house, gradually person gets addicted to bad habit. He goes deeper and deeper in uncertain situation and ultimately experiences acute stress.

- **Positive stress**: The stress through which person is motivated and feels excited that stress is helpful in person’s development.

- **In sufficient stress**: Sometimes a person gets tired of some situation. He is fed up of it, feels frustration and failure. He wants to escape from such situation. In this circumstance he does not experience actual catalyst. On the contrary to get excitement he gets addicted. It adds to his stress.

Different external and internal factors create stress. Such factors are called stress. Acute stress is created by natural calamities like flood, earthquake and men made calamities like rape, robbery, etc. In these circumstances person’s reactions are of maladjustment.

Some persons break due to very normal stress. Some people can maintain adjustment in the situation of stress. There is no direct effect of stress but as per the situation the persons experiencing stress are interpreted. Such situations are called central variables.

### 1.4 THE MODLE OF STRESS:

As showed in the model of stress there are three main types.
(1) Physical: Physical health, based on physical deformities or specific type of illness.

(2) Mental: Conflict for necessities, anger, jealousy, fear based stress.

(3) Social: Social customs, tradition, social beliefs, social acceptance etc.

Some of the above stress can be hypothecated and can be overcome. Certain stress cannot be inferred, so they are proved shocking. Thus the stress consists of variety as per its intensity.

The following diagram shows whether a person is to face the stress or not, and it depends on his physical, mental and cultural characteristics.
THE MODEL OF STRESS

Stress
Types:
- Physical
- Psychological
- Social
Aspects:
- Intensity
- Time duration
- Rate
- Probable Hypothesis

Sources
Physical:
- Economic
- Medical care
Individual:
- Skill
- Method to cope with
Social:
- Professional Help
  Social help Organization

Person
Physiological Characteristics
- Physical Health
- Physical constitution
- Immunity
Psychological Characteristics
- Mental health
- Nature, Ideas, Self respect
Cultural Characteristics
- Cultural meaning of events
  Method of chief expected reaction

Physical
- Acute Awareness
- Immunity
- Normal Adjustment
- Characteristics
- Psychosomatic-diseases
- Untimely death

Behavioural
- Increasing level-of activity,
- Disturbance in-
- problem solving,
- Self destructive-
- behaviour
- Mechanical or
- stereotype behaviour

Emotional
- Fear, Worry,
- Anger, ego,
- Defence-
  Mechanism

Moral
- Adjustment
- Creativity
- Consideration
- Moral
- Evaluation
- Perception
- Narrowness
- Self-assessment
Potentially Stressful Event

Primary Appraisal
Person evaluates event as positive, neutral or negative.
Negative appraisal can involve:
- **Harm or loss** (Damage has already occurred)
- **Threat** (The potential for harm or loss)
- **Challenge** (The opportunity to grow or gain)

Secondary Appraisal
If the Solution is judged to be the person’s control:
1. Person evaluates coping resources (physical, social, psychological, material) to determine if they are adequate to deal with stressor.
2. Person considers options in dealing with stressor

Stress Response
- **Physiological**: Autonomic arousal, fluctuations in hormones
- **Emotional**: Anxiety, fear, grief, resentment, excitement
- **Behavioral**: Coping behaviour (including problem-focused and emotion-focused coping strategies)

Source Taxed in the process Falkman (1984)
1.5 CAUSES OF STRESS:

The law of science of situation shows that any even correlates with other things situation related to mental stress means the mutual relation between a man and his environment more complex than we can imagine. To examine various causes of any problem there is science. Causes of stress are mostly centered on man. Man becomes a victim of stress. He becomes the cause of stress for other too. He becomes responsible in creating stressful atmosphere. There is mutual relationship between man and atmosphere. Sometimes his atmosphere creates stress in him. And sometimes a person experiencing stress makes the atmosphere around him full of stress.

Stress is an event of personal understanding. The same situation is full of stress for one person and for other person, it is enjoyable. We can divide the causes of stress in two groups. Inevitable and evitable stress.

Different scholars have showed various causes of stress. Baron (1986) classifies causes of stress of social atmosphere and institutional atmosphere.

(A) Causes related individual’s specific characteristics and experience.
(B) Causes related to institution and work.

(A) Causes related individual’s specific characteristics and experience:

(1) Intellectual and mental stress: People with less intelligence suffer a great deal of stress in school, family, society and everywhere. On the other hand highly educated and young people live life with great expectation. As a result they are frustrated in reality. Their intensity is acute.

(2) Conflict at the level of sub-conscious mind: Man’s sub-conscious mind is like a playground of ego and super ego. Ego means the experience based on the atmosphere around a person and intellectual understanding based on individual’s norms, values and ambitions.
Super ego means social boundaries, social laws and man’s inner conscience. The conflict among all these three results in to stress.

Ego means the principle of reality. It is awareness. Super ego is in the form of inner consciousness. Moral conflict between “To be or not to be”, “To do or not to do” is an integral cause of stress.

(3) Individual causes of stress: There are some common causes responsible for deep and intense stress. Hon and Rari has arranged social causes creating stress. Some social problems are responsible for stress.

(1) Death of husband or wife.
(2) Divorce.
(3) Broken marriage.
(4) Punishment of imprisonment.
(5) Personal illness or injury.
(6) Change in economic status.
(7) Marriage.
(8) Dismissed from job.
(9) Retirement.
(10) Pregnancy.
(11) Sexual problem.
(12) Arrival of new family member.
(13) Illness in family.
(14) Demise of a personal close friend.
(15) Change in job.
(16) Borrowing big loan of mortgaging.
(17) Son’s or daughter’s abandonment of house.
(18) Conflict with in-laws.
Fulfillment of basic needs: Fulfillment of man’s desires and feelings are human beings need to satisfy physical and psychological needs. Maslow has indicated them for mental health. (A) Physical active needs: Food, water and life are essential needs. (B) Needs of security: Needs for protection are avoidance of harm. (C) Social needs: Needs for friendship and love. (D) Need for self-achievement: Opportunity of individual growth and development, feeling of valuable achievement, opportunity for creative achievement. Feelings of self-perfection and proper environment. (E) Psychological needs: This includes individual’s feeling of fulfillment of desire and other feelings.

Human needs can be arranged in like Pyramid. Maslow has put first two needs in high diagram. Stress emerges when these two needs are not satisfied.

Family life and stress: Ideally family performs duty to relieve the stress of family members brought from outside. Difference of opinion with clase family members, distrust, oppose, feeling of being offended or testing etc. are the root causes of stress experienced by a person. Constant new complaints or demands are psychological harassment. Lack of understanding creates stress in married life.
There can be normal or serious type of conflict in family. Normal conflicts nurtures progress while serious type of conflict breaks the balance of relationship and affects adversely. Sometimes fake fatherhood or motherhood is exhibited to pay off self-guilt or individual consciousness. This is a cause of mental stress.

(6) **Responsibility of awareness information**: Blood circulation and heart play vital role in conscious condition. The consciousness is measured by the measurement of the level of heart. The heartbeat of a healthy person is 60 to 75 per-minute. In hurry the heart beats increase to 190 to 200. When the nerves have ability to respond threat their method of respond increases and the whole body feels relaxed when the respond is over. Heart also regains normal condition.

(7) **Life circumstances**: Sometimes circumstances create stress. Sometimes they make a person more sensitive. e.g. death of a close relative, disappointment, broken marriage, frustration etc. critical time when an individual becomes more sensitive, pregnancy, childhood and entry in the school, youth, college period, time to decide future career, menopause, old age, confiscation of position, etc. Critical time of life may increase the experience of intensity of stress.

Stress experienced by youth is an exercise of feelings. It is needed to establish his individual identity to establish his own self among friends to cope up with the conflict of sexual feelings and morality. It is necessary to present aggressive instincts in limited tolerance. But they are responsible for creating psychological problems e.g. (1) stress of study, (2) Lack of vocational guidance, (3) Transit from rural to urban environment, (4) Harassment of senior students, (5)
Rate of unemployment, (6) Co-education, (7) Family and economic problems.

When husband has to remain away for office work, the wife feels stress. Mental stress occurs before the attack of any disease. One has to face mental stress and tension in every walk of life. Tension is not a treat but development of efficiency and ability.

(8) ‘Fight or flight’ response: ‘Fight or flight’ is a popular method reply to challenge and fear vary according to the chemistry of the complexity of body. This includes internal function of body. We have ability to respond to any situation such as facing any situation of life, running in competition or accepting death etc. Responsibility in chemistry means increase in blood pressure. Heart rate is related to oxygen intake and circulation. It provides us energy, stamina and need for pure thoughts. When digestion system stops, then perspiration and muscles get activated.

(9) Stress and personality: Before effective identification with stress one should be aware of his pressure and stress. The impact of stress is harmful to our life. But do not take resinous not of it. Body and mind have ability to adjust to each other. They have ability or skill to be comfortable with each other. We seem or appear to adjust to the stress around us. But stress destroys our power of understanding. We experience vary little opportunity. That is way it is inevitable to be aware of the reaction of stress.

There are two types of personality (1) type A and (2) Type B. Both these types of personality affect physical health of a person. The impact of stress is observed on body. In type A persons it is showed that they are associated with stress. Persons associated with type B
stress. Do not prefer to think of time given for completion of work. They are not much punctual regarding time. The type A persons very much stick to time.

It means that A type of persons bear too much stress. They accept stress as part of routine life unless it affects their health. We can give counseling to the persons against falling ill due to acute stress. It is better to know caution and warning. We have to continue without curing serious illness, there is no option before us. You have to be more serious and sensitive towards body functioning. We have to see when the illness occurs.

(B) Causes related to institution and Job Performance:

(1) **Job Demands**: Certain professions create more stress than other profession. e.g. Medical profession, employees of fire brigade, pilot etc. Such profession creates high level of stress. College professors, Farmers, librarians, etc. experience less degree of stress. National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health has conducted a study of the degree of stress experienced by 130 different occupations. The institution concluded that doctor, manager, waitress and waiters experience higher degree of stress than household workers and labourers. Stress increases when important decisions are taken or when there are inter-action with others, or one has to stay in dangerous condition.

(2) **Conflict of role**: When a person has to play the role which is much beyond his capacity, stress is experienced. e.g. Working women feels stress because she cannot pay much attention towards her family due to her occupation.
(3) **Maximum and Minimum work**: Both the situation create stress when a person has to do too much work or he has a little work to perform. Maximum work is of two types, result oriented and quality based. Sometimes person has to complete maximum work within stipulated time. Sometimes a person does not possess the skill and ability to perform the work assigned to him. If the work load is minimum then also person feels stress. It creates loneliness, boredom and unintrestedness. These reactions are painful and create stress. In qualitative minimum workload person’s ability is not utilized. In quantitative minimum workload work is less than fixed limit.

(4) **Role relevancy**: Many times it so happens that what type of work a person has to perform in his occupation is clear and fixed. Sometimes regarding his work irrelevancy prevails. There is no clarity regarding the limit of his responsibilities. Most people do not prefer this type of uncertainty. Such situation creates stress for them.

(5) **Lack of social help**: Baron defines social help and writes, Social help means the helpful activities done by the members of the institution where a person is working. Lack of social help creates stress.

(6) **Responsibilities towards other**: Responsibilities are shared in any institution. Responsibilities other than their profession are given to some people. Some people bear internal responsibilities. Professionals generally bear the responsibilities of working with people. Researches reveal that those who bear the responsibilities of others experience high level stress. Because the possibility of occurring stress and tension is more.

(7) **Lack of sharing in decision**: If a person is not involved in the decision regarding his performance he would definite feel that he is a
puppet only under the control of other. He is an aimless puppet. This situation is really shocking and creates stress. In (1983) has studied this matter.

(8) Other institutional factors: Performance evaluation, work circumstances, situation and change also create stress. Many people experience stress if he is assessed by others. Working conditions sometimes is responsible for stress. e.g. too much heat, too much cold, change in the policy matters of the company, changes in institution’s profession etc. create stress in employees.

Arnold and Feldman (1986) showed the following causes of stress.

(1) Characteristics of work, role relevancy, maximum workload role, minimum workload role.

(2) Inter personal relationship; develop acquaintance with others, dealings with the people of other department, environment of institution.

(3) Individual components, components related to career, components related to geographical changes, rate of changes in life.

