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INTRODUCTION

Many researches in Industrial psychology are centered on job satisfaction and occupational stress. Even though in India, the scientific study began as early as 1920, but in the post independence period significant researches in Industrial Psychology started for the measurement of job satisfaction. In India many factories are established in a big cities but very few factories are working in the rural areas. The workers working in rural factories are facing many problems stress is one of the major problems. In the present study an attempt has been made to measure job satisfaction, job stress and mental health among the workers working in the rural factories.

Job satisfaction is one of the most crucial but controversial issues in Industrial Psychology and Behavioral Management in organization. Because of rapid changes in technology have brought in changes customs and in moral standards. As we progress towards the end of 20th century there will be a significant change in the make up and set up of our entire industrial work force. This workforce includes managerial personnel also, as they want work which gives them more security, higher responsibility greater opportunities, less routine work and

1
higher pay pockets.

In fact job satisfaction is the result of various attitudes possessed by an employee. These attitudes are related to the job and are concerned with condition of work, wages, supervision, fair evaluation of work, social relations on the job, prompt settlement of grievances and other similar items.

As job satisfaction is a more controversial issue, so it should be understood completely. For this purpose a more comprehensive approach requires many additional factors to be included before a complete understanding of Job Satisfaction i.e. age of the employee, his temperament, health, desires and level of aspiration should be added. Further number of dependents, and family relationships, social status, occupational status etc. factors contribute to job satisfaction.

In short, Job satisfaction is a general attitude which is the result of many specific attitudes in three areas—namely

1) Specific job factors,
2) Individual characteristics
3) Group relationship outside the job

The most important need of an organization is to achieve the effective utilization of the resources that the organization has got at its disposal. Men, money and Material have been classified as the principal resources. From the all these three resources, the
most important source which needs to be taken care of properly in the handling of its workforce is men. If the workforce in an organization is properly looked after and understood and if their primary needs are properly cared, studied, and met, then these are the people who can take the organization to the maximum height of glory and achievement.

Many valuable researches have been contributed for the study of job satisfaction unlike the concept of morale, job Satisfaction is more amenable to precise definition. The credit for bringing this term into currency goes to Hoppock (1935).

HOPPOCK STUDY:

One of the early community-wide survey was conducted by Hoppock in the town New Hope, Pennsylvania (1935). In the epilogue to his study on Job Satisfaction Hoppock proposes the following six major components of Job Satisfaction.

1) The way the individual reacts to unpleasant situations.
2) The facility with which he adjusts himself to other persons.
3) His relative status in the social and economic group which he identifies himself.
4) The nature of the work in relation to his abilities, interests and preparation.
5) Security.
6) Loyalty.
The study of Job Satisfaction is closely related to the question 'why do people work'? or what does a worker want from a job? Since Hoppock's monograph on Job Satisfaction (1935) a great deal of research has been directed towards identifying factors that influence Job Satisfaction. The simplest answer to the question, 'why does a man work'? Would be to satisfy his needs. All behaviour serves some purpose and satisfies some needs.

The term Job Satisfaction came in vogue in 1935 with the publishing of a book 'Job Satisfaction' by Hoppock. Since then the number of investigators in this field have defined the term Job Satisfaction. Hoppock was the first industrial psychologist to provide the concept of Job Satisfaction. Hoppock defined Job Satisfaction 'as any combination of Psychological, Physiological and environmental circumstances that causes a person truthfully to say, I am satisfied with the job.' This concept has been redefined and reformulated in many different ways since Hoppock (1935) gave his 'logical' definition. In 1969, Crites J.O. in his 'vocational psychology' has taken job attitudes. Job satisfaction, vocational satisfaction and moral all together and has attempted to analyse their nature. He observes that if it is some specific aspect of the job such as duties and task or working conditions. Then the concept which is defined would be job attitudes. If it is the overall job in which the individual is presently employed, then the concept would be Job Satisfaction. If it is the type of work
in which the individual has been trained and/or has gained experience in several jobs (two or more) then the concept would be vocational satisfaction. And if the referent includes the work group and or employing organization as well as French, Kornhauser and Marrow (1946) compiled a list of 'on-the-job' and 'off-the-job' factors which were found by various investigators as underlying causes of satisfaction and dissatisfaction of workers. These are:

i) Factors in the individuals ability, health, age, temperament, desires and exceptions, neurotic tendencies unconscious conflict etc.

ii) Factors in life away from work. Home conditions, recreations, consumer problems, labour union activities, socio-political economical conditions etc.

iii) Factors in employment relations: Wages or earnings, steadiness of employment. Transfer, lay off and rehiring procedures, kind of work performed, supervision training, conditions of work, opportunities for advancement, opportunity to use ability, social relationships on the job, recognition and their evaluation of work, opportunities for participation, free interchange of ideas, prompt and fair settling of grievances, understanding and respect by employer.

The above classification suggest that workers' satisfaction does not arise merely from factors on the job but runs the whole
gamut of man's needs and aspiration.

Morse N.C. (1953) point out that satisfaction from a job is a function not only of how much a worker receive from the job or the environment, but also of where he stands with respect to his level of aspiration. Morse (1953) considered Job Satisfaction a function of (1) job counted (2) Identificatgion with the company (3) Financial and job status, and (4) Pride in group performance.

HERZBERG and his Associates (1957) in their review of job attitude studies, revealed ten major factors constituting Job Satisfaction with nearly 150 specific factors. The major factors are as follows:

i) intrinsic aspects of job
ii) supervision
iii) working conditions (iv) security (v) wages (vi) opportunity for advancement (vii) company and management (viii) social aspect of job (ix) communication and (x) benefits.

