CHAPTER-1
INTRODUCTION

Are most people satisfied with their jobs? The answer seems to be a qualified "yes" in the in most developed countries. Independent studies, conducted on workers over the past 30 years, generally indicate that the majority of workers are satisfied with their jobs, While the percentage range is pretty wide—from the low 50s to the high 70s - more people report that they're satisfied. Moreover, these results are generally applicable to all developed countries. For instance, comparable studies among workers in Canada, Mexico, and Europe indicate more positive than negative results.

In spite of the generally positive results, recent trends are not encouraging. The evidence indicates a marked decline in job satisfaction since the early 1990s. A Conference Board study found that 58.6 percent of Americans were satisfied with their jobs in 1995. By the year 2000, that percentage was down to 50.7. This intuitively seems surprising since those five years were ones of economic expansion, increased incomes, and a strong labour market. Apparently, economic prosperity doesn’t necessarily
translate into higher job satisfaction. And even though all income
groups in the Conference Board study indicated lower job
satisfaction in 2000 than in 1995, money did seem to buy some
happiness. Job satisfaction increased directly with pay for every
income category in both 1995 and 2000.

What factors might explain this recent drop in job
satisfaction? Experts suggest it might be due to employers’ efforts
at trying to increase productivity through heavier employee
workloads and tighter deadlines. Another contributing factor may be
a feeling, increasingly reported by workers, that they have less
control over their work. But does the fact that job satisfaction
increases with pay mean that money can buy happiness? Not
necessarily. While it's possible that higher pay alone translates into
higher job satisfaction, an alternative explanation is that higher pay
is reflecting different types of jobs. Higher-paying jobs generally
require higher skills, give incumbents greater responsibilities, are
more stimulating and provide more challenges, and allow workers
more control. So it may be that the reports of higher satisfaction
among better-paid workers reflects the greater challenge and
freedom they have in their jobs rather than the pay itself.

Long term nation wide studies indicate that general job
satisfaction has been relatively high and stable in the developed countries. Although worker expectation have both increased and change in their focus over time. The quality of management practices also has improved. As result more then 80 percent of those in the work force usually report, that they are reasonably satisfied with their jobs.

Managers should not be complacent, however, for this also suggests that million of workers are unhappy, and many other million are probably dissatisfied with same specific aspects of their job. In addition many of the "satisfied" workers may have simply resigned themselves to their work situations, with the result that they are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

The level of job satisfaction across groups is not constant, but it is related to numbers of variables. This allows managers to predict which group is more likely to exhibit the problems behaviors associated with dissatisfaction. The key variables revalue around age, occupational level, and organizational size.

Who is satisfied? As workers grow older, they tend to be slightly more satisfied with their jobs; apparently they lower their expectations to more levels and adjust themselves better to their work situations. Predictably, too, people with high-level
occupations tend to be more satisfied with their jobs. As we might expect, they are usually better paid, have better work conditions, and hold jobs that make fuller use of their abilities.

Finally, there is some evidence to suggest that level of job satisfaction are higher in smaller organizational units (such as branch plant). This is because larger organization tend to whelm people, disrupt supportive process, and limit the amount of personal closeness, friendship, and small groups team work and limit the amount of teamwork that are important to the satisfaction of many people.

Definitions of Job Satisfaction

According to Hoppock (1935) any combination of psychological, physiological and environmental circumstances that cause a person truthfully to say I am satisfied with my job is satisfaction.

E.A. Locke (1976) persumed that Job Satisfaction is Pleasurable emotional state resulting from the one's job values. In contrast, job dissatisfaction is defined as the unpleasant emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job as frustrating or blocking the attainment of one's job values or as entailing disvalues. Satisfaction and dissatisfaction were seen as, a function of the perceived relationship between what one perceives it as offering or
entailing.

Bullock (1992) defined 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 of failure in the achievement of personal objectives and upon the perceived contribution of the job and company towards these ends.

Smith (1969) defined the job satisfaction as the employee's judgment of how well his job on the whole is satisfying his various needs.

Schaffer (1953) described the job satisfaction as 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.

Job satisfaction is a set of favourable or unfavourable feelings with which the employees view their work. Job satisfaction is a feeling of relative pleasure or pain. It typically refers to the attitudes of a single employee. Job satisfaction can be viewed as the overall attitude, or it can apply to the part of an individual's job.

Job satisfaction is one part of life satisfaction. The nature of
one's environment off the job influences one's feelings on the job. Similarly, since a job is an important part of life, job satisfaction influences one's general life satisfaction. Managers may need to monitor not the job and immediately work environment but also the employee, attitudes towards other part of life.

**History of Job Satisfaction**

One of the biggest preludes to the study of job satisfaction was the Hawthorne studies. These studies (1924-1933), primarily credited to Elton Mayo of the Harvard Business School, sought to find the effects of various conditions (most notably illumination) on workers' productivity. These studies ultimately showed that novel changes in work conditions temporarily increase productivity (called the Hawthorne Effect). It was later found that this increase resulted, not from the new conditions, but from the knowledge of being observed. This finding provided strong evidence that people work for purposes other than pay, which paved the way for researchers to investigate other factors in job satisfaction.

Scientific management (aka Taylorism) also had a significant impact on the study of job satisfaction. Frederick Winslow Taylor's 1911 book, Principles of Scientific Management, argued that there was a single best way to perform any given work task.
This book contributed to a change in industrial production philosophies, causing a shift from skilled labour and piecework towards the more modern.

The initial use of scientific management by industries greatly increased productivity because workers were forced to work at a faster pace. However, workers became exhausted and dissatisfied, thus leaving researchers with new questions to answer regarding job satisfaction. It should also be noted that the work of Bryan, Scott, and Hugo set the tone for Taylor's work.