1.6 REGULATION OF STRESS AND MENTAL HEALTH:

After stress occurs or any mental disease appears instade of reacting one should change one’s life style and life structure should be so designed that your desired needs get satisfied. Guidelines here are given to provide more positive psychological environment. By implementing them one can be shaved from negative impact of stress.

(1) Realize the reference of behaviour: Search for the present and past causes for your failure. Means realize past factors and utilize them for success.
(2) Evaluate the reactions properly and assess its relevancy: Compare your thoughts, ideas, reactions to the people living around you. e.g. A failed student should compare himself with bright student specially in relation to his reading method, hours of play, etc. and he should make certain changes.

(3) Develop your friend circle: Make close friends with whom you can share the moments of happiness and sadness. Develop the organization of social help and maintain it.

(4) Develop deservingness for friendship: never hesitate to make friendship with others. Is the other person does not accept your friendship don’t nervous and disappointed. Develop ability and deserve other’s friendship.

(5) Don’t under estimate yourself: Do not feel inferior. Do not under estimate yourself. “I am foolish”, “I am not creative” Do not fill your mind such thoughts. Find the causes of your failure and improve them that’s all.

(6) Share positive feelings with others and make them partners in positive feelings: Share the feelings of achievement with others. Make others the partners of good feelings.

(7) Recognize special characteristics: Develop special characteristics which is be useful and helpful to you and others. e.g. Is a person is shy, he can become the best listener and become a special person for a speaker.

(8) Do not get excited: when you lose control over emotions and feelings do not keep yourself away from the situation. Put yourself in place of others and think about the situation. Imagine good time and make attempt to get relief. e.g. confused employee gets relief by thinking of
promotion or increment and he thinks that the problem will be over. With the passage of time unbearable problem and difficulty becomes quite easy. Take care that problem doesn’t get more confused and try to control emotions.

(9) Learn from the past experience, do not think much about it: Let past not hummer you. Do not think of the past. Live in the present; forget undesirable incidents of the past. It strengthens guilt complex. It will be proved harmful.

(10) Failure to has positive aspect: Every could has a silver lining. Remember that failure and dissatisfaction are proved blessing in disguise in certain circumstances. It informs you of selecting improper goal. You get a chance to analyze your errors. It sometimes saves you from big loss of tomorrow. Accept your mistake, experience and go ahead.

(11) Help others but maintain your security: Help others humbly when you find others in difficulty and you can help them, but not at the cost of safety. Sometimes a person in difficulty requires a patient listener. It will be a great help to him if you give your ears to him.

(12) Take the help of professional experts: When you cannot help others or yourself, never hesitate to ask for expert advice. Do not feel ashamed specially in taking help to psychologists for mental confusion.

(13) Develop long term goals: Make planning of what you want to be or what you want to gain after 5, 10 or 15 years. Keeping mind your ability, attitude, interest and circumstances. Distribute long term hard to gain goals into minor sub-goals. Be optimist; enjoy satisfaction by achieving sub-goals one by one.
(14) Stay connected with yourself: Self introspection is essential. Be introvert and think of yourself. Analyze your emotions and feelings. Perform Yoga practice and meditation and Shavasana (The condition of relaxation). Develop various hobbies.

(15) Remember that yourself is changeable: Do not look at yourself as an inactive person to whom any bad event can happen at any moment. Yourself is changeable and active. You yourself is the judge of this change. What needs is firm determination and hard work.

(16) Make your life happy with mutual co-operation: As long as life is, there is possibility of good life and till then we will take care of others and we will be happy, rich and we will have bright possibility of peaceful life.

Here we shall discuss the causes of stress and methods to lessen it. Stress depends on a person, how he perceives the event is of much importance. Perception is significant. The method of reducing stress may not be equally effective for all people experiencing stress. The list of the method of stress reducing remains incomplete. However long the list may be, it remains incomplete. Others help can be taken to reduce stress. But the best remedy is to prepare one’s own self. That is the best and the most reliable option.

1.7 OUTCOMES OF STRESS:

As the causes of stress are different, in the same way the results of stress too are different. Performance of both nervosa systems are connected with stress. Physiological, psychological, Social and behavioural results are observed. An attempt of fulfilling drawbacks reduces stress. Too many such attempts make the body over active. If such situation is continued for longer
time many deformities occur. As a result work performance decreases. This deficiency process is known as general adaption syndrome.

Besides all these Robins (1986) includes head ache, dejection, high blood pressure, heart attack, pervasion, worry, decreases in job satisfaction as psychological result.

Trivedi (1989) include fatigue, irritation, dejection, boredom, and decrease in self-respect. In behavioural pattern smoking, drinking, emotional instability is included. Social and institutional effects of results are also included.

There are some central variables between the causes and result of stress. The effect of causes and result of stress. The effect of cause depends centralized variables. There are many variations too. The following chart of (1983) shows the effect of stress on performance.

**Effect of stress on performance**

![Graph showing the effect of stress on performance](image)

Source: Ran S.S. “A study correlates of organizational climate and job involvement and mental health among industrial employees”

Impacts of stress are many. Some are positive such as self-motivation, inspiration for hard work etc. Yet most of the impact is negative and dangerous. Cox (1978) has showed five important effects of stress.
(1) Self-centric impact: Worry, aggressiveness, boredom, dejection, frustration, anger, loneliness, etc.

(2) Behavioural Impact: Drinking wine, losing control over emotion, excessive eating, helplessness in laughter, emotional behaviour.

(3) Impact regarding knowledge: Inability to take proper decision, weakness in concentration, obstacle in thinking power.

(4) Psychological impact: Excessive sugar in blood, increase in heart beat rate, dryness of mouth, too much movement of eye.

(5) Institutional Impact: Absence, low production, job dissatisfaction, decrease in loyalty and dedication towards institution.

Above mentioned five impacts do not agree with one another. It is not binding that all psychologist agree to these impacts.

1.8 JOB SATISFACTION:

We are all living in complex and competitive world. Industrialization and globalization are in the roots of this progressive time. This has also created some difficulties with providing some facilities. The encouragement that is given to the organizations by the government is the main characteristic of this era. So in the organization “Quality” is not only matter. With the quality of the production and the maintenance of the organization "the man" should also be taken care because he is the main base of the organizations.

Why does the man work? Most of the people would say "to earn money". In order to understand the motivation force for the work, wage incentive plans had been implemented. Wage is the main force for the motivation, but not "only one" factor for that. In a study of Morse and Weiss (1955) 401 workers were asked that would they do their job if they would be given significant money to spend convenient life instead of
not doing the job? Approximately eighty percent workers stated to continue their job instead of leaving it. This shows that the man do not work just for earning the money, but for his own satisfaction also.

Among all the origins of motivation the work is itself a source of motivation because man spends his third part of the day concerning the professional activities. Profession is the most important aspect in our life. Satisfied worker affects the sense of identity and feeling of personal worth of his own life. Motivated person having more job satisfaction which helps man in personal development. On the other hand if the worker is not satisfied it is likely to have created opposite results. Dissatisfied worker's personal, social, domestic and professional adjustment can also be affective. Dissatisfaction getting from the work causes for frustration and sense of uselessness. That also affects to the efficiency of person. As a result employee turnover increases and dissatisfied workers leave their jobs, the training goes fail and the organization has to be ready to spend the money for the training and newcomer employees. That causes loss for the industries. There are almost two to four thousand studies have been conducted in last decades on job satisfaction as well as to know the related factors. Industrial psychologists have long considered "type of work" as the most important factor inherent in a job. Studies abroad have shown that "variety in the job" causes greater job satisfaction than "routine work." Morse's (1953) study has stated that a majority of factory workers to be dissatisfied whereas a minority of professionals were dissatisfied. So it is so interesting problem that whether job satisfaction, job involvement and organizational climate are influenced by type of organization?
Ghosh and Ghorpade (1980) says that job satisfaction is the favorableness or unfavourableness with which employee view their work. Job satisfaction is a widely accepted psychological aspect in any profession. The credit of bringing this term into currency goes to Hoppock (1935). He reviewed thirty contemporary studies about job satisfaction. The Summon Bonum of the opinions is that job satisfaction is that job satisfaction is a favorableness with which workers view their job. It results when there is a fit between job requirements and wants and expectations of employees. It expresses the extent of match between worker's expectations (also aspirations) and the rewards the job provides and the values it creates and gets cherished.

Job satisfaction is the most important issue both for a man and the organization, but job satisfaction is not a God's gift. Each and everyone does not easily get it. It does not automatically come to the employee. It depends on some internal and external factors of a mankind that is directly or indirectly concerned with the man's efficiency, work motivation and job satisfaction. The most important element which is internally concerned with the work motivation is job involvement. Its roots lie in the employee's interest. Interest leads a man to perform his duty exactly, honestly and willingly. Involvement depends upon interest, motivation, attitudes, age, experience personality etc. A job involved person appears to be one for whom work is very important part of life and who is affected personally by his whole job satisfaction; the work itself; his co-workers; the organizations etc. Kanungo, et al. (1975) refers that an involved employee expects his work to be intrinsically rewarding because he thinks work provides him the opportunity for self expression, while the job non-involved does leaving off the job.
According to Lawler (1970), job involvement motivates individuals to perform better; carefully and satisfying. The job involved person develops more sense of responsibilities and identification with their job.

The factor that externally drives individual's motivation is organizational climate. Size of organization, type of work, challenging work, geography; supervision, security, promotion chances, extra benefits besides illumination, temperature, ventilation, noise these are all also concerned indirectly with the organizational climate. That contributes to work motivation, satisfaction and job involvement. According to Chattopadhyay and Agarwal (2003), an organization has a structure. It reflects class relation; it has roles; ownership is defined indefinite terms. It has also specific goals and there is varying size of organization. The various elements of organization contribute to the psychological environment in an organization. Organization climate is determined by member characteristics, their age, sex, and the length of association with the organization. It also reflects various roles and status. Apart from these there are several other organizational variables which also influence upon organizational climate, such as communication, performance standard, support system, warmth responsibilities, reward system, member identity, conflict resolution, participating in decision making, organizational structure and the level of motivation. Thus organizational climate does not have just physical meaning, but also psychological meaning. Thus organizational climate is also indirectly connected element that contributes to the efficiency, job involvement and job satisfaction.

Thus, job satisfaction, job involvement and organizational climate are the important issues not only for the man, but also for the industries and
organizations. If the employee would not have good organizational climate, he would not have an interest. Then the lack of interest would not increase job involvement. As a result the employee would not be motivated and satisfied. Ultimately he would not enjoy his job. The quality and the product would be affected. Today we are standing on such a kind of a bank of a century in which man's expectations are very high. Tension, force, frustration, cause for unhealthy mentality. In this time of complexity and competition, the man has to work to fulfill his economical and psychological needs either he or she does like or not like their job. Today villages are converted into cities and still continuing, and so many organizations are being grown. There are so many important key factors exist are directly or indirectly associated with job satisfaction, job involvement and organizational climate. This is why a researcher inspires to study it.

Ever since the time of men's arrival on this good earth, he must have worked, for his every survival depended on his work. We can't conceive of man, even of the primitive times, without doing one kind of work or the other. In the beginning there was not much of a difference in the kind of work men did, but slowly man's world of work has progressively differentiated, through haltingly and slowly, there was steady progress and widening of the avenues. Thus, the world of work has come to be confusingly complex in the modern times. The progress of development was painfully slow in the beginning. Nevertheless, there was progress or else we can't explain the present state of our civilization.

The primitive man hunted to obtain food and also to defend himself against the predatory denizens in the wilderness. Thus at the
outset, he was largely a hunter. However, in course of time the hunting man who was essentially a food gatherer settling down to become a food producer. Presently men learnt to pursue different kinds of activities to eke out their livelihood, which have, in time, come to be identified with different occupations. Men had to devote a good part of their lives in the pursuit of their occupations to make a living. The relationship between man and his work, therefore, is of great importance and thus become rich material for writers, poets, and philosophers to write, sing, speculate and theorize about work. Some of the theories and highly imaginative, insightful and thought provoking. However much of their content is still in the realism of speculative thinking, for human nature itself, is not fully understood.