Blum (1952) and Blum and Naylor (1968) considered J.S. as a resultant of many attitudes possessed by a worker. It 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. Schaffer's (1953) theory of also throws some light on the nature of this concept. He observed that "Overall satisfaction will vary directly with the extent to which those needs of an individual which can be
satisfied in a job are actually satisfied, the stronger the need, the more closely will job satisfaction depend on its fulfilment."

Bullock (1952) considered Job Satisfaction as "an attitude which results from a balancing and summation of many specific likes and dislikes experienced in connection with the job. These evaluations may rest largely upon one's own success or failure in the achievement of personal objectives and upon the prescribed contribution of the job and company toward these ends." Smith (1955) suggest that Job Satisfaction is "the employee's judgement of how well his job on the whole is satisfying his various needs."

Siegel (1962) on the basis of his review of Job Satisfaction studies came to the conclusion that all the results may be conveniently grouped under two headings on the basis of their pertinence to factors (i) intrinsic or (ii) extrinsic to the job itself. Factors intrinsic to job include pay, job security, participation and personal recognition, hours and working conditions and occupational status. Among factors extrinsic to job are perceptions about supervision, sex, age, level of intelligence job experience or length of service and personal adjustment. "Job Satisfaction", as suggested by Ghiselli and Brown (1955) "has many different points of reference, and few workers indeed are satisfied with all aspects of their jobs."
Worthy (1950) found Job Satisfaction to be a composite of the following six factors:
i) company in general (ii) the local organization (iii) local management (iv) Immediate supervision (v) co-workers and (vi) working conditions.

Tiffin and McCormic (1962) have suggested that to understand human behaviour it is always desirable to have some idea about the sets of values by which people live and about the satisfaction associated with the type of work they do. On the problem of Job Satisfaction they observed that "Job Satisfaction is influenced both by the extent to which the work of a person does is intrinsically interesting to him and by his attitude toward the total work situation including the company, his supervisor and his fellow workers. In short, Job Satisfaction is governed to a large extent, by perceptions and exceptions. Men work to satisfy their needs and they aspire or to except their work life - to fulfill these needs. For perfect Job Satisfaction there should exist a one to one relationship between the perception of how well the job life fulfills various needs and exceptions or aspirations of the individual and the extent to which these needs are actually fulfilled. Any discrepancy between aspirations and perceptions accounts for dissatisfaction. As mentioned earlier, the perceived or imagined judgement of how well the job life is satisfying the various needs, accounts for the degree of Job Satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

Keeping in view of the above framework, Job Satisfaction was
taken as a summation of feelings in four important areas. Two of these areas encompass factors directly connected with the job (intrinsic factors) and the other two include factors not directly connected with the job but which have presumed to have a bearing on Job Satisfaction. These four areas with their related "aspects" are as follows: i) Job: Nature of work: dull, dangerous, interesting. (ii) Hours of work (iii) Fellow workers, opportunities on the job for promotion and advancement, overtime regulations, interest in work, physical environment, machines and tools etc.

In this connection Super and Zest (1951) establish beyond doubt that the factors mentioned above are vital to the study of Job Satisfaction.

JOB SATISFACTION AND JOB BEHAVIOUR:

Something about the dimensions of Job Satisfaction their relative importance varies as a function of the particular reference group. As yet we have not considered the degree to which Job Satisfaction is related to other aspects of work behaviour.

Vroom (1964) has done an excellent job of examining the relationship between Job Satisfaction and various aspects of job behaviour and summarised his findings. Vroom categorized studies in terms of which job behaviours are correlated with Job Satisfaction. Specifically he grouped them into studies of turnover, absenteeism, accidents and job performance.
SATISFACTION AND JOB PERFORMANCE.

While each of the above categories was concerned with job related behaviour and Job Satisfaction none of them is directly concerned with actual job performance, that is how well the worker actually accomplishes his assigned tasks. For example a worker may be absent a great deal but still do his job quite well. Does Job Satisfaction have any relationship to actual job performance? The available evidence seems to indicate that no such relationship exists. This was first brought dramatically into focus by Brayfield and Crockett (1955) who examined all research relating job satisfaction to job performance up to that time and concluded that there was virtually no evidence of any relationship between these two variables.

This of course is a rather critical finding for those who support the general "human relations" notion that a satisfied worker is a more productive worker.

THEORIES OF JOB SATISFACTION.

According to McCormick and Tiffin(1965) the study of human behaviour is carried out at two levels. One of these is descriptive (or empirical), in the sense of characterizing or demonstration the existence of certain relationships or phenomena (such as demonstrating that feedback contributes to learning). The other is explanatory (or theoritical), in the sense of offering
possible explanations or theories relating to the 'why' of such relationships or phenomenon.

Several different theories exist concerning the dynamics of Job Satisfaction and its general impact on work behaviour. The more prominent ones are discussed below:

1) Vroom's theory of work motivation:-

Vroom (1964) has given Valence force thory. In his theory he has used the basic concept of valence as a key notion. According to him, valence is the 'attractiveness of a goal or outcome.' In another words, it is, 'the anticipated satisfaction from an outcome.' Vroom has outlined two propositions.

PROPOSITIONS: 1- The desire (valence) for any particular objective (outcome) on the part of the individual is directly related to the likelihood (instrumentality) that the objective will in turn lead to other subsequent objectives of given desirability (valence).

PROPOSITIONS: 2- Simply states that the greater the valence of any outcome, the more apt is a person to take action. According to Vroom, an individual's level of performance is determined by his preference for a particular goal. For example, assume that an individual desires promotion and feels that superior performance is a very strong factor in achieving that goal. This first level outcomes are then superior, average or poor performance. His preferred second level outcome is promotion through hard work, through there can be several other second level outcomes also such as salary, social approval, self-esteem etc. According to Vroom,
what an individual does, will depend on a three step thorough process:

How important are the various second level outcomes? (valence).
Will the first level outcome lead to the second level outcome? (Instrumentality).
Will existing effort in fact achieve high performance? (Expectancy).