Some argue that Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory, a motivation theory, laid the foundation for job satisfaction theory. This theory explains that people seek to satisfy five specific needs in life - physiological needs, safety needs, social needs, self-esteem needs, and self-actualization. This model served as a good basis from which early researchers could develop job satisfaction theories. Job satisfaction can be seen within the broader context of the range of issue which affect an individual's experience of work, or their quality of working life. Job satisfaction can be understood in terms of its relationships with other key factors, such as general well being, stress at work, control at work, home-work and working conditions.
Measuring Job Satisfaction

There are many methods for measuring job satisfaction. By far, the most common method for collecting data regarding job satisfaction is the Likert scale (named after Rensis Likert). Other less common methods for gauging job satisfaction include: Yes/No questions, True/False questions, point systems, checklists, and forced choice answers. This data is typically collected using an Enterprise Feedback Management (EFM) system.

The Job Descriptive Index (JDI), created by Smith, Kendall, & Hulin (1969), is a specific questionnaire of job satisfaction that has been widely used. It measures one’s satisfaction in five facets: pay, promotions and promotion opportunities, coworkers, supervision, and the work itself. The scale is simple, participants answer either yes, no, or can’t decide (indicated by ‘?’) in response to whether given statements accurately describe one’s job.

The Job in General Index is an overall measurement of job satisfaction. It is an improvement to the Job Descriptive Index because the JDI focuses too much on individual facets and not enough on work satisfaction in general.

Other job satisfaction questionnaires include: the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ), the Job Satisfaction Survey
(JSS), and the Faces Scale. The MSQ measures job satisfaction in 20 facets and has a long form with 100 questions (five items from each facet) and a short form with 20 questions (one item, for each facet).

The JSS is a 38 item questionnaire that measures nine facets of job satisfaction. Finally, the Facets Scale of job satisfaction, one of the first scales used widely, measured overall job satisfaction with just one item which participants respond to by choosing a face. Superior-subordinate communication has an important influence on job satisfaction in the workplace. The way in which subordinate's perceive a supervisor's behaviour can positively or negatively influence job satisfaction. Communication behaviour such as facial expression, eye contact, vocal expression, and body movement is crucial to the superior-subordinate relationship. Nonverbal messages play a central role in interpersonal interactions with respect to impression formation, deception, attraction, social influence, and emotional expression. Nonverbal immediacy from the supervisor helps to increase interpersonal involvement with their subordinates impacting job satisfaction. The manner in which supervisors communicate their subordinates may be more important than the verbal content. Individuals who dislike and think negatively about their supervisor
are less willing to communicate or have motivation to work where as individuals who like and think positively of their supervisor are more likely to communicate and are satisfied with their job and work environment. The relationship of a subordinate with their supervisor is a very important aspect in the workplace. Therefore, a supervisor uses nonverbal immediacy, friendliness, and open communication lines, is more willing to receive positive feedback and high job satisfaction from a subordinate where as a supervisor who is antisocial, unfriendly, and unwilling to communicate will naturally receive negative feedback and very low job satisfaction from their subordinate's in the workplace. Moods tend to be longer lasting but often weaker states of uncertain origin, while emotions are often more intense, short-lived and have a clear object or cause. There is some evidence in the literature that state moods are related to overall job satisfaction. Positive and negative emotions were also found to be significantly related to overall job satisfaction.

Frequency of experiencing net positive emotion will be a better predictor of overall job satisfaction than will intensity of positive emotion when it is experienced. Emotion regulation and emotion labour are also related to job satisfaction. Emotion
work (or emotion management) refers to various efforts to manage emotional states and displays. Emotion regulation includes all of the conscious and unconscious efforts to increase, maintain, or decrease one or more components of an emotion. Although early studies of the consequences of emotional labour emphasized its harmful effects on workers, studies of workers in a variety of occupations suggest that the consequences of emotional labour are not uniformly negative.

It was found that suppression of unpleasant emotions decreases job satisfaction and the amplification of pleasant emotions increases job satisfaction. The understanding of how emotion regulation relates to job satisfaction concerns two models:

1. Emotional dissonance - Emotional dissonance is a state of discrepancy between public displays of emotions and internal experiences of emotions, that often follows the process of emotion regulation. Emotional dissonance is associated with high emotional exhaustion, low organizational commitment, and low job satisfaction.

2. Social interaction model. Taking the social interaction perspective, workers' emotion regulation might be responses from others during interpersonal encounters that
subsequently impact their own job satisfaction. For example:
The accumulation of favorable responses to display pleasant emotions might positively affect job satisfaction. Performance of emotional labour that produces desired outcomes could increase job satisfaction.

Theories of Job Satisfaction:

As implied earlier, the study of human behaviour is carried out at two levels, One of these is descriptive (or empirical), in the sense of characterising or demonstrating, the existence of certain relationships or phenomena. Many theories have been offered to explain the behaviour of men at work, as well as to gauge the nature and causes of job satisfaction. Of the theories postulated, a few of them are alternative to each other and some of them are complimentary. Antagonistic thinkers may support, deny or modify them with evidences available with them. Wernimont, Toren and Kapell (1970) points out that it is difficult to consider motivation as separate and apart from personal or job satisfaction. Wanous and Lawler (1972) believe that negative feeling can arise from lack of variety, autonomy or challenge. They may be traced to the inability of one's work to offer a chance for promotion and recognition. Those aspects of jobs which deal with job content are called motivators by Frederick Herzberg (1968), an
advocate of job enrichment as a way of redesigning jobs to add satisfaction and improve performances. The absence of motivators leads to job dissatisfaction only if workers need challenge and autonomy from their jobs. Some workers may be dissatisfied with environment aspects of their jobs. Thus, any number of aspects of one's job could lead to discontent, depending, of course, on each worker's own needs, experience and expectations. The theories listed below explain job satisfaction.

1. Maslow's Need hierarchy theory-Maslow

2. McClelland's Needs Theory

3. Alderfer's ERG Theory

4. Porter-Lower Model of Motivation

5. Performance Theory of Job Satisfaction

6. McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y

7. Maturity and Immaturity Theory of Argyris.

8. Employee centered theory - Likert

9. Behavioral theory - Skinner

10. Wolf's Need Gratification Theory

11. Herzberg's Dual Factor Theory of Job Satisfaction

12. Summum Bonum of Theories
Maslow's Need Hierarchy Theory:

This is the most widely discussed theory. In this, Maslow (1964, 1970) proposes that people typically are continuously in a motivational state, but the nature of motivation is fluctuating and complex; further human beings rarely reach a state of complete satisfaction except for a short time. As one need becomes satisfied, another arises to take its place, and as this need becomes satisfied, another replaces it, so on and so forth. This never-ending sequence gives rise to Maslow's theory of motivation, in which a hierarchy of needs is postulated. This theory has its central feature the concept of human needs generally ordered in terms of their relative potency as human motivators.