Rao (1986) says that in early days it is understandable that no distinction was made between man's abilities and the kind of work he did. Every individual was supposed to be like every other in his capacity to perform work. It must, however, have been common experience that some performed well while others did not. Towards the end of the19th century, individual differences came to be widely recognized. At the time of the beginning of the 20th century, came the discovery of human intelligence and aptitude. Thus the early decades of the present century saw the discovery of human abilities. This led to the general belief that different individual perform differently owing to differences in their abilities physical and psychomotor. First, the psychomotor tests came to be used widely to assess individual differences. The rise of the guidance movement stressed the importance of psychological abilities in the performance of work. The aim of the guidance movement was to
fit the "right" person in the "right" jobs. The emphasis on improving the "fit" or "match" between the abilities of the individuals and the several skills demanded by the different jobs available in the market, led to the search for and identification of other ability, personality and motivational factors.

The supposed best "fit" between the abilities demanded by the job and the abilities available on the part of the individual; often failed to explain the differences in the efficiency and the output or performance. Obviously other factors, in addition to their abilities and skills, play a significant part in performance. Therefore, motivational factors came to be recognized as of great significance. Hawthorne and Harwood’s studies highlighted the importance of working conditions on the other hand, and social environment on the other, which affect human performance. The former led to the studies emphasizing the importance of motivational factors within the individual worker, and the letter to the study the study of organizational and environmental climate of the work situation. Little wonder, work motivation has been a hot topic for researchers for ever four decades now. When people accept jobs, why do they continue with them even when they may not feel like owing them? Why do they work hard? In the past the most common readymade answer was: "It is the love for money that makes people work." But when we watch many people and observe the kind of things they most frequently do, we become less convinced of the patent answer that "People work only for money." Further, we also find that some people would not do certain kind of things, no matter how much money was afforded. As a result of several investigations concerning work motivation, job performance
and job satisfaction, it came to be generally believed that "a happy worker is a productive worker." Questions such as, "Does it mean that if you make the worker happy, he will be then more productive?" come to the fore. It is not difficult to find instances of individuals who were rather unhappy but yet were productive. On the other hand, several cases of happy workers were identified who were found to be unproductive.

Why we seek information about job satisfaction? In the reference of this question Blum and Naylor (1984) say that for an industrial organization the consequences extremely important. By discovering attitudes and factors related to the job, a firm can correct certain bad situations and thereby improve the job satisfaction of its staff. From this point of view it would be justified in being concerned only with this area and neglecting individual "ego" and its employee's adjustment to groups outside the plant. However, an industrial organization can benefit materially if it knows that individual attitudes contributes to job satisfaction. For one thing applying this knowledge will result in better selection procedure. This is a broad implication as far as job satisfaction concerned, and even though most industrial and business organizations feel that it is not also directly related to vocational guidance, Schools and colleges, public and private employment etc. Society as a whole must face it realistically.

1.9 MEANING OF JOB SATISFACTION :

Job satisfaction is one of the most crucial but controversial issue in industrial psychology and behavioral management in organization. It ultimately decides the extent of employee's motivation through the development of organizational climate or environment.
Job satisfaction means something different to each one of us. Each one of is unique and has different skill sets, employment histories and interests. Our goal in finding a new position should be to try and combine each of these areas into the job that we are seeking. If we are employed, we spend approximately eight hours per day-one half of our working life including holidays, weekends and vacations - at our job. For our sense of well being it is important that we like what we do.

Blum and Naylor (1984) refers that job satisfaction is the result of various attitudes possessed by an employee. In a narrow sense, these attitudes are related to the job and are related to the job and are concerned with such specific factors as wages, supervision, steadiness of employment, conditions of work, advancement opportunities, recognition of ability, fair evaluation of work, social relation of job, prompt settlement of grievances, fair treatment by employer and other similar items.

However, a most comprehensive approach requires that many additional factors be include before a complete understanding of job satisfaction can be obtained. Such factors as the employee's age, health, temperament, desires, and level of aspiration should be considered. Further his family relationships, social status, recreational outlets, activity in organizational labor, political, or purely social- contribute ultimately to job satisfaction. In short, job satisfaction is a general attitude which is the result of many specific attitudes in three areas, namely specific job factors, individual characteristics and group relationships outside the job. Let us see some definitions:
Hoppock (1935) says job satisfaction is "any combination of psychological, physiological and environmental circumstances that causes a person truthfully to say, "I am satisfied with my job."

Bullock (1952) considers job satisfaction as "an attitude which results from a balancing and summation of many specific likes and dislikes experienced in connection with the job.

Blum & Naylor (1984) indicates that"job satisfaction or dissatisfaction is result of various attitudes that the person holds towards his job and related factors life in general."

McCormic (1984) referes that job satisfaction is specificsubset of attitudes held by organizational members. It is the attitude one has towards his or her job. Stated another way it is one's affective response to the job.

Locke (1976) defines job satisfaction as " a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experience."

Mitchel and Larson (1987) observes job satisfaction as a result of employee's perception of how well their job provides those things that are viewed as important. It is generally recognized in the organizational behavior field that job satisfaction is the most important and frequently studied attitude."

Ghosh and Ghorpade (1980) say that there are number of different definitions of job satisfaction. One comprehensive definition is that it is a generalized attitude resulting from many specific attitudes in three
areas: 1) Specific job factors; 2) Individual adjustment; 3) Group relationship. These factors can never be isolated from each other for analysis but implications of their relative importance in job satisfaction may be obtained through the use of statistical techniques.

For our purpose, the definition which seems to be apt, at the same time simple, is that job satisfaction is the favorableness or unfavorableness with which employee view their work. It results when there is a fit between job requirements and the wants and expectations of the employees. It expresses the extent of match between the job and the rewards that the job provides. It may refer either to a person or a group. Job satisfaction may be more clearly understood in the context of the employee's extent of satisfaction in general in his total life situation. Job satisfaction can be viewed in relation to employee's satisfaction with their home and community life, but view their jobs as average. Consequently, their job satisfaction is lower than their job satisfactions. Some other employees may feel dissatisfied with home and community but they also feel their jobs are average. In this case the employee's job satisfaction will be relatively high. But generally job satisfaction and life satisfaction are closely related. The effect is of spillover of one over the other. Another kind of effect where people compensate for low job satisfaction by trying to achieve high non-job satisfaction, this takes the form of achieving higher satisfaction in various pursuits in society and in union activities. Mitchel and Larson (1987) suggest that job satisfaction is a result of employee's perception of how well their job provides those things which are viewed as important. It is generally recognized in the organizational behavior field that job satisfaction is the most important and
frequently studied attitude. There are three important dimensions of job satisfaction. First, job satisfaction is an emotional to a job situation. As such, it can't be seen; it can only be inferred, second, job satisfaction is often determined by how well outcomes meet or exceed expectations. For example, if organizational participants feel that they are working much harder than others in the department but are receiving fewer rewards, they will probably have a negative attitude toward the work, the boss, and / or co-workers. They will be satisfied. On the other hand, if they are being treated well and are being paid equitably, they are likely to have a positive attitude toward the job. They will be job satisfied. Third, job satisfaction represents several related attitudes. *Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969)* have suggested that there are five job dimensions that represent the most important characteristics of a job about which people have affective responses. There are:

1. **Work itself:** The extent to which the job provides the individual with interesting tasks, opportunities for learning, and the chance to accept responsibilities.

2. **Pay:** The amount of financial remuneration that is received and the degree to which this is viewed as equitable vis-à-vis others in the organization.

3. **Promotional Opportunities:** The chances for advancement in the hierarchy.

4. **Supervision:** The abilities of the superior to provide technical assistance and behavioral support.

5. **Co-workers:** The degree to which fellow workers are technically
proficient and socially supportive.

Thus, job satisfaction depends on many work-related factors, ranging from where we have to park to the sense of fulfillment we get from our daily tasks. Personal factors can influence job satisfaction. These factors including age, health, length of job experience, emotional stability, social status, leisure activities, and family and other social relationships. Schultz and Schultz (1994) say that our motivations and aspirations and how well there are satisfied by our work also affect our attitudes toward our jobs. For some employees, job satisfaction is a stable, enduring characteristic, independent of the features of the job. Changes in job status pay, working conditions, and goals have little effect on the job satisfaction of these people. Their personal tendency toward happiness (satisfaction) or unhappiness (dissatisfaction) varies little over time and circumstances. One statement has also been found by some psychologists, on the basis of research conducted on twins, that the attitudes toward work and the outcomes or satisfactions we want from it - such as achievement, comfort, status, safety and autonomy - may be inherited. These attitudes and outcomes may be influenced more by our genetic endowment than by features of our work environment. Researches of Arvey, Bouchard, Segal & Abraham (1989); Bouchard, Arvey, Keller & Segal (1992), and Keller, Bouchard, Arvey, Segal & Dawis (1992) suggest that between 30 and 40% of job satisfaction may be related to genetic factors. While against this matter Cropanzano & James (1990) say that the notion of an inherited predisposition toward satisfaction and dissatisfaction has drawn criticism, and additional research is needed before the issue is resolved. If the genetics advocates are
correct, then the theories, research, and programs designed to change aspects of the work environment to promote job satisfaction will have to be reevaluated.

Related researches suggest that different patterns, involving both work-related and personal attitudes, may characterize different people. Schaffer (1987) conducted a study of 390 male college graduates, tested after they had held full-time job for 5 or 6 years, suggested the following satisfaction profiles:

1) Generally satisfied with life - high in work and non-work satisfaction.
2) Non work compensator - high in personal satisfaction, low in work satisfaction.
3) Work compensator - generally, dissatisfied with work and non work activities but satisfied with pay.
4) Materially dissatisfied - generally dissatisfied with the work environment and with the pay.
5) Generally dissatisfied with life - low in work and non work satisfaction.

It must also be born in mind that the job satisfaction is dynamic. Almost like machinery which requires proper installation, operation and maintenance, the level of job satisfaction is required to be achieved, used and maintained - otherwise it can leave more quickly than it does arrive. As we have noted, there are many factors which interact in a complex pattern to contribute to job satisfaction. We shall however confine our discussion to those which are considered as more important.

1.10 JOB SATISFACTION AND RELATED BEHAVIORS :
1.10.1 JOB SATISFACTION AND JOB BEHAVIOR:

As yet we have noted considered the degree to which job satisfaction is related to other aspects of work behavior. Is there any relationship between how successfully a worker performs and the degree to which he is satisfied with the various aspects of his job? As we shall soon see, the answer to that question is not clearly established.

Vroom (1964) has done an excellent job of examining the relationship between job satisfaction and various aspects of job behavior, and perhaps summarizing his findings is the best way of giving the reader an overview. Vroom categorizes studies in terms of which job behaviors are correlated with job satisfaction. Specifically, he groups them into studies of turnover, absenteeism, accidents and job performance. Schultz and Schultz (1994) say that it is reasonable to assume that high job satisfaction is related to positive job behaviors such as high performance, low turnover, and low absenteeism. Management once believed that an increase in job satisfaction would automatically result in an increase in productivity, but relationship is neither direct pr simple. The interaction of job satisfaction and job performance is complicated by a range of job-related and personal factors. While, Beak (1982) suggests although it is something of truism that happy workers are good workers, this is only partly true. There is a relationship between job satisfaction and job performance, but it is not a perfect relationship. There is also an implication that job satisfaction causes good performance. Therefore, if we do think to make workers happy, they will perform better. The flaw in this argument is that a relation between job satisfaction and performance does not prove that satisfaction causes performance. Good performance might
lead to high job satisfaction rather than the other way around. Lawler and Porter (1967) proposed the following model of job satisfaction: performance which leads to rewards produces satisfaction with the work, and the expectation that future performance will also lead to rewards. This is shown in the figure. no.1.3.1.1.

![The Lawler-Porter (1967) Model of Job Satisfaction showing how Performance leads to Rewards and Satisfaction and Expection of future Rewards](image)

**Fig. no. 1.10.1.1. The Lawler-Porter (1967) Model of Job Satisfaction showing how Performance leads to Rewards and Satisfaction and Expection of future Rewards**

Several studies indicated that "there is greater job satisfaction when rewards are specially related to job performance than when equal rewards are given but now specially related to job performance." Job satisfaction is related to control over events. Though organization attempts to "increase morale" by contrived programs may have some positive effects, they may not necessarily lead to increased performance. It is when the employee perceives the rewards as beings the consequences of
his or her work that performance and satisfaction both increase.

1.10.2 JOB SATISFACTION AND TURNOVER:

Of the seven studies examined by Vroom (1964) which related job satisfaction to turnover, all indicated all negative relationship. That is, the higher worker's satisfaction the less apt and he was to leave the job.