Although Vroom's theory does not directly contribute to techniques of motivating personnel in an organization, yet it is of value analysing organizational behaviour. Here job satisfaction reflects valence of the job for its incumbent and that the strength of the force on a worker to remain on his job, is an increasing function of the valence of his job. Thus, satisfaction should be negatively related to turnover and absenteeism. But the relationship between job satisfaction and productivity is difficult to predict with this model.

2) MASLOW'S THEORY: (Hierarchy of needs).

Maslow (1943) has proposed an interesting theory concerning human needs and their effect upon human behaviour. Maslow has stated 'that 'man is a wanting animal' His needs are never satisfied. The moment his one need is satisfied, the next need appears in its place and there is no end to it. This process is unending. It continues from birth to death. Still there are some
basic needs, which Maslow has postulated as hierarchy of needs. According to Maslow, human needs can be classified into Five categories as under:

1) PHYSIOLOGICAL NEEDS:

These needs are prepotent of all the needs. For a starving man matters other than food, are of no significance whatsoever. Very often the physiological needs are intertwined with the non-physiological needs e.g. if a man who has enough to eat may desire to have a cup of coffee which is actually not required to fill up his hunger, but it is only a requirement for a feeling to relax a to have a little chat with the friends.

2) SAFETY NEEDS.

Once the physiological needs are relatively well met, there emerges a new set of needs which are categorized generally as safety needs. These needs are generally concerned with protection against danger, threat and deprivation. Protection against physical dangers are of less consequences now, in our Civilization, than was the case in the past. On the other hand, in an industrial society the safety needs may take on considerable importance in the context of the dependent relationship of employees to employers. As pointed by McGregor(1957) - the safety needs may serve as motivators in such circumstances as arbitrary management actions, behaviour which arouses uncertainty with
respect to continued employment, and unpredictable administration of policy.

3) SOCIAL NEEDS:

When the physiological needs of a person are satisfied and he is no more fearful about his physical welfare, his social needs become important motivators of his behaviour. These are needs of belonging, for association, for acceptance by his fellows, for giving and receiving friendship and love. Social needs refer to belongingness. These are the needs of affectionate relations with other individuals and needs for having a recognised place as a group member. All individuals want to associate with others to gain acceptance and to give and receive friendship from them. People do not work for money alone but also companionship. Cohesive informal groups indicate that employees have found an outlet for their social needs.

4) THE EGO NEEDS:

Next in the hierarchy are the ego needs. McGregor distinguishes two kinds (1) Those needs that relate to one's self-esteem, need for self confidence, for achievement, for competence, for knowledge, and (2) Those that relate to one's reputation - needs for status, for recognition, for appreciation, for the deserved respect of one's fellows. In contrast with the lower needs, the ego needs are rarely fully satisfied. The needs however usually do not become dominant until the lower needs have been
5) SELF-ACTUALIZATION NEEDS:

Finally on the top of the hierarchy of human needs are the needs for 'self-actualization' or self-fulfillment. These needs relate to realizing one's own potentialities for continued self-development, for being creative in the broadest sense of the term. This is the need to achieve one's full capacity for doing to fulfil one-self by maximising the use of abilities, skills and potential. The term 'self-actualization' was coined by Kurt-Goldstein and means become actualised in what one is potentially good at. A person may achieve self-actualization being the ideal in fitter supervisor, mother or an eminent enlist.

1) As the name suggests, these needs are arranged in a lowest to the highest hierarchy. Unless the lower order needs are first. Even partially satisfied, the satisfaction of higher order needs will not be possible. Thus physiological needs have to be satisfied before we can think of security. Security and physiological needs have to be satisfied, before one moves to the social needs and so on. Satisfaction refers to the percentage that should be satisfied before the next higher needs emerge and demand satisfaction. The percentage will be different from individual to individual, situation to situation and in the same individual vary in different situations.

2) As suggested above, a satisfied need is no motivator of behaviour. Once a need is fully satisfied, it does not remain a
potential motivator. Only unsatisfied or partially needs motivate behaviour.

3) Since the theory assumes that human beings are 'normal' exceptions to the general ranking of the need hierarchy will exist. A highly motivated artist may forgo his needs for food and shelter to complete a painting which might satisfy his ego or self-actualization needs.

4) A behaviour may be motivated by several needs at a given time, those on of the fix needs will predominate in causing his behaviour. One need may lead to different kinds of behaviour in different situations. Deprivation of need may lead to aggression, assertion, compliance, shrewdness etc. Therefore, it may be difficult to segregate need from behaviour.

5) Maslow also points out that though satisfaction of higher order needs can be preponed, their satisfaction leads to greater biological efficiency. Organizations should motivate their employees to attain the higher levels, when they perform more meaningfully.

Man works to satisfy his needs. Job which are able to satisfy more of the Maslow needs would be jobs affording greater satisfaction on the part of the employees.

III) HERZBERG'S TWO FACTOR THEORY OF JOB SATISFACTION.

The most popular two factor theory explaining the dynamics of job satisfaction is proposed by Herzberg, Mausner and Synderman (1959) This theory suggest a non-linear relationship between
men's performance and environment. It tests the concept that man has two sets of needs; the need to avoid pains and needs to grow psychologically. It proposes that job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction are two independent and distinct experiences and that one is not the obverse of the other. The theory implies that both the outer needs of man and the inner needs for creative survival should be satisfied to induce involvement with his job and to obtain the maximum output from him.