Maslow's need hierarchy theory has enjoyed widespread acceptance particularly in the writings of many prominent organisational theorists e.g., Argiris (1953) Haire (1965), McGregor (1969), Schein (1965). It has been used to explain such diverse issues as why pay can become unimportant and why self-actualisation seems to be very important to people today. More recently, several writers have offered modifications and alternatives to Maslow's theory (e.g., Alderfer, 1969).

Maslow's (1943, 1954, 1970) hierarchical model is
composed of five level classification of human needs, and a set of hypotheses about how the satisfaction of these needs affect their importance. The five need categories are explained as follows

1. **Physiological Needs**: The physiological needs are at the top of the hierarchy because they tend to have the highest until they are reasonably satisfied. Until these needs are satisfied to the degree needed for the efficient operation of the body, the majority of a person's activities will probably be at this level, and the other levels will provide him with little motivation. A famous saying 'man can live on bread alone if there is no bread' suggests that human beings first try to acquire necessities for their survival.

2. **Safety Needs**: Once the physiological needs are satisfied to a reasonable level—it is not necessary that they are fully satisfied and degree of reasonableness is subjective—other levels of needs become important. In this hierarchy come the need for safety, that is need for being free of physical danger or self-preservation. In the industrial society, safety needs may take considerable importance in the context of the dependent relationship of employees to employers. As pointed out by McGregor, the safety needs may serve as motivators in such circumstances as arbitrary management actions, behaviour which
arouses uncertainty with respect to continued unemployment and unpredictable administration of policy. Peter F. Druker has suggested that one's attitude towards security is an important consideration in choosing a job. Organisation can influence these security needs either positively - through pension plan, insurance plan, etc. - or negatively by arousing fears of being fired or laid off, or demoted.

3. Social Needs: After the first two needs are satisfied, social needs become important in the need hierarchy. Since man is a social being, he has a need to belong and to be accepted by various groups. When social needs become dominant, a person will strive for meaningful relations with others. If the opportunity for association with other people is reduced, men often take vigorous action against the obstacles to social intercourse. In the organisation, workers form informal group environment. Such environment develops where the work is routine, tedious or over-simplified. This situation is made worse when workers are closely supervised and controlled, but have no clear channel of communication with management. In this type of environment, workers depend on informal groups for support of unfulfilled social needs such as affiliation.
4. Esteem Needs: The esteem needs are concerned with self-respect, self-confidence, a feeling of personal worth, feeling of being unique and recognition. Satisfaction of these needs produces feelings of self-confidence, prestige, power and control. The satisfaction of esteem needs is not always obtained through mature or adaptive behaviour. It is sometimes generated by disruptive and irresponsible actions. Some of the social problems have their roots in the frustration of the esteem needs.

5. Self-Actualisation Needs: Self actualisation is the need to maximise one's potential, whatever it may be. This is related with the development of intrinsic capabilities which lead people to seek situations that can utilise their potential. This includes competence which implies control over environmental factors, both physical and social, and achievement. A man with high intensity of achievement needs will be restless unless he can find fulfillment in doing what he is fit to do. As Maslow has put it, "this need might be phrased as the desire to become more and more what one is, to become everything that one is capable of becoming."

Maslow suggests that the various levels are interdependent and overlapping, each higher-level need emerging before the
lower-level need has been completely satisfied. Since one need does not disappear when another emerges, all needs tend to be partially satisfied in each area. When the peak of a need is passed, that need ceases to be the primary motivator. The next level need then begins to dominate. Even though a need is satisfied, it still influences behaviour because of interdependent and overlapping characteristics of needs.

According to Maslow (1970), the five need categories exist in a hierarchy of prepotency, such that the lower or more basic needs are inherently more important (prepotent) than the higher or less basic needs. Need No. 2 does not dominate unless need No. 1 is reasonably satisfied. Need No. 3 does not dominate until need Nos. 1 and 2 are reasonably achieved, and so on. It means until physiological needs are met, social and psychological needs do not operate.

The characteristic features of Maslow’s theory are given below:

- The higher needs are a later evolutionary development.
- The higher the need and the less imperative it is for sheer survival, the longer gratification can be postponed.
• Living at the higher need level means greater biological efficiency, greater longevity, less disease, better sleep, appetite etc.

• Higher needs are less urgent, subjectively.

• Higher need gratifications produce more desirable subjective results, i.e., more profound happiness, serenity and richness of inner life.

• Pursuit and gratification of higher needs present a general healthward trend.

• Higher needs require better outside conditions (economic and educational, etc.) to make them possible.

• Satisfaction of higher needs is closer to self-actualisation than is lower need satisfaction.

Critical Analysis of Maslow’s Theory

Maslow’s theory has reasonable support for the hypothesis that human needs have some hierarchical order. The theory is based on the assumption, it is true also, that man is continuously wanting. All his needs are never fully satisfied. As soon as one need is reasonably satisfied, its prepotency diminishes and another need emerges to replace it. Thus, at last, some needs
remain unsatisfied which serve the man to strive to satisfy. Thus, it presents a very simple solution of managerial problems, that is, managers can try to satisfy the needs of people in this particular order. But this raise. a basic question: Is need hierarchy rigid? Does every person try to satisfy his need according to this model? If the answers are in positive, there is no problem ij motivating people. However, it is not so. The hierarchy is not so rigid for all th individuals and all the times. Identified below are few problems which are nc adequately solved by this theory:

1. There is lack of hierarchical structure of needs as suggested by Maslow, though every individual has some ordering for his need satisfaction. This is based on th assumption that man has limited resources which he can use alternatively Resources, here, cannot be taken only in a physical way, rather it is used in more comprehensive way. Naturally, every person has to satisfy his needs in some order. However, this order may not follow Maslow's need hierarchy. This has been demonstrated by a large number of researches both in foreign countries a well as in India. Following generalisations can be drawn on the basis of these studies - both in foreign countries and in India:

i. Some people may be deprived of their lower order needs but may
try for self-actualising needs. The example of Mahatma Gandhi is one of the most important. This does not require any further explanation.

ii. There are certain persons for whom self-esteem needs are more important than social needs. Such people may be those who seek self-assertion as a means to an end, that is, love need.

iii. There is considerable disordering among physiological needs, safety needs, social needs, and esteem needs, particularly in organisational context. For example, many people do not care for job security (security need) but care for social need. Similarly, many people may not care for social need but for self-esteem need.

iv. For certain people, many of the needs may not form part of their own need hierarchy. Thus, there is not only question for reversal of hierarchy but also discontinuity of hierarchy. For example, there may be people who might be deprived of social need from their childhood. They may develop apathy towards such needs, though it is just possible that they may develop high order for such need.

2. There is another problem, which is common with many other theories also, that there is often a lack of direct cause-effect
relationship between need and behaviour. Thus, a particular need may cause behaviour in different ways in different persons. Similarly, one particular behaviour may be the result of different needs. For example, if a person is thirsty, he may take water, or some soft drink, or some juice. Similarly, people may earn money to satisfy several types of needs, not only physiological needs. Thus, need hierarchy is not as simple as it seems to be.

3. There is another problem in applying the theory into practice. A person tries for his higher-level need when his lower-order need is reasonably satisfied. What is this reasonable level is a question of subjective matter. Thus, the level of satisfaction for particular need may differ from person to person. Infact, needs and their satisfaction are mental feeling. Sometimes, even the person concerned may not be aware about his own needs. The question is: how can a manager know the needs of others?

These are some basic problems involved in the application of Maslow's need hierarchy model. At every level of needs, it can be seen that the role of individual is very important. Since individuals differ, it may not be quite possible to prescribe one standard action for solving motivational problems of all persons, rather, a contingency approach has to be applied.
McCLELLAND'S NEEDS THEORY

Shortly after World "War II, a group of psychologists led by David C. McClellan of Harvard University began to experiment with TAT (Thematic Apperception Test) to see if it were sensitive enough to detect changes in motivation that were caused by simple attempts to sway the individual's attitudes. In order to simplify their task, the group decided to select one particular motive for intensive analysis. For, it was not long before the implications of the achievement motive were recognised that it became the subject of intensive investigaiton in its own right.

McClelland has identified three types of basic motivating needs. He classified these as need for power \((n/PWR)\), need for affiliation \((n/AFF)\), and need for achievement \((n/ACH)\). Considerable research work was done by McClelland and his associates in this respect, particularly, on achievement motive:

**Power Motive** : The ability to induce or influence behaviour is power. Power motive has been formally recognised and studied for a relatively long time. The leading advocate of the power motive was Alfred Adler. To explain the power need, the need to manipulate others or the drive for superiority over others, Adler developed the concepts of inferiority complex and compensation.
Accordingly, the individual's life style is characterised by striving to compensate for the feelings of inferiority which are combined with the innate drive for power. McClelland and his associates have found that people with a high power need have a great concern for exercising influence and control. Such individuals generally seek positions of leadership; they involve in conversation; they are forceful, outspoken, haughty, beaded, and demanding.

**Affiliation Motive**: Since people are social animals, most individuals like to interact and be with others in situations where they feel they belong and are accepted. Sometimes affiliation is equated with social motives. However, the affiliation motive is not so broad. Affiliation plays a very complex but vital role in human behaviour. The study of affiliation is complicated by the fact that some behavioural scientists believe that it is an unlearned motive. However, the fact is partly true. McClelland has suggested that people with high need for affiliation usually derive pleasure from being loved and tend to avoid the pain of being rejected. They are concerned with maintaining pleasant social relationship, enjoying a sense of intimacy and understanding, and enjoy consoling and helping others in trouble.

**Achievement Motive**: Over the years, behavioural scientists
have observed that some people have an intense desire to achieve. McClelland's research has led him to believe that the need for achievement is a distinct human motive that can be distinguished from other needs. It can also be isolated and assessed in any group. McClelland has identified four basic characteristics of high achievers:

1. **Moderate Risks**: Taking moderate risks is probably the simplest descriptive characteristic of the person possessing high achievement need. This is against the common sense that a high achiever would take high risks.

2. **Immediate Feedback**: Person with high n/ACH desires activities which provide immediate and precise feedback information how he is progressing towards a goal.

3. **Accomplishment**: Person with high n/ACH finds accomplishing a task intrinsically satisfying in and of itself, or he does not expect or necessarily want the accompanying material rewards. Though he likes to earn money a lot but not for the usual reason of wanting money for its own sake or for the material benefits that it can buy.

4. **Preoccupation with the Tasks**: Once a high achiever selects a goal, he tends to be totally preoccupied with the task until it is
successfully completed. He will not feel satisfied unless he has put his maximum effort in completing the task. This type of dedicated commitment often reflects on his outward personality, which frequently has a negative effect on those who come in contact with him.

**Implications of the Theory**

Because any organisation and every department of it represents groups of individual working together to achieve goals, the need for achievement is of paramount importance. According to the research conducted by McClelland and others, managing show high on achievement and power and low on affiliation. The research finding also indicates that chief executives of smaller companies show higher achievement motive as compared to those of large companies. Similarly, middle level managers have higher n/ACH as compared to the chief executive. This seems to be contradictory but McClelland feels that it is quite understandable because chief executives have already achieved, and those below them are striving to advance.

Achievement-motivated people can be the backbone of most organisations because they progress much faster. However, when they are promoted where their success depends not only on
their work but on the activities of others, they may be less effective. Since they are high task-oriented and work to their utmost capacity, they expect similar results from others. As a result, they sometimes lack human skill and patience of being effective managers, specially of those persons having high affiliation motive. Thus, such persons can be better managers in production, research and development as compared to personnel activity. Thus, an organisation may need managers with varying degrees of achievement and affiliation motives.