Turnover is also costly for organizations. Every time someone quits, a replacement must be recruited, selected, and trained, and permitted time on job to gain experience. Factors related to high turnover include job dissatisfaction, low job involvement, poor promotion opportunities, and dissatisfaction with supervision and with pay. Work group cohesiveness is negatively related to turnover. Study of Kline & Peter (1991) on 315 newly hired clerical workers found that those with high organizational commitment remained on the job almost three times longer than those with low organizational commitment. Turnover is higher in time of high unemployment and expanding job opportunities than it is in time of high unemployment and limited opportunities. Gerhart (1990) suggest that when people perceive that the economical climate is good and the economy is growing, they find it easier to consider changing jobs in the hope of increasing their job satisfaction. There is a crucial difference between absenteeism is almost always harmful to the organization, turnover is not necessarily detrimental. Sometimes it is the unsatisfactory employees who
leave the company. I/O psychologists distinguish between functional turnovers, when good performers quit. A study of Hollenbeck & Williams (1986) on 143 salespersons of a department store found that their turnover was largely functional, more than half the employees who quit their jobs had been rated marginal or unsatisfactory in their performance appraisals. Satisfaction is negatively related to turnover. Some of the most interesting research in this area was done by Hulin (1966; 1968). In his 1966's study, clerical workers who subsequently quit were compared to a matched sample to job satisfaction survey taken before the former group resigned. Turnover was clearly related to job satisfaction. Following the study, changes were made in the jobs to correct some of the factors mentioned by those who had quit as unsatisfactory. These changes led to a significant in turnover.

Evidence indicates that an important moderator of satisfaction-turnover relationship is the employee's level of performance. Spencer & Steers (1981) say that specifically level of satisfaction is less important in predicting turnover for superior performers. Why? The organization typically makes considerable efforts to keep these people. They get pay raises, praise, recognition, increased promotional opportunities, and so forth. Just the opportunities tend to apply to pour performance. Few attempts are made by the organization to retain them. There may even be subtle
pressures to encourage them to quit. We would expect, therefore, that job satisfaction is more important in influencing poor performers to stay than superior performers. Regardless of level of job satisfaction, the latter are more likely to remain with the organization because the receipt of recognition, praise, and other rewards give more reasons for staying.

Kim, Roderick & Shea (1973) found that for women eighteen to twenty-five, satisfaction was an excellent predictor of whether or not they changed jobs. On the other hand Parnes & Associates (1973) found that tenure has also been found to lessen the effects of dissatisfaction among male employees.

An organization's records on employee turnover may be incomplete or inaccurate, making it difficult to determine precisely why some employees quit. Despite of that we conclude that where job satisfaction is high, turnover is low. Turnover is one of the most expensive of personnel problems because of time and money lost in training and retaining. Thus measurement of job satisfaction can also be used diagnostically to find those aspects of a job which are not satisfying. If these can be corrected, turnover can perhaps be reduced.

1.10.3 JOB SATISFACTION AND ABSENTEEISM:

Research of Scott and Taylor (1985) has pretty well
demonstrated an inverse relationship between satisfaction and absenteeism. When satisfaction is high, absenteeism tends to be low; when satisfaction is low, absenteeism tends to be high. However, similar to the other relationships with satisfaction, there are moderating variable such as the degree to which people feel that their jobs are important. For example, research among state government employees has found that those who believed that their work was important had lower than absenteeism than did those who did not feel this way. Additionally, Clegg (1983) suggests, it is important to remember that while high job satisfaction will not necessarily result in low absenteeism, low satisfaction is likely to bring about high absenteeism.

Absenteeism is not consistently related to job satisfaction because many other factors, such illness or specific work conditions, affect absenteeism. Smith (1977) nicely illustrated both that there is an effect of job satisfaction on absenteeism and the difficulties in showing that such relationship exists. Ilgen & Hollenback (1977) also add their voice to this matter that absenteeism frequently may not be associated strongly with job satisfaction, because absence behavior is determined by other factors even when there is dissatisfaction.

Absenteeism is widespread and costly for organizations. On any given workday in the United States, 16 to 20 % employees do not
show up for work. Absenteeism has plagued industry since that invention of machines. In the textile mills in Wales in the 1840s, the absenteeism rate was approximately 20% during the two week period following each monthly payday, absenteeism often reached 35%, throughout the 19th century in England, workers typically took off Mondays - "Saint Monday", they called it to recover from weekend drinking bouts. Absenteeism is also high in companies that do not require proof of illness, such as a doctor's note. High-playing manufacturing industries have higher absenteeism than do low-paying industries. The more money employees earn, the more likely they are feel entitled to take time off. Workers in routine jobs often have a higher absence rate than workers in more interesting, challenging corporate jobs.

Societal values also foster absenteeism. In Japan and Switzerland, where job attendance is considered to be a duty, absenteeism rates are low. In Italy where societal attitudes toward job are more permissive, companies routinely hire15% more workers than needed to make certain that enough people report to work each day to maintain operations. Absenteeism declined in the United State, during World War II because it was considered unpatriotic to miss a day of work.

Management often contributes to an organizational climate that appears that condone absenteeism by failing to enforce company policy. If
management is believed to be lenient and unconcerned about absences, some employees will take advantages of the situation.

Economic condition can also influence absenteeism rates. On the bases of the researches, Markham & McKee (1991) concluded that when coworkers are being laid off and jobs are scarce, fewer people are willing to risk the disciplinary action that might result from frequent absence. Both, avoidable and unavoidable absences appear to be inversely related to age. Hackett (1990) and Martocchio's (1989) meta-analysis of studies of employee attendance show that younger workers are much more likely to have higher absenteeism rates than are older workers.

Thus, the results of the studies in this grouping were somewhat equivocal. Four studies tended to support the notion of a negative relationship between the amount of job satisfaction and the degree of work absenteeism. However, three studies did not support this premise, and three others indicated that the magnitude of an absenteeism-satisfaction correlation can be demonstrated to be such other variable as the type of absenteeism measure used and the sex of the workers.

1.10.4 JOB SATISFACTION AND PERFORMANCE:

Does job satisfaction have any relationship to actual job performance? Although it is intuitively appealing to conclude that satisfied workers are
better performers. Perhaps the best conclusion about satisfaction and performance is that there is definitely a positive relationship. But probably not as conventional wisdom assumed concerning happy workers as productive workers. The relationship may even be more complex than others in organizational behavior. For example, there seem to be many possible moderating variables, the most important of which are rewards. **Podsakoff and Williams (1986)** suggest that if people receive reward, they feel are equitable, they will be satisfied, and this is likely to result in greater performance effort. Also **Adsit, London, Crom and Jones's (1996)** research evidences indicate that satisfaction may not necessarily lead to individual performance involvement but does lead to departmental and organizational-level involvement.

**Herman (1973)** argued that job satisfaction should relate to performance, (and to any other behavior) only when other influence on behavior have been removed. Complex behavior, such as those represented by work performance, frequently are influenced by other factors; therefore, we would suggest that they often would not be strongly related to job satisfaction. This is much different from saying that, across the board, job satisfaction is unimportant to performance.

The result of the widely publicized early studies of the Survey Research Centre in an insurance company (**Katz, MacCoby, and**
Morse (1950) in a railroad (Katz, MacCoby, Gurin, and Floor (1951) cast some doubt on this assumption that no differences were found in either study between the satisfaction with wages, satisfaction with job status, or satisfaction with the company of workers in high and low productivity. Second, in the insurance study, those in highly productive groups tended to be more critical of certain aspects of company policy; and in the railroad study, those in highly productive group. Furthermore, it is likely that most of the workers studied in investigations of the relationship between satisfaction and performance, have reached or exceeded the minimum level of performance necessary to avoid being fired. It has been suggested that workers will demonstrate their gratitude for rewards received from management by increasing their output or that a satisfied worker is more likely to accept managerial goals of higher production. However, these proposals seam tenuous in the absence of direct evidence.

The number of studies in which data is presently available and the lack of detail with which some are reported make further analysis of this type unfeasible. It is impossible to determine from existing data whether the size and direction of the relationship depends on whether the worker is paid by the piece by the time he works, by the nature of the supervision he receives, or on a wide range of other potentially
relevant variables. Smith and Kendall (1963) reported different relationships between job satisfaction and performance and for men and women. They found a positive relationship between the total satisfaction of men as measured by the job description, index and performance rating in 18 of 20 companies. A similar relationship was found for women in only 8 of 13 companies. Since no data on the strength of association is reported for either sex.

1.10.5 JOB SATISFACTION AND ACCIDENTS:

Hill and Trist (1953) have suggested that accidents, like turnover and absence, reflect the strength of motivation on the part of the individual to withdraw from a work situation. In support of this view they found that accident rates are positively associated with others form of absence and most strongly associated with the least sanction forms of absence. If this information is correct, we should also expect to find a negative relationship between satisfaction and accidents. Dissatisfied workers should be more likely to have accidents in order to remove themselves from their unpleasant work situation. There is relatively little data on this relationship.

Hill and Trist (1953) interpretate that accidents are a means of withdrawal from the work situation can't be completely accepted. This interpretation implies that dissatisfaction motivates persons to have
accidents and is contrary to the more traditional views, implies in the term, that accidents are unintended consequences of acts. Since accidents are often highly painful and otherwise costly to those who have them, it is not easy to see why they should be adopted as a solution to an unpleasant work situation. Dissatisfied employees may be more likely to make trips to the dispensary for minor reasons but this does not mean that they are more motivated, either consciously or unconsciously, to have accidents.

The more conventional view leads us to a different interpretation of a negative relationship between satisfaction and accidents. This interpretation assumes that accidents cause dissatisfaction. Having an accident in the work situation, or working in environment in which accidents are likely, creates anxiety and reduces attractiveness of the job.

Very few data are available which relate accident data to job satisfaction. Vroom (1964) reports only two studies, one of which found substantial negative relationships and another which found no relationship at all. Accidents as a criterion measure usually leave much to be desired since there is considerable evidence that most accidents are caused simply by chance factors.

1.10.6 JOB SATISFACTION AND PRODUCTIVITY:

Are satisfied workers more productive than their less satisfied
counterparts? This "satisfaction-performance" controversy has raged over the years. Although most people assume a positive relationship, the preponderance of research evidence indicates that there is no strong linkage between satisfaction and productivity. For example, a comprehensive meta-analysis of the research literature of Iffaldano and Muchinsky (1985) found only .17 average correlations between job satisfaction and productivity. Satisfied workers will not necessarily be the high producers. There are many possibilities, the most important of which seems to be rewards. If the people receive rewards, they feel are equitable, they will be satisfied and this is likely to result in greater performance effort.

Ghosh and Ghorpade (1980) imply that historically, the concept of human relations assumed that high job satisfaction led to high productivity, but later research indicated that this was an incorrect assumption. Satisfied workers turned out to be either high producers, or low producers or average producers. The satisfaction-productivity relationship appeared to be quite complex being influenced by various intermediate factors such as rewards that an employee receives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>REWARDS: INTRINSIC</th>
<th>PERCEPTION OF EQUITY IN THE REWARDS</th>
<th>SATISFACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig no. 1.10.6.1:** The Lawler-Porter's (1967) Model of Performance leading to Job Satisfaction

Performance leads to rewards, and if these are perceived to be equitable
employee satisfaction is the result. The assumption which seems realistic is that satisfaction and productivity are in a circular relationship in which each effect the other. Using this model, it can be said that high satisfaction indicates a predisposition to be productive in effective leadership is provided.
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**Fig no. 1.10.6.2: The Model in relation of Job Satisfaction and Productivity**

From the various studies a general relationship emerges between job satisfaction and productivity as show in following figure. Line 'C' of the chart shows the condition of high productivity and low job satisfaction which can occur when the supervisor pushes the production through techniques of scientific management such as methods study, and close supervision. Line 'A' represents a condition which believes that satisfied workers are the best workers and tries to keep workers happy regardless of the effects of organizational goals. In this condition, the workers may derive much job satisfaction, but work may not be done.
This condition is described by one supervisor as "my workers are so happy that they don't feel like working". The middle line 'B' appears to be the most desirable arrangement - where high satisfaction and high productivity are combined together. In practical situations, it is entirely possible to have high productivity with low satisfaction but it is highly doubtful that extremes of the condition can be maintained in the long runs.

A study of 148 managers of Porter and Lawler (1968) in five organizations found that high-performing managers and low-performing managers received similar external rewards, such as pay. However, high performers reported more satisfying their needs for autonomy and self-actualization. They reported greater satisfaction. These results support the suggestion that need fulfillment leads to satisfaction, which, in turn, leads to high performance.