According to Herzberg (1959), man has two different categories of needs which are essentially independent of each other and affect behavior in different ways. When people feel dissatisfied about their job, they are concerned about the environment in which they are working. On the other hand, when people feel good about their job, this has to do with the work itself. Herzberg calls the first category of needs as hygienic factors, because they describe man's environment and serve the primary function of preventing job dissatisfaction. He calls the second category of needs as motivators, since they seem to be effective in motivating people to superior performance. Hygienic factors include company policies and administration, supervision, working conditions, interpersonal relations. Money, status and security. Motivational factors include achievement, recognition increased responsibility, challenging work, growth and development.

The original study was concerned with an investigation of
factors causing job satisfaction and dissatisfaction amongst engineers and accountants. The approach was to ask engineers and accountants, to think a time, when they felt specially good about their job and a time when they felt specially bad about their jobs and to describe the conditions which led to those feelings. Herzberg found that employees named different types of conditions for good and bad feelings i.e. if a feeling of achievement applied to a good feeling, lack of achievement was rarely given as cause for bad feelings.

Herzberg (1959) concluded that some job conditions operate primarily to dissatisfy employees. When they are absent, but when they are present, they do not motivate employees in a strong way. These dissatisfiers are called hygienic of maintenance factors in the job, because they are necessary to maintain a reasonable level of satisfaction in employees. Another set of job conditions operate primarily to build motivation and high job satisfaction, but their absence proves strongly dissatisfying. These conditions are known as motivational factors or satisfiers. The original Herzberg (1959) study included the following motivational factors:

1. Achievement.
2. Recognition.
3. Work itself.
4. Possibility of growth.
5. Responsibility.
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The following were the various maintenance factors:

1. Company policy & Administration.
2. Technical supervision.
3. Interpersonal relations with supervisors.
4. Interpersonal relations with peers and subordinates.
5. Salary.
7. Personal life.
8. Working conditions.

Motivational factors such as achievement and responsibility mostly and directly related to job itself, the employees performance on it and the recognition and growth that is secured from it. Motivators are mostly job centered; they relate to job context. Maintenance factors are related to the environment external to the job. Thus environment include, company policy and working conditions as well as interpersonal relations with others. Maintenance factors are environment centered; they relate to job context. The distinction between job content and job context is similar to the distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic motivators. Intrinsic motivators are internal rewards that occur at the time of performance of the work. Extrinsic motivators are external rewards that occur after or away from work, providing no direct satisfaction at the time, the work is performed.

**IV) STOGDILL'S THEORY: (1959)**

One of the major sources of frustration in Job Satisfaction
research is that there does not seem to be any clearly defined relationship between degree of Job Satisfaction and quality or quantity of job performance. Stogdill (1959) extremely concerned with this, decided that it was time to stop trying to view satisfaction as a 'causer' of job performance (that is as an input variable). Instead he felt, it much more appropriate to view that individual in terms of the context of the total organization.

On the basis of previous research findings, he concluded that the 'output' of organizations are group integration, production and morale. Further, satisfaction of individual expectations results in group integration and cohesiveness but is not necessarily related to production. Instead, both morale and production are a function of group structure. Therefore morale and production will only be related to satisfaction. When the conditions which lead to high morale and production are also those which leads to the reinforcement of worker expectations. Present study deals within Job Satisfaction as well as with Occupational Stress. Hence, it is necessary to study the concept of Occupational Stress in detailed.

STRESS:— Its nature =

We tend to think of 'stress' as a modern problem but it is not. The farmer who is afraid that he will lose his crop because of a cyclone or drought is as much under stress as a person living in the city.
Everyday we face some sort of challenge, at home, at work, even at play. Out of our ordinary demands pressures are imposed on our minds and bodies. Stress is the state of the arousal with which the body responds to such demands.

Stress is inevitable in daily life. Some stress is beneficial especially when it is within limits. It can improve performance and make a job stimulating. When stress exceeds a certain level it can stop being useful and will tend to harm both physical and mental wellbeing.

We often feel stress when we feel we have no control over events. This can one feel helpless. Most of us can manage some amount of frustration, delay, misfortune. But, when these accumulate and cross a person's stress tolerance level, it can be very difficult for the individual to cope with.

Selye (1936) the father of modern stress research wrote "Stress is the non-specific (physiological) response of the body to any demand made upon it. The response syndrome mentioned in his definition, represents a universal pattern of defence reactions which serve to protect the person and preserve his integrity.

Salyee (1956) also hypothesized that defence reaction progresses with repeated exposure to the stressor, through three identifiable stages. Together these stages represent the general adaption syndrome. Because all situations are not equally
stressful. It has been found that some situations are more stressful than others. For instance, death of a spouse, major illness or injury or divorce can be very stressful. Very simple situations such as a change in routine can also be stressful. Those who have to change shifts are more prone to stress than those who always work in the same shift.

What is perceived or considered to be stressful to one person may not be true for another persons. Some people can face more stress and pressure than others. Stress is caused by work overload having no control over one’s life and seeing little prospect of change. Stress has been defined as "the pattern of specific and non-specific responses an organism makes to stimulus events that disturb its equilibrium and tax or exceed its ability to cope" (Zimbardo, 1988).

CONCEPT OF STRESS:

The study of man’s reactions to conditions of intense psychological stress has been a major concern of psychological investigations for a long time. The concept of "stress" is one of the most significant concepts ever developed in the social and biochemical sciences, however, its potential as a prime intellectual tool for not only understanding but also explaining individual and collective human behaviour and disorders has not yet been fully realized. What has hampered the adequate use of the concept of stress is the fact that different investigations have employed somewhat different referents or meanings for the term stress and thus have employed different explicit or implicit
models; many of these have ignored important variables (see Burchfield, 1979). Definitions of stress have focused on stimulus-as an external negative force impinging on an individual; response—as an individual's emotional and/or external environments (French, Rodgers & Cobb, 1974). The latter view of stress is dependent on the work done by Lazarus and his colleagues (Lazarus, Averill & Opton, 1970).