**Development of Achievement Motive:** Achievement motive can be developed at an early age and also at a later stage. Experimenting with people from the USA, Italy, Poland and India, McClelland and his group found that in all cases, training programmes were successful in increasing individual need for achievement. Their achievement development course has four primary goals:

1. To teach, participate how to think, talk and eat like a person with high achievement.

2. To stimulate participants to set higher, but carefully planned and realistic work goals over the next two years.

3. To give the participants knowledge about themselves.
4. To create group spirit de corps from learning about each other's hopes and fears, success and failure, and from going through emotional experiences together, away from everyday life, in a retreat setting.

It was found that after two years, who had taken the course made more money, were promoted faster and expanded their business faster than comparable men who had taken some other management course. For example, in India, he subjected a group of fifty-two entrepreneurs to the concentrated achievement motivation course. Two-thirds of them were found unusually active in the post-training period. Some of them actually started new business, others investigated new product lines, increased their profits and expanded their present business. This has another implication, that is, in the training programmes, such courses may be added to develop achievement motives in individuals where it is needed.

**Alderfer's Erg Theory**

Alderfer has provided an extension of the Maslow's need hierarchy and Herzberg's two-factor theory of motivation, particularly the former. Like the previous theories, Alderfer believes that there is a value in categorising needs and that there is a basic
distinction between lower-order needs and higher-order needs. Based on the empirical evidences, he has found that there seems to be some overlapping between physiological, security and social needs. Also the lines of demarcation between social, esteem and achievement needs are not clear. Based on these observations, Alderfer has categorised the various needs into three categories: existence needs, relatedness needs, and growth needs. The first three letters of these needs are used to call it ERG theory.

**Existence Needs**: Existence needs include all needs related to physiological and safety aspects of an individual. Thus, existence needs group physiological and safety needs of Maslow into one category as these have similar impact on the behaviour of the individual.

**Relatedness Needs**: Relatedness needs include all those needs that involve relationship with other people whom the individual cares. Relatedness needs cover Maslow's social needs and that part of esteem needs which is derived from the relationship with other people.

**Growth Needs**: Growth needs involve the individual making creative efforts to achieve full potential in the existing environment. These include Maslow's self-actualisation need as
well as that part of the esteem need which is internal to the individual like feeling "I being unique, feeling of personal growth, etc.

**ERG:** theory offers the following limitations so far as satisfaction of various needs is concerned:

1. Three need levels form a linear only in the sense of decreasing concreteness. As people move from a focus on existence to relatedness and to growth needs, the ways in which they can satisfy those needs become increasingly abstract.

2. The rise in the level (if satisfaction of any lower-order need may result in decrease in its importance. Its place is taken by another need. Thus, the individual is able in move to income productive and creative, and as he moves to this level, he sets a higher goal for himself.

3. People are likely to try to satisfy their most concrete needs first and then, they move nil to the abstract needs. In this way, progression of need satisfaction of ERG theory is similar to Maslow's need hierarchy, that is, people first satisfy then Lower needs and gradually progress to the satisfaction of higher needs in that order. However, Alderfer goes one
step further. He argues that along with satisfaction progression, people can experience frustration-regression, that is, if people cannot satisfy their needs at a given level of abstraction, they 'drop back' and again focus on more concrete needs.

The relationship between Maslow's need hierarchy theory and Alderfer's ERG theory is presented in Figure 23.8 (page 582).

**Implications of ERG Theory**

Alderfer has conceived ERG needs along a continuum which avoids the implication that the higher up an individual is in the need hierarchy, better it is. According to this theory, different types of needs operate simultaneously. If the individual's particular path towards satisfaction is blocked, he may persist along that path but at the same time, he regresses towards more easily satisfiable needs. In this way, Alderfer distinguishes between chronic needs which persist over a period of time (like most of the lower order needs) and the episode needs which are situational and can change according to the environment. From this point of view, ERG theory provides us a categorisation of needs, their relationship, and the progression and regression of their satisfaction.
PORTER-LAWER MODEL OF MOTIVATION

Built in large part on expectancy model, Porter and Lawler have derived a substantially more complete model of motivation and have applied it in their study primarily of managers. They propose a multi-variate model to explain the complex relationship that exists between job attitudes and job performance. Their model encounters some of the simplistic traditional assumptions made about the positive relationship between satisfaction and performance. Porter and Lawler explain their choice for the expectancy approach as under:

"The emphasis in expectancy theory on rationality and expectations seems to us to describe best the kinds of cognition that influence managerial performance. We assume that managers operate on the basis of some sort of expectancies which, although based upon previous experience, are forward-oriented in a way that does not seem to be as easily handled by the concept of habit strength".

**Effort:** Effort refers to the amount of energy exerted by an employee on a given task. Perceived reward probability refers to the individual's perception of the probability that differential rewards depend upon differential amounts of effort. These two
factors - value of reward and perception of effort-reward probability - determine the amount of effort that the employee will put in.

**Performance**: Effort leads to performance but both of these may not be equal, rather, performance is determined by the amount of effort and the ability and role perception of the individual. Thus, if an individual has little ability and/or inaccurate role perception, his performance may be ineffective in spite of his putting in great efforts.

**Rewards**: Performance is seen as leading to intrinsic rewards (such as a sense of accomplishment and actualisation) and extrinsic rewards (such as working conditions and status). However, the intrinsic rewards are much more likely to produce attitudes about satisfaction that are related to performance. In addition, the perceived equitable rewards vitally affect the performance-satisfaction relationship. They reflect the fair level of rewards that the individual feels should be given for a given level of performance.

**Satisfaction**: Satisfaction is derived from the extent to which actual rewards fall short, meet or exceed the individual's perceived level of equitable rewards. If actual reward meet or exceed perceived equitable rewards, the individual will feel satis-
fied; if these are less than equitable rewards, he will be dissatisfied. Thus, this provides two implications. First, satisfaction is only in part determined by actual rewards. Second, satisfaction is more dependent on performance than performance is on satisfaction. Only through the less-direct feedback loops, satisfaction will affect performance. This is a marked departure from the traditional analysis of the satisfaction-performance relationship.