Thus, it may well be that the reason we haven't gotten strong support for the satisfaction-causes-productivity thesis is that studies have focused on individuals-level measures of productivity don't take into consideration all the interactions and complexities in the work process. So while we might not be able to say that a happy "worker" is more productive, it might be true that happy "organizations" are more productive.
1.11 FACTORS RELATING TO JOB SATISFACTION AND DISSATISFACTION:

Job satisfaction is a complex phenomenon. The nature and extent of factors contributing to it are not yet gully known. But, a good deal of research studies in various countries with different cultures which have accumulated by now, have certainly advanced our understanding of the factors. As we have noted, there are many factors which interact in a complex pattern to contribute to job satisfaction. We shall however confine our discussion to those which are considered as more important.

1.11.1 PERSONAL FACTORS:

Personal factors that can influence job satisfaction and work attitudes include age, sex, race, intelligence, use of skills, job experience. Although these factors can't be alerted by employing organizations, they can be used to predict satisfaction among various groups of workers.

1.11.1.1 SEX:

The research evidence about possible differences in job satisfaction between men and women employees is inconsistent and contradictory. While we don't have any distinct information about women workers in India so far, the studies in other countries have constantly shown that women workers are more satisfied with their job than are men. Ghosh
(1976) in his investigation in a synthetic jewel manufacturing factory in Gujarat found the girl operators to have greater job satisfaction than boys. The boys as a group were highly discontented and Chief Executive of the company was extremely unhappy about the fact that some "unruly element" among the boys had formed a union to press their demands. He went to the extent of exclaiming that "girls are much better than the boys as workers." In India, women have been generally discriminated against in job competition and pay. In such circumstances, the reason for great satisfaction of women may be that they have less ambitions and financial needs. In Indian studies, the males almost irrespective of the organization levels have generally been found to aspire primary for good pay, job security and opportunity for advancement. Ghosh in his study of job motivation has shown that a group of female nurses preferred friendly people to work with, good social position and a secure job as more important than and other factors in their jobs. Praharaj and Sinha (1973) compared 500 high school girls on occupational values and found the largest number (19.80 %) of girls to prefer occupation involving "social service." The second largest proportion among the girls (19.20%) preferred occupations involving god social position. In contrast, the values most popular among the boys were "job security" (21.1 %) and good pay (19.80 %).
Study of more than 6000 employees in nine Western European countries by deVaus and McAllister (1991) found no clear pattern of differences between males and females in job satisfaction. It is to be expected that this whole area may be rapidly changing, but one study of male and female college graduates joining the Prudential Insurance Company (Manhardt, 1972) found that men were more concerned with long range career objectives and women more with comfortable working conditions and good interpersonal relations. More important, perhaps, is that they did not differ on many other factors, such as degree of autonomy of the job.

Other studies have shown that sources of job satisfaction differ for women who choose a career in the business world and forced to enter the work force to support the families. It may not be gender, as much, that relates to job satisfaction as much as the group of factors that vary with sex. For example, women are typically paid less than men for the same work, and their opportunities for promotion are fewer. Most women employees believe that they have to work harder and be more outstanding on the job than men employees before they receive comparable rewards. Obviously, these factors influence job satisfaction.

1.11.1.2 AGE:

There have been two different sets of findings about age.
According to **Bass and Ryterband (1979)** one of it is that job satisfaction is relatively high for young workers, declines in middle age (the 30s and 40s), then increases again with further age. The other is that there is a steady increase in job satisfaction with age. It is well-established that younger workers are more likely to quit their jobs than older workers. A reasonable overall interpretation is that there is relatively low satisfaction at some point early in a career because expectations are not met and greater satisfaction later because expectations have been reduced.

At some point, most workers seem to realize that they have reached some limit and adjust with greater satisfaction to their situation. Very young workers may be satisfied in the belief that they are going to progress and then show a middle-age decline when they do not go as far as they had hoped. The result for the discrepant results is not understood, except perhaps as a result of studying different individuals or companies or occupational levels. A young person coming out of low school with a degree in hand might be expected to have steadily increasing job satisfaction, whereas a person in business who does not get the desired promotions might well show lower satisfaction before finally "settling in."

Indian studies in this regard have, so far, produced conflicting
results. In some groups of job satisfaction is higher with increasing age, in other groups job satisfaction is lower, and in still others there is no difference.

Sinha (1958) in his study reported regarding job satisfaction in office and manual workers in North Bihar did not find any significant difference in job satisfaction between the younger (below 30 yrs.) and older (above 30 yrs.) workers in both the group. The study of Bombay Textile Research Association (BTRA) reported in 1963, showed that job dissatisfaction of textile workers went on increasing with age.

Thus, from the consensus of the Indian studies, it can be broadly concluded that job satisfaction tends to increase with the age but in some jobs trend may be different.

1.11.1.3 TIME ON JOB:

The study of Sinha and Nair (1961) reported that workers with service of three years and less and those with service of over six years were more satisfied than workers with service of four to six years. The trend, in other words, showed a relatively high job satisfaction at start, which dropped between the fourth and six years, than rose again with greater length of service on the job. He trend broadly confirms other studies elsewhere and in India although the lowering of satisfaction after the initial high level is found usually to occur any time between the
fourth and eleventh year.

1.11.1.4 INTELLIGENCE :

Some studies in U.K and U.S.A have shown the intelligent workers to have somewhat poorer work attitudes. In an English investigation the most intelligent girls employed in a chocolate factory were found to be most easily bored.

In another study, no relationship was found between attitudes scores and intelligence. Ghosh (1976) found relationship of moderate level of intelligence with job satisfaction among the operators in a synthetic jewel manufacturing plant in Gujarat. The more intelligent were highly discontented about work conditions although physically it was most ideal to work in. Researches show that inferior than the intelligence level of the worker and challengeless work causes for dissatisfaction and superior than the intelligence level of the worker and challengeable work increase employee turnover.

On an overall analysis it appears that the relation of intelligence-job satisfaction depends on the level and range of intelligence and the challenge of the job.

1.11.1.5 EDUCATION :

Indian study have generally shown that there is a tendency for the more educated workers to be less satisfied and conversely the less
educated workers to be more satisfied. The trend possibly reflect the generally prevailing situation in Indian organizations where no company advancement or reward or reward policies in relation to education exist.

1.11.1.6 PERSONALITY :

Studies have suggested that personality is a major cause of job satisfaction. The employees who are more satisfied in their work are better adjusted and more emotionally stable. However, fairly clearer trends have been found regarding relationship between anxiety and neurotic personality characteristics and job dissatisfaction in studies in India and abroad.

In their study of Indian school teacher Mehdi and Sinha, found that while the extent of neuroticism increased, job dissatisfaction also increased in the same way. Conversely, it showed that the teachers with low neuroticism had greater job satisfaction. Jawa in a study of semi-skilled workers of a factory at Delhi found that workers with high anxiety were less satisfied with their jobs, those with low anxiety were more satisfied with their jobs, and those with moderate job satisfaction.

Some studies have shown a high correlation between satisfaction in general and dissatisfaction. Such relationship indicates the possibility that the personality traits which cause general dissatisfaction of the job may
cause dissatisfaction on the job. Two personality factors related to job satisfaction are alienation and locus of control. Thus, all these studies imply that there is a personality pattern which facilitates adjustment with environment and another which does not.

1.11.1.7 NUMBER OF DEPENDENTS:

An earlier study by Morse (1953) of white-collar workers in America indicated that the more number of dependents one has, the less satisfaction he has with the job. In Indian study, by Sinha and Nair (1961) workers having to support fewer dependants (one to four) tended to have higher job satisfaction while those with five or more dependants tended to be dissatisfied.

It is possible that the stress of greater financial need due to increase in family size widens the gap between the need and the satisfaction of it thereby bridging about greater dissatisfaction with one's job.

The need for checking further increase in population and reducing the family unit size has been greatly emphasized by the Government of India, through its plan, as a measure towards national development. Some of the Indian organizations have incorporated family planning programs in their labor welfare activities. Some Indian companies claim to
have a beneficial effect on the workers and the organization through successful family planning programs, conducted with the help of professionally trained social workers.

1.11.1.8 RACE:

Beak (1982) implies that a number of studies have reached the conclusion that blacks and whites consider the same things to be of the same relative importance in jobs but that blacks have lower job satisfaction. This would appear to be because the whites are getting more of the rewards they seek than are the blacks. Again, as in the case of women, the similarities are as important as the differences. The fact that both groups had the same general values with regard to what is in a job should cut through any "stereotypes" about racial differences in this regard.

Forgionne and Peeter (1982); Weaver (1978) suggest that more white than non-white employees report satisfaction with their jobs, although the differences typically reach statistical significance only at the managerial level. However, before a person can be concerned with job satisfaction, he or she must have a job.

Although there is a growing middle class among blacks and other ethnic minorities, large numbers of employable persons are unemployed, employed
irregularly, or too discouraged to seek employment. Many who have full-time work are confined to low-level jobs that offer marginal pay and little opportunity for advancement or fulfillment. Thus, the primary concern for many workers is not satisfaction but finding a job that pays a decent wage.

1.11.2 FACTORS INHERENT IN THE JOB:
1.11.2.1 TYPE OF WORK:

Industrial psychologists have long considered "type of work" as the most important factor inherent in a job. Studies abroad have shown that "variety in the job" causes greater job satisfaction than "routine work." Morse's (1953) study has stated that a majority of factory workers to be dissatisfied whereas a minority of professionals were dissatisfied.

The extent of differential job satisfaction and dissatisfaction among employees engaged in Indian business and industry is not fully known. Also the importance of type of work can't be separated out from such other factors as skill, pay, status, and organizational factors as personal policies, level of effectiveness of management etc. Since they are interlinked, however the indications from Indian studies are that the extent of dissatisfaction is fairly widespread among workers as well as supervisory and lower level management personnel in Indian business, industry and government administration. Thus, although the type of work must
be considered as an important determinant of job satisfaction in Indian organizations, the widely prevailing inadequate personnel policies and ineffective personnel practice may have prevented the congenial relationship to be established.

1.11.2.2 OCCUPATIONAL LEVEL OR STATUS :

As Vroom (1960) says, one of the most frequently studied correlate of job satisfaction is job level. A positive relationship between level or status of the worker's job and his job satisfaction has been reported by a large number of investigators. Gurin and his associate's (1960) findings on this point are most interest since they are recent and are based on a national sample. The results indicate substantial differences between the levels of satisfaction reported by persons in different occupational categories. Forty two percent of employed in professional-technical occupations report that they are very satisfied with their jobs as compared with only 13 percent of workers in the unskilled category. In general, reported job satisfaction level declines with occupational level. However the relatively low level of satisfaction reported by clerical and sales workers should be noted. Only 61 percent of clerical and 68 percent of sales persons state that they are very satisfied or unsatisfied with their jobs as compared with 80, 76, and 75 percent for formers, skilled, and semi-skilled workers, respectively.
Research data have generally supported initial that satisfaction increases as occupational level increases. Armstrong (1971) compared engineers with assemblers in terms of job satisfaction and found engineers to be more satisfied. In addition, he found that job-context factors (i.e., motivators or intrinsic job factors in Herzberg, et al. (1959) (two factor theory) contributed more to the satisfaction or both occupational groups than job context (hygiene) factors. He had hoped to find that lower-level workers derived their satisfaction primarily from context factors, while upper-level workers derived satisfaction from content factors. Locke and Whiting (1974) looked at the relative and absolute levels of reported job satisfaction among five occupational levels in a single industry. In addition, they found that blue-collar workers were more likely to be both satisfied and dissatisfied with context factors (weather, amount of workers, co-workers, etc.), while white-collar workers were more satisfied with context factors (responsibilities, challenge, etc.) There was also surprising finding which is worth mentioning that garbage collectors were relatively well-satisfied with their jobs as compared to equally unskilled laborers in other jobs. The moral seems to be that we can't prejudice that a given job is or is not satisfying. Stockbrokers can have low satisfaction and garbage collectors, high.