A seminal influence on the entire area of stress research has been the work of the eminent Canadian scientist, Hans Selye (1950, 1974, 1976), who defined stress as the "non-specific response of the body to any demand". Approaching stress from a physiological point of view, Selye and his colleagues have conducted extensive investigations over the past 40 years on the widespread nonspecific bodily changes that occur as reactions to stressful situations. One of the most commonly accepted definitions of stress is that it is anything which causes an alteration of the psychological homeostatic processes (Selye, 1976). The term stress is applied to the total transaction (Lazarus, 1971, p. 54) between the stressor and the coping responses in interaction together over time so that one may speak of a system being "under stress" (Selye, 1974, p. 32) as well as a particular situation being stressful. In discussing the sources of confusion of controversy in stress research, Mason (1975a, 1975b) observed that physiologists, such as Selye, have focused on physical and humoral stimuli that mediate stress reactions, whereas behavioral scientists have emphasized the role of
psychosocial stimuli. He considers stress to be an intervening variable similar to "emotion" and "motivation" (Lazarus et al., 1970, p. 209). The most hard-hitting attack on the continued use of the stress concept was made by Hinkle who remarks that it is hard to conceive of a "state" of stress within an organism qualitatively different from other states of being alive (Hinkle, 1973, p. 43). Attempts to clarify the concept of stress resulted typically in semantic definitional disputes or in argumentation concerning a specific aspect of some vague and complex theory. The field of stress research still lacks an integrative framework which can explain the majority of research results in a logical theoretical manner (Cooper, 1983). However, a key point that is generally accepted by stress researchers is that stress, whether at work or elsewhere, is not an exogenous entity. Rather to modify an honored aphorism, stress lies in the eyes of the beholder.

In a laudable effort, Ramachandra Rao (1983a) has recently highlighted the ancient Indian contribution as an alternative way of thinking about stress so that a comprehensive conceptual model of stress culturally specific to India can be developed. Confining himself to the indigenous systems known as Samkhya, Yoga, and Ayurveda, Ramachandra Rao (1983a) highlights two Indian concepts, namely, klesa and dukha, which correspond not only to the concept of stress in common use but also, to an extent, to the concept in its technical sense. The concept of klesa, as crystallized in the Yoga framework, refers largely to the
stressor aspect, and the concept of dukha in the Samkhya, more to
the phenomenon of stress itself. The Samkhya system views dukha to
signify the stress that the individual experiences in the course
of his interaction with the world around him. It describes an
organismic state involving the experience of emotions and is
characterized by an urge to escape or avoid. On the basis of a
painstaking review of ancient Indian literature, Ramachandra Rao
(1983a) concludes that the broadbased conceptual model of stress
provided by the Yoga-Sutra relies on the cognitive appraisal of
the self, the object and the threat. In fact, cognitive appraisal
constitutes the functional frame-work for the conceptual model of
stress, not only in Samkhya-Yoga system, but also in Vedanta and
Buddhism. In another article, Ramachandra Rao (1983b) has
discussed stress with reference to situations in the Gita and
Ayurveda, claiming that the Gita provides an excellent
illustration of stress and how its is to be handled; and that the
main importance of the Gita is to redefine the major aspects of
stress in life situations. Adopting the conceptual model provided
by the Yoga-Sutra, it brings out the importance of the
individual's perception of himself in his role-status and of the
objective environment, including the task as assigned to or as
accepted by him. Ramachandra Rao (1983a) has also outlined an
elaborate ideology of stress based on Ayurveda, the Indian system
of medicine, which relies on the Samkhya school for its general
theoretical orientation. In fact, the concepts of cognitive
structuring, threat, emotional involvement, organic reactions and
coping activity can be found in the discussion of stress in Indian
thought. It has been demonstrated that such a conceptual model of stress concerns itself much more with cognitive processes than the western models of stress (Ramachandra Rao, 1983a). Thus, Ramachandra Rao (1983a) convincingly brings to light the ancient Indian contribution to the understanding of the stress phenomenon on the basis of which a comprehensive model of stress culturally specific/typical to Indian can be developed.

Out of a variety of ecological stressors, researches have been mainly concerned with life stress or stressful life events (B.S. Dohrenwend & B.P. Dohrenwend, 1974), examination stress assessed as test anxiety (Spielberger, Gonzalez, Taylor, Algaze & Anton, 1978), and organizational/occupational stress (Cooper & Payne, 1978, 1980; Pareek, 1981a, b). In the current studies, a life event is defined as stressful if it causes changes in an demands readjustment of an average person's normal routine. This definition of stress has relied upon empirical demonstrations (Holmes & Rahe, 1967; Holmes & Masuda, 1974) that there is a general consensus about the degree to which specific life event occurrences involve change and require readjustment. This consensual approach to life stress as a measurable environmental input has led to a host of studies relating stressful life events, illness onset and psychopathology. Pareek (1976, 1981a) has discussed organizational role stresses under two categories; (a) role space stress and conflicts; and (b) role set conflicts. In the former category, he includes self-role distance, inter-role conflict, role stagnation, inter-role distance, and
role boundness; and in the latter category, he covers role ambiguity, role overload, role isolation, role erosion, and role inadequacy. A job or organizational role is stressful to the extent that it does not provide supplies to meet the individual's motives and to the extent that the abilities of the individual fall below the demands of a job or an organizational role which are prerequisites for receiving supplies. In both cases, the individual's needs and values will not be met by supplies in the job environment (French, Rodgers & Cobb, 1974; Harrison, 1978). The undesirable effects of organizational/occupational stress may range from feelings of uneasiness to psychosomatic symptoms, work impairment and eventually coronary heart disease. Thus, not only is excessive stress damaging to the well-being of an individual, but its effects are dysfunctional to the organization as well.