**Equity Theory Of Adam**

Equity theory is essentially a social comparison theory in which an individual evaluates his input versus output derived from a given situation relative to those of an other, where this other may be another person, a class of people, an organisation, or the individual himself relative to his experiences from an earlier point in time. To the extent that an individual perceives an imbalance in this relationship (i.e. inequity), it is postulated that he will experience dissatisfaction and be motivated to engage in some kind of activity which will restore equity. This relatively simple motion has its roots in the social exchange theories of Homons (1961) and Thimbaut and Kelley (1959). Jeques (1961), Patohman (1961), Schein (1953), Weick (1964), among others
and most formally be Adams (1963, 1965), with this latter variant latter being extended by Pritchad (1969).

Equity theory of work motivation is based on the social exchange process. This theory has been around just as long as the expectancy theories of motivation. However, Adams has crystallised it in a more formal way. Basically, the theory points out that people are motivated to maintain fair relationship between their performance and reward in comparison to others. There are two assumptions on which the theory works:

1. Individuals make contributions (inputs) for which they expect certain rewards (outcomes).
2. Individuals decide whether or not, a particular exchange is satisfactory, by comparing their inputs and outcomes with those of others and try to rectify any inequality.

Various types of inputs and outcomes of an individual are -

Table: Various Types of Inputs and Outcomes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efforts</td>
<td>Pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Personal develop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas</td>
<td>Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability</td>
<td>Friendship oppotu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exchange relationship between a person’s inputs/outcomes in relation to those of other persons may be of three types: overpaid inequity, underpaid inequity, and equity.

**Overpaid Inequity:** In this case, the person perceives that his outcomes are more as compared to his inputs in relation to others. This relationship can be expressed by:

\[
\frac{\text{Person's outcomes}}{\text{Person's inputs}} > \frac{\text{Others' outcomes}}{\text{Others' inputs}}
\]

In this case, the person experiences guilt feeling.

**Underpaid Inequity:** In this case, the person perceives that his
outcomes are lower as compared to the inputs in relation to others. This relationship can be expressed as:

\[
\frac{\text{Person's outcomes}}{\text{Person's inputs}} < \frac{\text{Others' outcomes}}{\text{Others' inputs}}
\]

In such a relationship, the person experiences dissonance.

**Equity:** In this case, the person perceives that his outcomes in relation to his inputs are equal to those of others. This relationship can be expressed by:

\[
\frac{\text{Person's outcomes}}{\text{Person's inputs}} = \frac{\text{Others' outcomes}}{\text{Others' inputs}}
\]

In this case, the person experiences satisfaction. The impact of inequity on the person is as follows:

1. Perceived inequity creates tension in the person.
2. The amount of tension is proportional to the magnitude of inequity.
3. The tension created in the person will motivate him to reduce it.
4. The strength of the motivation to reduce inequity is proportional to the perceived inequity.

**Re-establishing Equity**

As pointed out above, inequity creates tension in the mind of
the person, therefore, he tries to re-establish equity between his inputs and outcomes. He can do this in a number of ways:

**Changing his Inputs:** The person may change his inputs to match his outcomes by lowering his inputs (in the case of underpaid inequity) or by increasing his inputs (in the case of overpaid inequity). Thus, he may either put lesser amount of work efforts or may work harder, as the case may be.

**Changing his Outcomes:** The person may attempt to change his outcomes by persuading/pressurising those who are responsible for the decision of outcomes.

**Changing Perception about Inputs and Outcomes:** Since measurement of inputs and outcomes is a matter of perception, the person may re-establish equity between his inputs and outcomes by changing his perception.

**Changing Inputs and Outcomes of Others:** The person may try to re-establish equity by persuading the other persons to change their inputs, or by changing his perception about the inputs/outcomes relationships of others.

**Changing the Persons Compared:** In comparing with the particular person/s’ inputs/outcomes, if relationship produces inequity, the person may change the person/s and may replace by
someone whose inputs/outcomes relationship produces equity.

**Leaving the Situation:** If the person is not able to re-establish equity by the methods described above, he may try to change the situation in which he perceives inequity. He may opt for transfer to another department or location in the same organisation or may leave the organisation.

**Performance Theory Of Job Satisfaction**

The animals worked like slaves. But they were happy in their work. They grudged no effort or sacrifice, well aware that everything that they did was for the benefit of themselves and those of their kind who would come after them (Donald P. Schwab and Harry Cummings, 1970).

Unquestionably, it is the hypothesised connection between employee satisfaction and job performance which has generated the greatest research and theoretical interests. Brayfield and Crockett (1955), Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson and Capwell (1957), and Vroom (1964) have focussed their reviews in this connection on the basis of their empirical research.

Sehawab and Cummings (1972) evaluated theoretical propositions concerning relationship between satisfaction and performance. Three major points of view are considered: (1) the
view that satisfaction leads to performance, a position generally associated with human relation concepts; (2) the view that the satisfaction performance relationship is moderated by a number of variables; and (3) the view that performance leads to satisfaction.

Management have at last discovered that there is great production and hence greater profit when workers are satisfied with their jobs. Improve the morale of the company and you improve your production.

Brayfield and Crockett (1955) by their review of over fifty studies provided a capstone to the satisfaction-performance relationship. They hypothesised that employees govern their job seeking, job performing and job terminating behaviour by law of effect, subsequently elaborated and relabelled by Vroom (1964), Porter and Lawler (1968) and Lawler (1970) as expectancy theory.

Good performance may lead to rewards, which in turn lead to satisfaction. This formulation then would say that satisfaction rather than causing performance is caused by it. Porter-Lawler model (1968) points clearly in the relationship between performance and satisfaction. This implies that satisfaction causes performance and performance causes satisfaction. The most direct linkage has performance as the causal and satisfaction as the
dependent variable.

March and Simon provides the most salient comparison with Porter- Lawler model because both explicitly postulate a circular performance- satisfaction relation.

Discrepancy Theory Of Job Satisfaction

Many psychologists have argued for a discrepancy approach to thinking about satisfaction.