Job satisfaction increases as occupational level increases. Terkel
(1974), Study, in his book "working", quotes at length from a grave digger who thoroughly enjoys his work. It is outdoors, it is necessary, it is in a pleasant environment, and he takes pride in how well he does it. **Schultz and Schultz (1994)** also suggest that the higher the occupational or status level of a job, the higher the job satisfaction. Executives express more positive job attitudes and findings than do first-line supervisors, who, in turn, are usually more satisfied than their subordinates. The higher the job level, the greater the opportunity for the satisfaction of motivators needs and the greater are the autonomy, challenge, and responsibilities of the work. Satisfaction of **Maslow's (1943)** esteem and self-actualization needs also increase with each level in the organizational hierarchy. High job satisfaction scores have been found among entrepreneurs (self-employed persons) and employees in technical, professional, and managerial jobs. Most investigations have suggested that positive relationship between level and satisfaction is due to the fact that position at high level provides more rewards to their occupants than those at lower levels. Jobs which are high in level, either in a single organization or in society as a whole, are generally more freedom, or require less physical effort than other jobs low in level. If we are to gain any understanding of the psychological basis of the correlation between level and satisfaction, we must deal with these
different variables separately.

Occupational status and job satisfaction are related but not identical with each other. Frequently, studies show that even when the holders of specific occupations state that they are very happy with their occupations, only a few of them express their willingness to enter their present occupation again, given choice.

Baldamus (1951) found a negative relationship between the level of jobs within a single factory and the rate of turnover within this job. Vroom also found that unskilled workers change jobs more frequently than semi-skilled, which in turn change jobs more frequently than skilled workers.

Grewal (1973) compared occupational prestige held by Indians, Ethiopians and Americans and concluded as follow:

1) Government occupations are placed at the top or near the top and unskilled occupations are placed near the bottom.

2) Occupational prestige is not affected much by the economical and industrial advancement of a country.

3) The study discards the commonly had view that the occupations placed at the bottom like the street sweeper, janitor or janitress
have a standing in developed countries of the world like the U.S.A. They are placed at the bottom in the same way as in India, Ethiopia and other countries. The occupation prestige of Indian (students and faculty members in American University) as investigated by Grewal is reported as below:

**Table no. 1.11.2.2.1 Occupational prestige ranking of Indian Students and Teachers (Grewal, 1973)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diplomat foreign affairs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Governor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supreme Court Justice</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet Minister</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of Parliament</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Captain</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientist</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountant</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio Announcer</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priest</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper Columnist</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soldier</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricians</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policeman</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Teacher</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table gives only the occupational prestige ranking of Indians (Students and Faculty members in American Uni.)

There are indications that occupational status depends not only on the job itself but also on the economic, social and political, system in which a particular society operates. Russian school children, for instance, gave very low status to occupations like banker, prosperous businessman and minister which were given high status in America. Correspondently, Russian children ranked pleasant first, aviator second and physician fourth. The findings suggest that prestige values of occupations are rather general in a community.

In a traditional society in India one reckons that occupational status hierarchy and social school status have been inseparable within the context of caste system. As shown in following table, occupations of higher castes. Similarly assigned to lower caste people. The vestiges of the occupational status based on caste system still remain although our constitution, and lip services following the same, has reported to established equal opportunities for people, independent of caste, creed or religion since independence. The roots of tradition appear to be too deep to disappear soon.
Table no. 1.11.2.2.2 Traditional Indian Caste Hierarchy and Associated Occupations based on Bhagavad Geeta.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caste</th>
<th>Social Prestige Rank</th>
<th>Associated Occupations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brahmin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Priesthood, Diplomatic, Ministerial, Advisory, Higher Administrative, Scholarly, Teaching and Learned Occupations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kshatriya</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Army, Defence Forces, Police, Security Services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaishya</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Trade and Commerce, Agriculture and Farming, and Animal Husbandry, and Weaving, Pottery and Crafts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudra including</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sweepers, Cleaners, Washermen, Barber, Cattle hide processors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backward classes and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untouchables.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The caste hierarchy have not yet increased to influence in India. While the first three castes and a part of the lowest caste have forgotten some semblance of equality a large majority - of the lowest of caste - are still struggling.

1.11.2.3 SKILLED REQUIRED:

In one of the earlier studies it has been recognized that where skill exists to a considerable degree it tends to become the first source of satisfaction to the workman. The study also noted that satisfaction in conditions of work or in wages become prominent only where satisfaction in skill has materially decreased. The study of Sinha and Nair (1961) among the Indian workers has shown that skilled workers have significantly higher job satisfaction than unskilled workers.

It is also often asserted that an individual derives satisfaction from jobs which permit him to use his skills and abilities. For example, Maslow (1943) has stated:

"A musician must make music, an artist must paint, a poet must write, if he is to be ultimately happy. What a man can be. This need we may call self-actualization…"

Such a proportion is basically testable. If we assume that the extent to which a person has a particular ability is reflected in his score on a test which purports to measure that ability and that the relevance of
the ability for performance on a job is reflected in a validity coefficient of the test for that job, that we can make prediction about the relationship of abilities to satisfaction. For example, we would predict that persons receiving high scores on a test would be more satisfied than those receiving low scores if the test is positively correlated with the performance on a job.

A common complaint, particularly among college graduates in engineering and science, is that their jobs do not allow them to exercise their skills or apply the knowledge acquired during their college training. The researchers Vancouver and Schmitt (1991) found that agreement about organizational goals (goal congruence), such as increasing student's basic skills or upgrading physical resources, was positively related to job satisfaction and negatively related to intention to quit.

1.11.2.4 GEOGRAPHY:

Geography has been found to have some bearing on satisfaction and dissatisfaction of workers. In a study of U.S, it was found that people on the Pacific coast were most satisfied and those in the mountain states are the least satisfied. Other studies have shown that workers in large cities are less satisfied than those in smaller cities and towns. It is however, difficult to separate the cause of worker's satisfaction and dissatisfaction can't, however be attributed to geography alone as it is inseparable from the working condition, level of industrial development, the
political, social and economic environment, the worker's characteristics and possibly other factors as well in the regions. Still, taking all factors into account, the possibility of regional variations attributable to geography can't be carefully ruled out.

The extent and the nature of the effect of geography and satisfactions and dissatisfactions of Indian workers is not exactly known but the All India Survey (1974) by the J.B. Institute of Management Studies, Bombay University, has broadly indicated some regional variations in this regard.

For the Survey, the country was divided into four regions:

1) Western Region with Bombay and Pune as the main centers;
2) Eastern Region with Calcutta and Jamshedpur as the main centers.
3) Southern Region with Bangalore and Madras as the main centers; and, Northern Region with industries around Delhi and in Saharanpur as the main centers.

The part of the survey concerns 10 years retrospective trends in satisfaction and dissatisfaction of Indian workmen. The idea was to have a moving picture of the aspirations of workmen. Survey was conducted through small group discussion, individual interviews and questionnaires covering a representative sample of 600 workmen including factory and clerical workers.
The sample was fairly equally represented by the regions. Through a careful pilot study and consultation with experienced professionals in the field a list of 56 items was selected for the study on bases of aspirations of Indian workmen. Those 56 items were ultimately grouped in five categories such as; 1) Wage and salary; 2) Rules and practices concerning job; 3) Fringe benefits and perquisites; 4) Supervision, and 5) physical and mechanical conditions of the job.

The workmen were asked to indicate their order of inspirational priorities for 5 broad categories. The four regions separately, however, show a good deal of variation. The workmen in the northern region show a trend of maximum extent of dissatisfaction and minimum extent of satisfaction over majority of items whereas, those in the southern region show relatively the minimum extent of dissatisfaction and somewhat greater extent of satisfaction over the items among the four regions. In the trend and intensity or dissatisfaction the workmen in eastern region come next to the northern region and those in the western region and those in the come third. In fact, workmen in the northern and eastern regions do not show and distinct trend of satisfaction in any of the 19 items of "wage and salary", and fringe benefits whatsoever. Whereas the southern region shows a trend towards greater satisfaction than dissatisfaction concerning canteen, medical and sports and recreation under 'fringe
benefits’ and western region shows a similar trend on medical benefits only.

1.11.2.5 SIZE OF PLANT:

One of the abroad studies abroad has shown that morale, a combination of attitudes, in small companies in 6 percent higher than that in the large companies. There is no large scale study in Indian context so far to confirm or reject such possibility but that size but the fact is well recognized that the size of the plant has a very important influence on employee attitude.

Size of organization again, does not independently affect the employees. It affects along with management practices and various other factors. Thus, small organization can't attain effectiveness by being small alone. On the other hand, a large organization has to devise the organization structure and formulate work groupings which are suitable for its effectiveness.

The limited studies of Ghosh and Jai (1975) however indicate that larger organizations tend to be more impersonal and formalized leading to a lesser sense of participation, involvement, optimism and willingness to contribute. Smaller organizations do have an opportunity of knowing each other better and through more frequent and informal contacts and
thereby generate greater optimism, sense of involvement and willingness to contribute.

1.11.3 FACTORS CONTROLLABLE BY MANAGEMENT:
1.11.3.1 SALARY:

There has been a persistent controversy over the importance of wages to workers. Economists and many executives are prone to stress the importance of the size of the pay check in determining a worker's job satisfaction and the probability that he will remain in his job. This assumption is decried by social scientists associated with the "human relations movement" that typically view economic factors as highly overemphasized and stress the importance of the satisfaction of social and ego needs.

Both sides can find some support for their position. In a study of Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson and Capewell (1957), when workers are asked to rank different aspects of the work role in terms of their importance, wages tend to be related as less important than security, opportunity for advancement, and company and management but as more important than job content, supervision, the social aspects of the job, communication, working conditions and benefits. However, when they are asked to describe what makes them satisfied or dissatisfied with their jobs, wages are found to be the most frequent source of dissatisfaction but the
least frequent source of satisfaction, Clearly neither side to the controversy may be said to have scored a complete victory when the criteria are worker's descriptions of their motivations.

**Ganguli (1954)** argues against minimizing the importance of wages as a factor in satisfaction at least on Indian workers. He asserts that studies in private and government organizations of workers, as well as of supervisors have brought out the very first place men given to remuneration. The controversy concerning financial and non-financial factors is a pointless one. No investigator has minimized the importance of wages.

The determinants of incentive and job satisfaction may overlap but are not identical. Therefore though the wage may be looked upon as most powerful incentive, it may not occupy the same place only by itself in determining satisfaction. As a result, many factors other than wages seem to operate powerfully behind worker satisfaction. Of these, nature of supervision, job security and intrinsic character of the work itself have generally been found as significant determinants.

It may be noted that in the Indian experience meeting of such demands of wages and salary does not necessarily lead to overall employee satisfaction and favorable attitudes - and does not "buy piece". In fact,
the problems discontent are also very much evident in some of the organizations paying high rates of wages to the workers in Indian conditions. Studies have also supported to the belief the factor of wages contribute more to satisfaction than dissatisfaction of the worker. Rarely ever does a man express satisfaction with the amount of money he is making. Thus, it is also evident in Indian conditions that if the problems exist in the areas of attitudes and job satisfaction for various reasons, such as ineffective supervision and work relationship no amount of increase in wage and salary help in improving productivity. The converse is also true, that management's eagerness to improve attitude, job satisfaction and interpersonal relationship without any regard to adequate salary and financial benefit also will not lead to overall improvement in productivity.

In general, wages are more important to workers than to women workers and are generally more important to factory workers than to office workers. In an case, while inadequate earning have been evidently a cause of dissatisfaction, seemingly adequate earning have not necessarily assumed satisfaction in Indian condition.

1.11.3.2 SECURITY :

This factor deals with the steadiness of employment; it is positive
where the manager or worker feels he has a responsible chance of working under conditions of company stability. Security is a strong reason for linking a job and generally mentioned first by both men and women as contributing to job satisfaction.

Security is a job-attitude's factor which increases slightly in importance with an increase in age. There is evidence that security is less important to employees regardless of their dependents, with the possible exception of the single man who is entirely on his own.

According to Ghosh and Ghorpade (1980), "job security" is the second most important preference out of various job factors among Indian workers. In short while "getting a job" is of foremost importance "being secured on the job" is the very next requirement of the Indian workers. Security for old age does not feature in the list as it does in western structure. The security on the immediate job is possibly so pressing a need that thought of security for old age recedes to the background. Another explanation may be that traditionally it is thought in India that security in old age was expected to be dependent on the earning of one's own sons on one's own employment and earning. The situation is however changing and various retirement provisions have come into existence in view of the changing circumstances.
While security is important for both the employers to provide and the employees to get, the other side also is important to not when overdone. The failure of a financial incentive scheme and reduction in production has been traced to excessive security of workers in a study of Indian port and dock workers.