REACTIONS TO STRESS:

Stress manifests itself through a variety of reactions. The most common sign of stress, reported by about one in four Americans (26%) is increased nervousness, anxiety and tension. Almost many people (24%) experience tension headaches because of stress. Another one in five (19%) say their stress shows up in anger and irritability with others. About 12% report that stress also takes its toll in fatigue. Finally, one in nine Americans (11%) say their stress leads to a sense of depression. Other symptoms of stress include muscle aches, stomach aches, an overall feeling of being upset, in so many and loss of sleep, an
increased heartbeat, a rise in blood pressure, compulsive eating or loss of appetite, a feeling of frustration, crying, yelling and screaming etc. (L Harris 1987).

PHYSIOLOGICAL STRESS REACTIONS:

Hanse Selye (1980), a pioneer in the study of how stress affects the body, holds that in additions to the body's responses that are specific to a particular stressor (such as sweating in response to heart) there is a characteristic pattern of nonspecific physiological mechanisms that are activated in response to almost any stressor. Selye called this pattern the general adaption syndrome. It consists of three progressive stages.

1) ALARAM REACTION: In the initial emergency response to stress-provoking agents, the body attempts to restore its normal functioning. The alarm reaction consists of complicated body and biochemical changes that produce simple symptoms regardless of the type of stressor. For this reason people in the beginning stages of different illness often complain of common symptoms such as fever, headache, aching muscles and joints, loss of appetite, and generally tired feeling.

2) THE STAGE OF RESISTANCE:

If our exposure to stressful situations continuous, the alarm reaction is followed by the stage in which the human organism develops an increased resistance to the stressor. The symptoms of the alarm stage disappear and body resistance rises above its
normal level to cope with the continued stress. But the price of this resistance includes increased secretions from various glands lowered resistance to infections, and the "diseases of adaption." Stress-included peptic ulcers and high blood pressure are common examples, through not all cases of these disorders are induced by stress.

3) THE STAGE OF EXHAUSTION:

If chronic stress continues too long, the stage of exhaustion is reached. The body is unable to continue secreting its hormones at the increased rate, so that the organism can no longer adapt to chronic stress. Body defends break down, adaption energy runs out, and the physical symptoms of the alarm reaction reappear. The symptoms of this stage are similar to aging in many respects, except that the symptoms of exhaustion, depending on the severity of one's condition, are more or less reversible.

The current level of stress in your life is determined by the number of such stresses and seriousness of these stressors (what causes the stress) Many people who experience high levels of stress are affected mostly by the daily annoyances such as sending children to school, the servant not taming up on time etc.
Research on Organizational Stress

Indian researches have discussed stress at work, at least implicitly, while dealing with subjects like absenteeism, leadership, motivation, quality of working life and participative management. However, a systematic study of organizational stress is a recent phenomenon in this country. B. Singh, Malhan, and Agarwal (1979'), and Agarwal, Malhan, and B. Singh (1979) after reviewing related studies, lamented that researchers in India have primarily concerned themselves with physical hazard stressors (i.e. effects of stresses such as dust, dirt, noise, temperature, long working hours, and dangerous and unguarded machines) and have largely neglected psychological hazards like role conflict, role ambiguity, role overload and other organizational role stressors, which are equally important in affecting the quality of working life.

Measurement of Organizational Stress

Defining role efficacy as the potential effectiveness of a role of an individual in an organization, Pareek (1980a, 1980b) has developed a 20-item Role Efficacy Scale (RES), which covers 10 dimensions. The RES has been used in some studies (S. Sharma & U. Sharma, 1983; Surti, 1983). More recently, Pareedk (1982a) has standardized three
Role Stress Scales (RSS), i.e., Entrepreneurial Role Stress (ERS) Scale; General Role Stress (GRS) Scale, and Organizational Role Stress (ORS) Scale. The ERS is a 27-item scale measuring 9 entrepreneurial role stresses; the GRS (a 12-item scale) is designed to measure 4 general role stresses; and the ORS is a 50-item scale for assessing 10 organizational role stresses. In addition, A.K. Srivastava and A.P. Singh (1981) have standardized the Occupational Stress Index (OSI) which assesses the extent of employees' stress in relation to 12 dimensions of their job life.

After identifying eight styles of coping with stress (four functional and four disfunctional), Pareek (1982b) also standardized a semiprojective instrument for assessing styles or strategies used by a respondent to cope with role stress. This instrument, known as "Role Pics", has several forms, and Role Pics(O) is one of the forms to be used to assess coping styles in relation to organizational role stress. Singhvi and Pareek (1982) have recommended that criteria of significance of trends (positive or negative) must be developed empirically and should be based on the distribution pattern of Role Pics (O) responses of a large sample.

Stressors in Organizations

Some attempts have been made to analyze the nature of organizational stressors. M.V. Deshpande (1978) has provided
an in-depth analysis of the facilitating and restraining forces that impinge upon senior executive in terms of management policies, manpower planning, appraisal system, promotions, work routines, interpersonal relations, lack of coordination and the perception that their abilities remain unutilized. In addition, divergent objectives of individuals and organizations, lack of communication, general socio-political and economic environment, poor interpersonal relationship have been highlighted as organizational stressors by A.K. Shah (1978, 1980) and Kumar (1981). In fact, Kumar (1981), while emphasizing the harmful consequences of such stressors for the individual and the organization, has pleaded for serious research in the virgin field of industrial psychiatry.