Katzell (1964) views satisfaction as the difference between an actual amount and some desired amount. He assumes that this difference should be divided by the desired amount. Katzell (1964) speaks of actual discrepancies while most discrepancy theorists talk of perceived discrepancies.

Locke (1969) has stated a discrepancy theory that differs from Katzell's in several ways. First, Locke emphasises that the perceived discrepancy, not the actual discrepancy, is determined by the simple difference between what the person wants and what he perceives. Locke says, "job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are a function of the perceived relationship between what one wants from one's job and what one perceives it as offering".
Porter (1961) in measuring satisfaction, asks people how much of a given outcome there should be for their job and how much of a given outcome there actually is; he considers the discrepancy between the two answers to be a measure of satisfaction.

A few researchers have argued that satisfaction is determined by what a person expects to receive rather than by what he wants or feel he should receive. Thus the literature on job satisfaction contains three different discrepancy approaches:

a. The first looks at what people want.

b. The second at what people feel they should receive

c. The third at what people expect to receive

**McGREGOR’S Theory X and Theory Y**

The management’s action of motivating human beings in the organisation, according to McGregor, involves certain assumptions, generalisations and hypotheses relating human behaviour and human nature. These assumptions may be neither conciously crystallised nor overtly stated; however, these serve the purpose of predicting human behaviour. The basic assumptions about human behaviour may differ considerably because of the complexity of factors influencing this behaviour.
McGregor has characterised these assumptions in two opposite points, Theory X and Theory Y.

**Theory X.** This is the traditional theory of human behaviour. According to this theory McGregor has certain assumptions about human behaviour. In his own words, these assumptions are as follows:

1. Management is responsible for organising the elements of productive enterprises—money, materials, equipment, people - in the interest of economic ends.

2. With respect to people, this is a process of directing their efforts, motivating them, controlling their actions, modifying their behaviour to fit the needs of the organisation.

3. Without this active intervention by management, people would be passive - even resistant - to organisational needs. They must be persuaded, rewarded, punished, controlled, and their activities must be directed. This is management's task. We often sum it up by saying that management consists of getting things done through other people.

4. The average man is by nature indolent—he works as little as possible.

5. He lacks ambition, dislikes responsibility, prefers to be led.
6. He is inherently self-centered, indifferent to organisational needs.

7. He is, by nature, resistant to change.

8. He is gullible, not very bright, the ready dupe of charlatan and the demagogue.

Of these assumptions, last five deal with the human nature and first three with lagerial actions. These assumptions about human nature are negative in their approach, however much organisational processes have developed on these assumptions. Managers subscribing these views about human nature attempt to structure, control and closely supervise their employees. They feel that external control is most appropriate for dealing with irresponsible and immature employees. McGregor believes that these assumptions about human nature have not changed drastically though there is a considerable change in behavioural pattern. He argues that this change is not because of changes in the human nature, but because of nature of industrial organisation, management philosophy, policy, and practice.

**Theory Y.** The assumptions of Theory Y are described by McGregor in the following words:
1. The expenditure of physical and mental effort in work is natural as play or rest. The average human being does not inherently dislike work. Depending upon controllable conditions, work may be a source of satisfaction or a source of punishment.

2. External control and the threat of punishment are not the only means for bringing about effort towards organisational objectives. Man will exercise self-direction and self-control in the service of objectives to which he is committed.

3. Commitment to objectives is a function of the reward associated with their achievement. The most significant of such awards, e.g. the satisfaction of ego and self-actualisation needs, can be a direct product of effort directed towards organisational objectives.

4. The average human being learns under proper conditions not only to accept, but to seek responsibility. Avoidance of responsibility, lack of ambition, and emphasis on security are generally consequences of experience, not inherent human characteristics.

5. The capacity to exercise a relatively high degree of imagination, ingenuity, and creativity in the solution of
organisational problem is widely, not narrowly, distributed in the population.

6. Under the conditions of modern industrial life, the intellectual potentialities of the average human beings are only partially utilised.

The assumptions of Theory Y suggest a new approach in management. It emphasises on the cooperative endeavour of management and employees. The attempt is to get maximum output with minimum amount of control and direction. Generally, no conflict is visible between organisational goals and individual goals. Thus, the attempts of employees which are in their best interests are also in the interests of organisation.

**Comparison of Theories X and Y**

Both theories have certain assumptions about human nature. In fact, they are reverse sides of a coin, one representing head and the other representing tail. Thus, these assumptions seem to be mutually exclusive. The difference between two sets of assumptions can be visualised as follows:

1. Theory X assumes human beings to be inherently distasteful towards work. Theory Y assumes that for human beings,
work is as natural as play.

2. Theory X emphasises that people do not have ambitions and try to avoid responsibilities in jobs. The assumptions under Theory Y are just the reverse.

3. According to Theory X, most people have little capacity for creativity while according to Theory Y, the capacity for creativity is widely distributed in the population.

4. In Theory X, motivating factors are the lower needs. In Theory Y, higher order needs are more important for motivation, though unsatisfied lower needs are also important.

5. In Theory X, people lack self-motivation and require to be extremely controlled and closely supervised to get maximum output from them. In theory Y, people are self-directed and creative and prefer self-control.

6. Theory X emphasises scalar chain system and centralisation of authority in the organisation while Theory Y emphasises decentralisation and greater participation in the decision-making process.

7. Theory X emphasises autocratic leadership; Theory Y emphasises democratic and supportive leadership styles.
Maturity-Immaturity Theory of Argyris

Argyris (1953) assumes that worker has very little self-discipline and personal pride. He is branded as a shortsighted and foolish human. He points out that most employees are expected to do first as they are told and leave the thinking to the bosses or supervisors. The conclusions reached by Argyris (1953) are as follows:

1. That worker does not need a supervisor to control his actions, and more than he needs a parent to control him.

2. The worker is not willing to sacrifice everything for the sake of preserving his employment. If his pride or sense of justice are challenged, he may be quite willing to risk everything.