1.11.3.3 OPPORTUNITY FOR ADVANCEMENT:

What are the chances of getting ahead? This factor ranked high in importance, particularly to the person striving for upward mobility. Opportunity for advancement is quite a different problem for persons at opposite's ends of the socio-economic scale. The professional man and the executive have this factor primarily with their own individual control. To the man in middle management, however the problem of opportunity is of greater concern, for his future is largely tied in with what happens to and within his company. To the worker, advancement is related to merit, to be sure, but seniority plays a big role where union contracts are in effect. The young, ambitious, good worker may find advancement held back because of seniority agreements. Luthans (2008) said that promotional opportunities seem to have a varying effect on job satisfaction. This is because promotions take a number of different forms and have a variety of accompanying rewards. For example, individuals who are promoted on the basis of seniority often experience job satisfaction but not as much
as those who are promoted on the basis of performance. Additionally, a promotion with a 10 percent salary raise is typically not as satisfying as one with 20 percent salary raise. These differences may be more satisfying than promotions that occur at the lower levels organizations.

The results of many attitude survey show the lack of opportunity for advancement is frequently a strong reason for disliking a job, but rarely is opportunity for advancement mentioned as contributor to job satisfaction. Men are much more expressive in giving importance to this factor than are women. There is some evidence that there is a decrease in the importance of the advancement factor with increasing age. Once man has reached his "occupational level" and becomes adjusted to his situation, other factors become more important to him, length of service in a stable company, for example, Intelligence and education are substantially related to the opportunity factor.

Thus, psychologically, however, the opportunity for advancement is not viewed as promotional alone. It may also mean personal development, growth and increase in responsibility as well.

1.11.3.4 SUPERVISION :

Supervision is another moderately important source of job satisfaction. It can be said that there seem to be two dimensions of
supervisory style that affect job satisfaction. One is employee centeredness, which is measured by the degree to which a supervisor takes a personal interest and cares about the employee. It commonly is manifested in ways such as checking to see how well the employee is doing, providing advice and assistance to the individual, and communicating with the associate on a personal as well as an official level. Buckingham and Coffman (1999) say that American employees generally complaint that their supervisors don't do a very good job on these dimensions. There is considerable empirical evidence that one of the major reasons employees give for quitting a company is that their supervisor does not care about them.

Indian psychologists state that the worker's preference for a sympathetic supervisor is one of such issue where management has the onus to bring a change in such expectation of the workers for the interest of productivity of the organization on one hand and for obtaining satisfaction and involvement of the employees on the other.

The Indian studies, including the All India Survey (1974), have generally confirmed the relatively lower rank that the Indian workers give to supervision. However, it appears relevant to refer to the remark made in the J.B.I Survey that with regard to "supervision" the dominant feeling among the Indian workers in general is that of indifference - a lack of concern. The workers think that he is there for "naam ka waste"
(just for namesake) without having much to do for them. The feeling is also distinctly there that over the past decade their technical skills, knowledge, qualifications and behavior have confirmed to their satisfaction.

However, the practice of appointing them from outside without filling up the position by promotion from where he has been a major source of dissatisfaction in many case. The need supervision is not even felt by majority of workers. The feeling is as if that as long as they are nice in behaving with us and they do not impose any restriction in any way on us, they can be "tolerated."

The things that the coworkers want most in their supervisors are: his technical skill and knowledge, desirable personal qualities and, friendliness his concern for training and development of his subordinates.

However that is a slight difference between younger and older as well as between skilled and unskilled workers on the detailed preference of items within supervision. The younger (below 35) ask more for technical skill and knowledge of the supervisor whereas the older workers (above 35) ask for "friendliness" and "more personal contact" with the supervisor. The skilled workers want the supervisor to be more concerned with "training and development" of subordinates whereas the unskilled
workers are least interested in that.

Supervision seems less important at high level in spite of the fact that people in high position have a greater tendency to verbalize the things that are wrong with their supervisors more than less educated people. There is some evidence that married workers with dependents are more conscious of the problem of good supervision than a single man. Supervision is, undoubtedly, one of the most important factors related to employee attitudes and job satisfaction. Looking at whole, it may be noted again that satisfaction of employees of their major preference (except possibly pay) such as "security", "suitable type of work", "opportunity of advancement" depends upon the supervision. And, of course, we can't overlook the fact that the supervisor, in playing his many roles with the workers, is a focal point for attitude formation.

1.11.3.5 FRINGE BENEFITS :

Retirement, provisions, hospitalization, leaves, vacation, and holidays are now a fairly standard part of most jobs; there is greater uniformity throughout industry in this factor than in any of the other major factors. This factor has not been mentioned as a real contributor either to satisfaction or to dissatisfaction in the many studies of job attitudes. It is interesting to note, however, how much attention is paid by
union representatives to fringe benefits at the time of contract negotiations.

Adequate personal benefits have been given frequently moderate ranking within the Indian studies. In some studies housings as one of the personal benefits has been ranked next to pay. In fact in the more recent All India Survey of J.B.I (1974) "fringe benefits" including housing, canteen etc. are related second in importance to "wage and salary." It seems apparent that the importance of fringe benefits has not been expressed in the past by the Indian workers. However, it is also true that although the importance is felt it is not expressed in clear terms. Some benefits may also be considered as subordinates for security.

1.11.3.6 RESPONSIBILITY :

Responsibility does not usually dependently in the list of factors people want most in their jobs. It, however, is important factor which possibly gets mixed up with factors like "opportunity for advancement", "type of work", "freedom" and "challenge in jobs" and so on. In their study of job satisfaction of highly skilled personnel in a private sector electric company in Bangalore, Rao and Ganguly (1973) found "responsibility" as one of the more important factor contributing to job satisfaction.

Responsibility usually goes with security and experience on the job,
salary, type of work, participation and involvement. In some Indian studies managers have been found to have higher job satisfaction scores than workers implying that the level of satisfaction increases with level of responsibility.

Ordinarily, seeking responsibility and being happy with it may be regarded as a sigh of maturity. In a Indian workers, although the evidence of its presence is there in one form or the other, the tendency seems neither to have been effectively used by the workers themselves nor it has been encouraged to be used on the part the workers effectively by the employers.

It is understandable that in a situation where rights are readily acceptable and imposed through either fear or coercive practices, the responsibility and obligation can not be share mutually. If for instance, the employees find that they gain greater, immediate rewards by pressing their rights and demands and not as much by taking their own share of organizational responsibility choose the path of pressing their rights rather than taking responsibility. The Indian industrial environment at present is potent with such a danger.

1.11.3.7 WORK GROUP :

Mayo (1945) vigorously opposed principle of management based on the
assumption that workers were strictly "economic man." To Mayo, "man's
desire to be continuously associated in work with his fellows is a strong, if
not the strongest, human characteristic." This point of view has been
reflected in a consistent focus by Mayo and his followers at the Harvard
Business School on the influence of the face-to-face group on worker
satisfaction and productivity.

The nature of the work group or team will have an effect on job
satisfaction. Friendly, cooperative coworkers or team members are a
modest source of satisfaction. Vander Vegt and his colleagues (2001)
imply that the work group; especially a "tight" team, serves as a source
of support, comfort, advice, and assistance to the individual members.
Researches indicate that groups requiring considerable interdependence among
the members to get the job done well will have higher satisfaction. A
"good" work-group or effective team makes the job more enjoyable.
However, this factor is not essential to job satisfaction. On the other
hand, if the reverse conditions exist - the people are difficult to get
along with - this factor may have a negative effect on job satisfaction.
Cross-culture research of Kirkman and Shapiro (2001) have found that if
members are resistant to teams in general and self managed in particular,
they will be less satisfied than if they welcome being part of teams.

May be this is not an important requirement of the Indian workers
who are bothered with self-seeking survival and growth need like salary, security, and advancement. But occasionally the Indian studies have shown the preferences of workers for this. In Ghosh's (1972) study of nurses preferences, for instance, the item friendly to work with features fairly high in the list. Ghosh in another study, also found that "friendly people to work with" was ranked fairly high by better performers, whereas it was ranked law by poorer performers.

1.11.3.8 WORKING CONDITION:

Working conditions have a modest effect on job satisfaction. If the working conditions are good (clean, attractive surroundings, for instance), the personnel will find it easier to carry out their jobs. If the working conditions are poor (hot, noisy surroundings, for example), personnel will find it more difficult to get things done. In other words, the effect of working conditions on job satisfaction is similar to that of the work group. If things are good, they may or may not be a job satisfaction problem; if things are poor, there very likely will be.

Gilmer (1971) says that temperature, lighting, ventilation, parking facilities, cafeteria, toilets, and the like are always a place affording criticism when the employee wishes to let off steam. Actually this factor has been found to make an equally low contribution to both
satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Working conditions are substantially more important to women than to men. Hours are more important to men than any other specific aspect of working conditions; but among women, especially married women, this aspect has even more significance. The more educated and higher level employee, hours are almost negligible in importance. Few, if any, executives work the limited hours of the union man! To workers in hazardous jobs, safety conditions are almost important; but when they are ranked with nine other job factors, working conditions come in next to last.

In All India Survey (1974), also the physical and medical conditions of work has been ranked low in preference by Indian workmen. The overall trend from dissatisfaction or lesser satisfaction to greater satisfaction over the past decade (prior to 1973) is quite clear implying improvement which has taken place in working conditions over the period. The dominant aspirations are for "temperature", and "ventilation", and "safety" with "cleanliness" and "conditions of machines and tools" following. The concern for "better conditions of machines and tools" appears to be greater in younger and skilled workers than older workers in general while the concern for 'safety' is greater in older workers than in the younger ones.

Today's organizations are trying to make conditions more
supportive and more discriminatory unthreatening. Tait et al. (1989) have also found a positive relation between satisfaction and life satisfaction. Judge and Watanabe (1993) add that the direction of causality is that people who are satisfied with their lives tend to find more satisfaction in their work.

1.11.3.9 COMMUNICATION:

An old military expression which says that "there is always someone who does get the word" is expressive but hardly a complete definite of the factor of communication. The lack of good communication may be a reason for disliking a job, but it is never a specific reason for liking a job. What, then, is really meant by communication? To be sure, it means the formalities of covering information, giving orders, turning out annual reports. But to the employee it also means being listened to, receiving recognition, as far as feeling go, means, the opposite of being ignored. The factor of communication seems to be more important at the educational level.

First-line supervisors list that lack of good communication as one of their chief annoyances. Perhaps this is because they feel that they are "told" by higher management rather than "conferred with." In one company an attitude survey was made among 120 foremen. When asked to describe
their biggest problem, most of these supervisors listed communication. In a few months these men were brought together to discuss company policies and problems. After a one-day session they returned to their jobs. One year later when they were asked to identify their problems, communication was far down list. A follow-up study showed that merely being brought together and asked for views on company problems and made the men feel that communication was now good. Recognition that he is a part of management may well be what the supervisor wants when he asks for improved communication.

1.11.3.10 HOURS OF WORK:

One of the properties of the work role which has obvious implications for the non-work environment is the work schedule or pattern of normal working ours during which the person is expected to be performing his regular duties at his place of work. Although the majority of workers in our society works from early morning to late afternoon, Monday through Friday, and have week ends and major holidays "off", this is by no means the only pattern. There are many different kinds of work schedules, some requiring night work (12:00 P.M to 8:00 A.M), and still other requiring the worker from one set of working hours to another.
The work role occupied by a person affects not only how he will use his working hours but also how he can spend his leisure time. A person's job usually influences the community in which he lives, the way in which other members of the community respond to him, and the amount of time he can spend with his children. The implications of work roles for use of leisure have generally been overlooked in studies of job satisfaction. With the exception of wages, which certainly affect how a person can use his leisure hours, little is known about the non-work environments associated with various kinds of work roles and the effect of these non-work environments on satisfaction and adjustment.

The increased capital investment associated with automation and consequent pressures to make greater use of equipment is resulting in the employment of greater number of persons on what is called "shift work." Evidences concerning the effects of shift work on worker satisfaction are incomplete, but there are indications that these effects depend on the personality of the individual personality.

In a study of Blakelock (1959), Canadian Oil refinery, only 13 percent of the shift workers expressed dissatisfaction with shift work. Furthermore, shift workers reported significantly greater satisfaction with their jobs than non-shift workers. A large multi-industry study of the effects of shift work has recently been conducted by staff members of
The Institute for Social Research of the University of Michigan. One of the purposes of this investigation was to test hypothesis about the effects of discordance. Unfortunately, at the time of this writing, the results are still being analyzed and no information concerning them has been released.