Role stress have also been studied in relation to job level, length of service, and different occupational groups. Natha (1980) showed that role conflict is experienced more frequently at the middle management rather than at the lower management level; supervisors manifest relatively higher role conflict than managers, whereas both managers and supervisors manifest higher role conflict than workers. This study also demonstrated that role conflict decreases with an increase in job tenure in an organization. Surti (1983) observed that nurses and bank employees experience minimum role stress, while university and college teachers experience maximum role stress. In addition, social workers and gazetted officers feel more efficacious in their roles, while researchers and
bank employees feel less efficacious.

Correlates of Organizational Role Stress

While Harigopal (1979) showed that job tension and job satisfaction have a significant inverse relationship across different job levels, Mehta (1978) concluded that life satisfaction promotes a positive response to the work situation. Narayanan and Venkatachalam (1979) found organizational stress and motivation to be negatively related. In two well-designed studies by Harigopal and Ravikumar (1978, 1979), it was observed that (a) role ambiguity is positively related to perceived deficiency of social and self-actualization needs, but it is negatively related to job involvement and intrinsic motivation; and (b) there is a negative relationship between company satisfaction, role ambiguity and role conflict. In another study, Madhu and Harigopal (1980) showed that in the case of nontechnical supervisors, a negative relationship exists between role ambiguity and job involvement and performance. Recently, S. Sharma and U. Sharma (1983) found that in the case of gazetted officers only, role efficacy has a positive relationship with job satisfaction, and this relationship is stronger in the case of on-the-job factor of job satisfaction. Thus, job level appears to be a moderator of
the role stress-job attitude relationship. B. Singh, Agarwal, and Malhan (1981a) reported that general role conflict is negatively related to job satisfaction and satisfaction with working life. In a study of officers of a private sector organization, Pestonjee and V. B. Singh (1982) found that the overall indices of role stress are negatively associated with all the dimensions of job satisfaction with the exception of the social relations aspect of job satisfaction; self-role distance has a significant negative correlation with all the dimensions of job satisfaction; inter-role distance, role stagnation, role ambiguity, and role inadequacy are negatively related to job satisfaction, except in the case of social relations. Surti (1983) also found that role stress and job satisfaction are negatively related. In addition, it was noted that fear of success is positively related with role stress, whereas participative and consultative organization climate has a negative relation with role stress. Earlier, Sen (1982) has studied the personal and organizational correlates of role stress. Further, Das (1982) has reported that work group climate is an important cause of managerial stress, and perceived power is the second most potent cause of managerial stress. Contrary to other findings, role ambiguity did not emerge to be a significant cause of stress. Thus, a negative group climate and powerlessness may be dominant causes of stress experienced by Indian managers.

In another group of studies, the relationship of
organizational role stress with adjustment and health-related variables has been considered. A.K. Srivastava and A. Krishna (1981) have demonstrated that high job-related anxiety is associated with lower satisfactory social relations and adjustment. Severe physiological, psychological, and behavioral consequences of managerial stress have been highlighted by A. Shah (1978). General role conflict has been shown to be positively associated with job-related tension and work alienation B. Singh et al. (1981a). Recently, S. Sharma and U. Sharma (1983) have reported that role efficacy has a negative relationship with general and job anxiety measures, and that the role efficacy-job anxiety relationship is stronger than the role efficacy-general anxiety relationship. A. Singh, Krishna and N. Singh (1972) studied the effect of occupational stress on the cardiogram of rickshaw pullers, and Barnes (1983) highlighted the negative consequences of occupational hazards on merchant marine officers. Recently, Srivastava (1983) studied a group of white collar employees and concluded that the high-stress group and significantly higher free-floating anxiety, obsessive neurosis, phobic anxiety and hysterical symptoms. Further, patients with psychosomatic complaints described their job as overtaxing, demanding and marked by a series of disagreements with their authorities (Chaturvedi, 1983).

Nothing significant has been brought out on the
moderators of organizational stress-well being connection. Harigopal (1980) studied personality factors (ego-strength, dominance-submissiveness) as mediators of role stress-company satisfaction relationship. He concluded that (a) high and low ego-strength supervisors differ significantly on role ambiguity and role conflict; (b) ego-strength moderates the relationship between role ambiguity and company satisfaction, and between role ambiguity and job involvement; (c) submissive supervisors experience more role ambiguity than their dominant counterparts, and dominance vs. submissiveness dimension of personality moderates the relationship between role conflict and job involvement.

B. Singh, U. N. Agarwala, and Malhan (1981b), studying a sample of supervisors, demonstrated that moderating effects of individual differences (locus of control and work values) and situational variables (group cohesiveness and supervisory support) on the relationship of role conflict with different indices of well-being. The moderating effect of supervisory support was pervasive and profound. In some studies, job/managerial level has also emerged as a moderator of the stress-well being relationship (Harigopal, & Ravikumar, 1978, 1979; S. Sharma & U. Sharma, 1983). In another study, Das (1982) concluded that higher feelings of power, stronger perceived group support, more open communication, more knowledge-based risk taking act as a buffer against managerial stress. Of these, work group climate emerged to be a major moderator of the managerial stress-well-being
relationship.

Organizational Role Stress and Coping

Only one study (Surti, 1983) offers an insight into the different styles of coping used by eight professional groups of working women in dealing with occupational role stressors. Some of the major conclusions of this pioneering study are: (a) defensiveness is used more as a style to cope with role stress by professional working women, followed by intrapersonistive style. The reversed pattern is found in women entrepreneurs; and (b) avoidance-oriented coping styles have a positive and approach-oriented coping styles have a negative relationship with role stress. In his publications, Pareek (1976, 1977a) has suggested the use of Inter-Role Exploration (IRE) for strengthening various roles and to increase role effectiveness through a joint effort of the role occupants. It works by increasing mutuality, creativity, exploration and confronting strategies. Later, Pareek (1977b, 1981b) explained in detail only two kinds of strategies through which any role conflict or role stress could be managed. It has been suggested that, in order to use them, it is essential to work out systematic ways of implementing them which would require a lot of work as well as some organizational developmental effort to obtain good results.
MENTAL HEALTH: Health is an indispensible quality in human being. It has been described as soil from which the finest flowers grow. Health indicates psychosomatic well-being. To Bhatia (1982) "health is a state of being hale, sound or whole in body and mind."