3. He does not need to be shown the one best way to do a job.

4. He may not regard work as simply a routine to be endured, but rather as a challenge to his skill and creativity.

5. The worker does not enjoy being told exactly what to do and when to do it. Being Boss is often a burden to him.

6. The worker wants to be given information, encouragement
Employee Centred Theory By Likert

According to Likert (1967), supervisory staff has a great impact on motivation. There is a marked relationship between the kind of supervision an employee receives and his productivity. When an employee thinks that his boss perceives him as a cog in the machine (instrument of production) he will be a poor producer; if he thinks that his boss is interested in him, his problems, his future, he will be a high producer.

Likert (1967) suggests that supervision should be employee centered i.e., friendly and supportive, and not job centred i.e. punitive and threatening.

Behaviouristic Theory By Skinner

Skinner (1954) has provide on the basis of his experiments on operant conditioning that the cause of behaviour is outside the person and in the environment. Behaviour is outside the person and in the environment. Behaviour of an individual is modified through operant conditioning. It is encouraged through positive reinforcement. At the same time, it is discouraged through negative conditioning. Skinner (1954), Guthrie (1968), Waston (1939) and other behavioural scientists are the champion of this
viewpoint and they advocate the incentives and rewards for the employees.

**Wolf’s Need Gratification Theory**

The hypotheses underlying Wolfs (1970) theory include the following:

- Person whose lower level needs (as postulated by Maslow, 1970) are as yet ungratified, derive both their satisfaction and their dissatisfaction from the degree of gratification of their lower level needs.

- Persons whose lower level needs are conditionally gratified receive both their satisfaction and their dissatisfaction from the degree of gratification of their higher level needs.

- Persons whose lower level needs are unconditionally gratified obtain both their satisfaction and their dissatisfaction from the degree of gratification of their higher level needs.

Dissatisfaction results from the frustration of the gratification of an active need, and from interruption of threatened interruption of a previously gratified need. Satisfaction results from the gratification of any need.
Wolf's formulations place particular emphasis on active needs that play a particular dominant role in job satisfaction and job motivation. Thus job motivation would be stronger when an individual perceives an opportunity to gratify an active need through job related behaviours.

**Herzberg's Dual Factor Theory Of Job Satisfaction**

The research findings of Herzberg, Mausner and Synderman (1959) suggested that man has two sets of needs: (1) his need as an animal to avoid pain, (2) his need as a human to grow psychologically. These findings led to advance a dual factor theory. This theory was hypothesised by studying two hundred engineers and accountants. During the structural interview they were asked to describe a few previous job experiences in which they felt exceptionally good or exceptionally bad about their jobs. They were also asked to rate the degree to which their feelings had been influenced for better or for worse by each experience which they described. The distinction between two kinds of factors were noted on analysis of results.

Job satisfaction consisted of two separate independent dimensions: the first dimension: the first dimension was related to job satisfaction and the second dimensions to job dissatisfaction.
These dimensions are not opposite ends of the same continuum, but instead represent two distinct continua. Those job characteristics that are important for and lead to job satisfaction but not to job dissatisfaction are classified as 'satisfiers' or 'motivators', while those that are important for, and lead to job dissatisfaction but not to job satisfaction are classified as 'dissatisfies' or 'hygienes' or 'maintenance'. Motivators contributed to satisfied feelings. Hygienes contributed to dissatisfied feelings. The first set of factors i.e. intrinsic, include job content: job itself, achievement, recognition, promotion, responsibility, advancement, psychological growth. Another set of factors i.e., extrinsic, include job context, working conditions, salary, supervision, job security, status, company policy.

Herzberg (1959) observed that satisfaction and dissatisfaction were two separate distinct and independent feelings. They are unipolar dimensions. The opposite of satisfaction is no satisfaction, and the opposite of dissatisfaction is no dissatisfaction. The traditional view conceives satisfaction and dissatisfaction as bipolar dimension, according to which absence of one indicates the presence of other.
Dissatisfaction       Satisfaction
Two-factor theory (Unipolar Dimension)
No Satisfaction       Satisfaction
Dissatisfaction       Dissatisfies No
Dissatisfaction

Second two-factor theory states that satisfaction and dissatisfaction do not exit on a continuum running from satisfaction through neutral to dissatisfaction. Two independent continuum exist; one running from satisfied to neutral and another running from dissatisfied to neutral as given below:

Satisfied       Neutral

Dissatisfied       Neutral

According to Herberg (1966), a person can be very satisfied and very dissatisfied at the same time. The theory implies that factors such as working conditions cannot increase or cause satisfaction they can only affect the amount of dissatisfaction that is experienced.

Thus the theory argues that job satisfaction and dissatisfaction result from different causes. Satisfaction depends on motivations while dissatisfaction is the result of hygiene factors.
**Summum Bonum Of Theories**

The summum bonum of all these theories can be expressed as under:

Singly none of the theories of job satisfaction is able to explain the management philosophies and practices. All of these theories go a long way to explain the different aspects and motives of employees behaviour and the concept of job satisfaction. All the theories are complimentary to one another. Majority of industrial psychologies are of the opinion that there is no generality of assumptions between job satisfaction and job productivity, turn over, etc. The commonly held hypothesis is that employees who experience positive job satisfaction in their work are more productive as a result. However, one can also contemplate the reverse explanation namely, that those employees who are more productive, have higher leaves of satisfaction, because of their superior work performance. In regard to this chicken and egg conundrum, Porte and Lawler (1968) make a plea to stop putting the satisfaction cart before the performance horse, rather they express the conviction that job satisfaction should be viewed as something that results from performance behaviour rather than as a cause of good or bad performance.
Morse (1953) suggesting additive view of the interplay of among job values, job rewards and job satisfaction argued, "the greater the amount the individual gets, the greater his satisfaction, and at the same time, the more the individual still desires, the less his satisfaction."

McCormick and Tiffin (1979) point out that the total welfare of individuals, and of society as whole depends in part on the satisfaction that the people experience in the various aspects of their lives, including their employment relationships. In recent years, there has been an increasing acceptance on the part of industry of social obligations to the community and to the nation as a whole, thereby creating adequate justifications for the action taken by managements and organisations to create work situations that are conducive to the increase of human satisfaction.