1.12 THEORIES OF JOB SATISFACTION:

Often job satisfaction is treated as if it were the same as or very similar to work motivation. For example, it is not uncommon to treat both topics in a single chapter. It should be clear from our discussion so far that we consider the two topics quite distinct. Job satisfaction is concerned with the "feeling" one has toward the job, and work motivation is concern with the "behavior" that occur on the job. Nevertheless, it is not clear differentiated. This occurs for two reasons. First, satisfaction is a hedonic response of liking or disliking the attitude object. Also, it is often assumed that individuals will approach those things with which they are satisfied. As a result, Job satisfaction is frequently associated with job behaviors just as motivation is. Second, most theories of motivation have an underlying hedonic assumption that individuals are motivated to seek that which is pleasant to them. As a result, many theories of motivation are also considered, at least in part, theories of job satisfaction.
Theories of job satisfaction involve motivational, emotional and informational components, as do other attitude theories. We will suggest some general orientations toward job satisfaction, all of which describe the process by which job satisfaction is determined for individuals.

1.12.1 TWO-FACTOR THEORY:

More than forty years ago Herzberg et al. (1959) were intrigued with the question, "what do people want from their jobs?" Using the critical incident technique they asked a group of two hundred accountants and engineers from Pittsburg to recall and describe incidents and situations that made them feel particularly good or bad about their jobs. The responses were later categorized and tabulated. Surprisingly, they found that satisfaction and dissatisfaction stemmed from two different sources and, therefore, his approach is popularly referred to as the two-factor theory of job satisfaction.

Herzberg concluded that in general employees were satisfied with aspects of their jobs that had to do with the work itself or to outcomes directly resulting from it. These included six factors - work itself, advancement, growth, recognition, achievement and responsibility. Since these variables were associated with high levels of satisfaction, Herzberg referred to them as motivators. However, dissatisfaction was relate to extrinsic
factors (working conditions, supervision, salary, company policies, job security, status relationship with supervisors, subordinates and peers, and factors and personal life). Because these variables generated dissatisfaction when present they are referred to as hygiene or maintenance factors. Herzberg's theory gained popularity partly because it contradicted the common assumption about the relationship between satisfaction and dissatisfaction. He conceived satisfaction and dissatisfaction as separate variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOB SATISFACTION</th>
<th>JOB DISSATISFACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOTIVATORS</td>
<td>HYGIENE FACTORS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Work itself</td>
<td>0 Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Advancement</td>
<td>0 Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Growth</td>
<td>0 Job security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Recognition</td>
<td>0 Relation with supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Responsibility</td>
<td>Subordinates &amp; peers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Achievement</td>
<td>0 Company policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 Working conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 Factors in personal life</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. no. 1.12.1.1: Herzberg’s (1959) Two-factor theory
Thus Herzberg suggested that the opposite of 'satisfaction' is 'no dissatisfaction' and the opposite of 'dissatisfaction' is 'no satisfaction'. According to Herzberg's theory, therefore, motivators when present at high levels contribute to job satisfaction, however, when absent do not lead to job dissatisfaction just less satisfaction. Similarly, hygiene factors only contribute to dissatisfaction when present but no to satisfaction when absent.

Research testing Herzberg's theory has produced mixed results; some studies have corroborated that Herzberg's findings while other documented that hygiene and motivators had strong effects on both satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Herzberg's theory has attracted voluminous research in India also with the attempt being mostly to negotiate the theory in India using different samples and measurement methods. The findings are again conflicting. In some studies like Sutaria (1980), the two-factor theory holds good, while in others it does not (Sarveswara and Rao, 1973).

This theory has been heavily criticized for its for its methodology (Schwab and Cummings 1970). Besides, while Herzberg assumed a correlation between satisfaction and productivity in his methodology, he measured only satisfaction and not productivity. Nevertheless, Herzberg's
work is useful in illustrating the condition of a job that the employees find satisfying and dissatisfying. Machungaws and Schmitt (1983) say that Herzberg's theory has also stimulated considerable research and theory on job enlargement and enrichment.

1.12.2 THE VALUE THEORY or INSTRUMENTALITY THEORY:

The second significant theory of job satisfaction is the value theory proposed by Locke (1984) suggests that the individual calculate the degree to which the job is satisfying by considering the job leads to valued outcomes. It is assumed that the individuals have a set of judgments about how much they value certain outcomes such as pay, a promotion, or good working conditions. They estimate the extent the context to which holding the job leads to each of these outcomes. Finally, by weighting the perceived value or attractiveness of each outcome in the set, the individual arrives at an estimate of the satisfaction he or she feels will come from the job. This process, labeled instrumentality theory for its emphasis on the extent to which the job is instrumental to producing satisfaction. He proposed that job satisfaction occurs when the job outcomes or the reward that the employee receives matches with outcomes that are desired by him, the theory focuses any outcome that people value regardless of their quality. This, the value attached to outcome is more important. The better the outcome that they get, the
more satisfied will be; and the less satisfied they will be; and the less valuable outcome they receive, the less satisfied they will be. Essential to Locke's (1984) theory there is, therefore, the discrepancy between the present aspects of the job and those that an employee desires such as pay, learning opportunities, promotion, and so on.

Although the notion of instrumentality appears to be important to motivation. First, it leads to focus on the future rather than on the present or on the past. Most of the concern is with anticipated satisfaction using an instrumental view, whereas, job satisfaction is a present - or past - oriented concept. Second, weighting each outcome by its instrumentality is a very complicated cognitive process which may be more complex than the process that human beings usually apply. Finally, one still is left with the question how the valences were formed by the individual. Because of its future orientation, complexity, and need to explain issues of valences, it has no received wide spread acceptance as a view of satisfaction.

Thus, job satisfaction is said to be high to the extent that the job is instrumental in getting the worker what he or she values, or wants from the job. This might be pleasure in the work, security, prestige, money, short hours, autonomy, convenient location, or anything else considered valuable. Locke's value theory has been substantiated by a study of McFarlin and Rice.
(1992). One of the valuable implications of the theories is that is focuses attention on those aspects of jobs that need to be changed for employees to experience satisfaction. People perceive serious discrepancies between the job and job satisfaction. But it also suggests that these factors may not be the same for all.

In addition to these two theories of job satisfaction, there are quite a few others some of the significant one's are briefly presented below.

1.12.3 COMPARISON PROCESS:

The most widely accepted view of job satisfaction assumes that the degree of affect experienced results from some comparison between the individual's standard and that individual's perception of the extent to which the standard is met. The amount of the size of the discrepancy between the standard and what is believed to be received form the job. Vroom (1964) labeled this view a 'substractive' theory of job satisfaction.

There is one issue with regard to the comparison process view of job satisfaction. This is the specification of what is used as the standard to which the job is compared. Some have argued that the individual's need serve as a standard (Morse, 1953; Porter, 1962-63). Locke (1976)
believes that the individual's values, rather than needs, serves as a standard. Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969) in their development of a popular job satisfaction measure, the Job Descriptive Index (JDI), considered the cognitive state of an individual's frame-of-reference as the standard to which the job is compared. The evidence seems to show that both values and frames-of-reference serve as standards more than needs.

Thus, the individual is said to have some reference standard against which he or she judges the actual job. Locke says that is then gender or lesser depending on the size and direction of the difference. If the real job is better than the referent, there is a positive attitude and high satisfaction. But if the job is worse than the referent, there is a negative attitude and low satisfaction. For example, construction workers might find much satisfaction in a job which lasts for several years, is indoors, and has a boss who is not too bossy. This is an contrast to a reference job (the worker's idea of a typical construction job) which might be short-lived, requires out door in winter, and has strict supervision.

1.12.4 SOCIAL INFLUENCE :

Salansic and Pfeffer (1977) questioned comparison theories of job
satisfaction and suggested that perhaps people decide how satisfied they are with their job not by processing all kind of information about it but by observing others on similar jobs and making inferences about other's satisfaction. In a similar Weiss and Shaw (1979) suggest than an individual simple infers a level of his or her own satisfaction from observing others. In a sense they are saying that individuals may come into a new job not knowing how satisfied they will be with it. They look around, see others like themselves who are satisfied (or dissatisfied) with it, and these observations influence how satisfied (or dissatisfied) they are with their jobs.

Research by White and Mitchell (1979) and Weiss and Shaw (1979) showed that people indeed are influenced by their perceptions of others satisfaction. Weiss and Show had people first view a training film showing others working on an electrical assembly task. The films showed others either working on an interesting or on a boring task. While working on the task, those in the film made identical comments which indicated that they liked the task (for example, "this task is ok" or "I don't mind doing this at all") or that they held a neutral position toward the ask. Following the film, the participants in the study worked on the same task they saw demonstrated in the film. (Either the interesting one or the boring one) and rated their degree of satisfaction. The results clearly
showed that the feelings about the task were influenced by other's reactions as well as by properties of the task itself.

Social influence theory of job satisfaction is interesting because it recognizes the social nature of work and suggests a way of determining job satisfaction that has been ignored for a long time. It seems obvious that those social factors do influence satisfaction and that they deserve more attention than they have received in the past.

1.12.5 EQUITY THEORY:

Equity theory also contains a social element in which the individual compares his or her inputs and out comes to those of others. Adam (1963) argues that people compare the ratio of their out come over input with the ratio of other's out come over input. If their ratio is greater than or lesser than that of the others, they feel dissatisfaction because inequity has occurred. However to feel satisfied with job, the ratio should be equal to that significant others.

The evidence seems to indicate that equity norms do operate and that overpayment inequity can exist (for example, Prichard, 1972) and others). Because the conditions occurs relatively infrequently and because it is uncertain how long individuals will continue to experience overpayment inequity before adjusting their point of view to allow them to receive the
same returns without feeling over compensated, it does not appear to us that an equity framework controls a major portion of the job satisfaction variance.

People generally want to get what they consider a fair (equitable) return for their behavior. This suggests there is greater job satisfaction if the worker perceives that the return for his or her work is equitable. To illustrate, the author listened to the complaint of a steel assembly worker about having to do some welding one day when the regular welder was sick. His complaint was not that he disliked welding or that it was more difficult than his regular job. Rather he was dissatisfied because welders earn more than his job paid and he considered it unfair that he be asked to weld but be paid at his regular rate. Equity of course, can involve much more than money, a worker might get a little without increased pay and consider this valuable and fair.

What about the converse, however, the situation where a worker gets 'more' than is 'deserve' for a job? According to equity theory the worker should feel the pressure of this inequity in his favor as well as inequity in his favor. There is in fact some direct evidence. Workers in an experimental setting who believed they were overpaid for their work did work harder than others who did not believe they were overpaid. What may happen in practice, however, is that people "adapt"
to "overpayment" so that the perceived inequity no longer exists.

Mirza (2003) says that though the basis of their comparison is one's perception, the fact remains that the organization must attempt to bring about equity to avoid the feeling of dissatisfaction. One of the criticisms of the theory is that it is imprecise because there are alternate ways of dealing with feelings of inequity. However, an important implication of this theory is that employees need to feel that they are fairly dealt with in order to feel satisfied.

1.12.6 THE OPPONENT PROCESS MODEL OF JOB SATISFACTION:

Initiating some change in job may increase worker satisfaction about it is not necessary that the increase in satisfaction will remain same over time. This is because constant input does not result in constant output. The process of adaptation implies that a constant input will have a decreasing output. The notion was applied to the concept of job satisfaction in the opponent process theory by Landy (1978) He applied this idea to the goal-setting theory and asserted that in the beginning of his/her career, an employee will resist goal-setting. But as experience with goal-setting as well as goal-attainment increases, resistance shall decrease. Consequently, pleasure from goal-attainment must also increase. The broad implication of this is that interventions intended to
increase job satisfaction may not necessary became popular of their introduction, says Chimel (2000).

1.12.7 CONCLUSION ABOUT THEORIES :

Of the theories presented, comparison process views seem to be the most important. That is, they appear to explain more variance in job satisfaction than other points of view do. Neither the social influence nor equity vies should be over looked, however. These seem to influence job satisfaction over and about the comparison process. Also, in settings in which social comparisons are quite prominent, these processes may in fact dominate. Comparative research on different theories is sorely lacking and is needed for firm conclusions.