The preamble of the World Health Organization's charter defined health as a state of complete physical mental and social well-being, not merely the absence of disease or infirmity (Monopolis et al. 1977).

Thus, health is a broader concept including physical, social, and mental health. Mental health has been reported as an important factor influencing individual's various behaviours, activities, happiness, and performance.

Before the second half of the twentieth century, mental health was considered as the absence of mental disease but now it has been described in its more positive cannotation, not as the absence of mental illness. Mental health has been mentioned as the ability of person to balance one's desires and aspirations, to cope life stresses and to make psychosocial adjustment.

Laddell has reported mental health as the ability to make adequate adjustments to the environment, on the plane of reality.

Menninger (1945) writes, "Let us define mental health as
the adjustment of human beings to the world and to each other with a maximum of effectiveness and happiness..... It is the ability to maintain an even temper, an alert intelligence, socially considerate behaviour and a happy disposition. Bhatia(1982) considers mental health as the ability to balance feelings, desires, ambitions and ideas in one's daily living. It means the ability to face and accept the realities of life.

Several psychologists and psychiatrists have presented different criteria of positive/good mental health.

Maslow and Mittelmann(1951) have suggested the following criteria for normal psychological health :

(i) Adequate feeling of security.
(ii) Adequate self-evaluation.
(iii) Adequate spontaneity and emotionality.
(iv) Efficient contact with reality.
(v) Adequate bodily desires and the baility to gratify them
(vi) Adequate self-knowledge.
(vii) Integration and consistency of personality.
(viii) Adequate life goals.
(ix) Ability to learn from experience.
(x) Ability to satisfy the requirements of the group.
(xi) Adequate emancipation from the group or culture.

Jahoda (1958) has noted following six aspects of positive mental health :

(i) Attitudes of an individual toward his own self: the
accesibility of the self to consciousness, the correctness of the self-concept, and its relation to the sense of identity and the acceptance by the individual of his own self. (ii) Growth, development, or self-actualization.

(iii) Integration.

(iv) Autonomy

(v) Perception of reality.

(vi) Environmental mastery.

Schultz (1977) has presented following seven criteria of the healthy personality:

(i) Extension of the sense of self.

(ii) Warm relation of self to others.

(iii) Emotional security

(iv) Realistic perception.

(v) Skills and assignments.

(vi) Self-objectification.

(vii) Unifying philosophy of life.

Operational definition of mental health—For the present study, "mental health is defined as person's ability to make positive self-evaluation, the perceive the reality, to integrate the personality, autonomy group oriented attitudes and environmental mastery".

The details of dimensions of mental health is as follows:

1. Positive self-Evaluation (PSE): It includes self-confidence, self-acceptance, self identity, feeling of worthwhileness, realization of one's potentialities, etc.
2. Perception of Reality (PR): It is related to perception free from need distortion, absence of excessive fantasy and a broad out look on the world.

3. Integration of Personality (PR): It indicates balance of psychic forces in the individual and includes the ability to understand and the share other people's emotions, the ability to concentrate at work and interest in several activities.

4. Autonomy (AUT): It includes stable set of internal standards for one's action, dependence for own development upon own potentialities rather than dependence on other people.

5. Group oriented attitudes (GOA): It is associated with ability to get along with other, work with others and ability to find recreation.

6. Environmental mastery (EM): It includes efficiency in meeting situational requirements, the ability to work and play, the ability to take responsibilities and capacity for adjustment.
AIM OF THE STUDY

The study of job satisfaction is one of the most popular field in the industrial psychology. In this field many extensive reseraches has been done but though it is the most crucial, it is a controversial issue in industrial psychology and behavioural management in organization. In fact Job Satisfaction ultimately decides the extent of employee motivation through the development of organizational climate. Occupational stress is closely related to Job Satisfaction Both of these are strongly associated to each other but the relationship is negative. Both are multifaced and multivariate phenomena depending on a large number of factors.

As compared to Job Satisfaction Occupational stress attracted the attention of researchers little late in the history of industrial and organizational psychology. Present study is designed to examine the influence of a few factors on the global Job Satisfaction and on various sub factors that are responsible for creating Occupational Stress. Thus, the present study aims at examining the effect of Training, type of background Age, Experience, Number of Dependents on Job satisfaction and twelve different sub-factors of Occupational Stress namely, role overload, role ambiguity, role conflict, responsibility for persons, powerlessness, poor peer relations, intrinsic improvement, low status. Strenuous working conditions, unprofitability, unreasonable group and political pressure, underparticipation and also on mental health.
OBJECTIVES OF STUDY.

The following objectives are taken into consideration for the present study.

OBJECTIVES:

1) To evaluate the effect of training on job satisfaction.

2) To evaluate the effect of workers background (rural v/s urban) on job satisfaction.

3) To examine the effect of training on workers occupational stress.

4) To measure the effect of background (rural v/s urban) on workers mental health.

5) To find out the effect of background (rural v/s urban) on workers occupational stress.

6) To examine the effects of training on workers mental health.

7) To measure the correlation between occupational stress and mental health.

8) To measure the correlation between occupational stress and Job Satisfaction.

9) To measure the correlation between Job Satisfaction and Mental Health.

10) To examine the correlation between demographic variables (Age, Experience, Number of dependents, Educational standard etc.) and Job Satisfaction, Occupational stress and Mental health.)