Chapter - III

Motivation and Job-Satisfaction
Before going to discuss the theories and principles of job-satisfaction, it is necessary to enumerate the various components of motivation. Let us start with the motivation theories, such as, the Needs Hierarchy Theory, Theory X and Theory Y and the Two - Factor Theory which are known as traditional theories and the contemporary theories like Expectancy Theory, Equity Theory, ERG Theory and so on. Because, there is the direct and positive relationship between the job-satisfaction and the motivation.

I. Motivation

The motivation thinkers have successfully integrated employment security, financial incentives, job flexibility and high productivity standards into a system that motivates its employees. Most organizations haven’t been so successful. This may explain why they concept of motivation is probably the most researched and discussed topic in the organizational sciences. Many people incorrectly view motivation as a personal trait—that is, some have it and others don’t. In practice, some managers label employees who seem to lack motivation as lazy. Such a label assumes an individual’s is always lazy or is lacking in motivation. Our knowledge of motivation tells us this just isn’t true. What we know is that motivation is the result of the interaction of the individual and the situation. Certainly, individuals differ in their basic motivational drive.

Motivation is defined as the willingness to exert high levels of effort to-ward organizational goals, conditioned by the effort’s ability to satisfy some individual need. While general motivation is concerned with effort toward any goal, we narrow the focus to organizational goals in order to reflect our singular interest in work-related behavior. The three key elements
in our definition are effort, organizational goals, and needs. The effort element is a measure of intensity. When someone is motivated, he or she tries hard. But, high levels of effort are unlikely to lead to favorable job performance outcomes unless the effort is channeled in a direction that benefits the organization. Therefore, we must consider the quality of the effort as well as its intensity. Effort that is directed toward, and consistent with, the organization's goals is the kind of effort we should be seeking. Finally, we treat motivation as a need-satisfying process.

A need, in our terminology, means some internal state that makes certain outcomes appear attractive. An un-satisfied need creates tension that stimulates drives within the individual. These drives generate a search behavior to find particular goals that, if attained, will satisfy the need and lead to the reduction of tension. So, we can say that motivated employees are in a state of tension. To relieve this tension, they exert effort. The greater the tension, the higher the effort level. If this effort successfully leads to the satisfaction of the need, tension is reduced. But, since we are interested in work behavior, this tension reduction effort must also be directed toward organizational goals. Therefore, inherent in our definition of motivation is the requirement that the individual's needs be compatible and consistent with the organization's goals. Where this does not occur, we can have individuals exerting high levels of effort that actually run counter to the interests of the organization. This, incidentally; is not so unusual. For example, some employees regularly spend a lot of time talking with friends at work in order to satisfy their social needs. There is a high level of effort, only it's being unproductively directed. Here, let us know the traditional theories and the contemporary theories of motivation.
A. Traditional Theories of Motivation

The Traditional Theory of Motivation is also known by three other names: (a) Monistic Theory of Motivation, (b) Economic Theory of Motivation, and (c) Carrot and Stick Approach to Motivation. The traditional theory explains human motivation in terms of economic factors only, that is, it assumes each worker as a classical 'economic man' who is interested in maximizing his monetary income. Thus, this theory says that people produce more by working harder when adequate material rewards are available or when there is a strong fear of punishment in case of non-performance. F.W. Taylor, the father of scientific management theory, was the first major exponent of this approach and later on, all the classical thinkers supported this theory. However, this theory came to be criticised by the human relationists and behaviourists on the ground that it has over-simplified and underestimated human motivation by neglecting the non-economic factors, that is, socio-psychological factors.

1. Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs

Abraham Maslow in his classic paper ‘A Theory of Human Motivation’ (1943) propounded the 'Need Hierarchy' theory of human motivation. His popular book ‘Motivation and Personality’ was published in 1954. Maslow's Need Hierarchy is the first systematic conceptual model of human motivation. He explained that human needs influence human behaviour. He, being a psychologist, understood human behaviour through psycho-analysis. Maslow's need hierarchy concept consists of five levels of human needs arranged in an ascending order. This is shown below:
Hierarchy of Needs

1. Physiological needs (biological needs) like hunger, thirst, sex, sleep.
2. Security needs (safety needs) like protection against natural calamities, threat, danger.
3. Social needs (love needs) like belongingness to groups, family, friendship.
4. Esteem needs (ego needs), which can be divided into two groups namely achievement needs like self-confidence, independence, competence; and recognition needs like status, importance, appreciation.
5. Self-actualization needs like self-fulfillment, realization of one's potential, creativity. The term 'self-actualization' was first coined by Kurt Goldstein.

Maslow divided these needs into lower order needs viz. physiological, security, and social and higher order needs, viz. esteem and self-actualization. According to Maslow, human beings usually strive to satisfy their physiological needs first. Once, these are satisfied, they no longer
motivate human behaviour. People then, are motivated by the next higher order needs, that is, security needs. Like this, human beings strive to satisfy their needs in the sequential order and in a step-by-step manner. Thus, the prepotency (urgency) of a satisfied need decreases and another unsatisfied need emerges to replace it. However, satisfaction is a relative term, that is, the emergence of needs is a gradual phenomenon, not sudden. Moreover, the hierarchy of needs is not as rigid as it is implied in the concept and needs are not watertight compartments. Thus, human needs are inter-dependent, interrelated and overlapping and human behaviour is multi-motivated.

2. McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y

Douglas McGregor propounded his theory of motivation, popularly known as ‘Theory X and Theory Y’ in his classic book ‘The Human Side of Enterprise’ (1960). He argues that "the theoretical assumptions which the management holds about controlling its human resources determine the whole character of the enterprise." His basic hypothesis has been that, "every managerial act rests on a theory." According to McGregor, management holds two different sets of assumptions about human nature and human behaviour in organisations. These two diametrically opposite sets of assumptions are called by him as Theory X and Theory Y. Theory X represents classical approach to management (i.e. authoritative management), while Theory Y represents behavioural approach to management (i.e. participative management). Thus, Theory X is work-centred, while Theory Y is both work and people-centred. McGregor called Theory X as the traditional view of managerial direction and control and
Theory Y as the integration of individual and organisational goals. According to McGregor, the manager holds the following assumptions about human nature and human behaviour under Theory X.

i. The average human being has an inherent dislike to work and will avoid it if he can.

ii. Because of this human characteristic of dislike to work, most people must be coerced, controlled, directed, and threatened with punishment to get them to put forth adequate effort towards the achievement of organisational objectives.

iii. The average human being prefers to be directed, wishes to avoid responsibility, has relatively little ambition, and wants security above all.

In contrast to the negative views under the Theory X, McGregor listed the following positive assumptions under Theory Y.

i. The expenditure of physical and mental effort in work is as 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 (and will be voluntarily performed) or a source of punishment (and will be avoided if possible).

ii. 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.
iii. Commitment to objectives is a function of the rewards associated with their achievement. The most significant of such rewards, for example, the satisfaction of ego and self-actualization needs, can be direct products of effort directed toward organisational objectives.

iv. An 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.

v. The capacity to exercise a relatively high degree of imagination, ingenuity and creativity in the solution of organisational problems is widely distributed in the population.

vi. Under the conditions of modern industrial life, the intellectual potentialities of an average human being are only partially utilized.

Managerial implications of theory X and theory Y

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managerial Functions</th>
<th>Theory X</th>
<th>Theory Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Goals</td>
<td>Subordinates have little participation in setting organisational goals</td>
<td>Subordinates participate in setting the organisational goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Communication</td>
<td>Downward</td>
<td>Downward and upward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Leadership</td>
<td>Autocratic/Directive</td>
<td>Democratic/Participative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Supervision</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Control</td>
<td>External and rigid</td>
<td>Internal and based on self-control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Motivation</td>
<td>Punitive/Coercive</td>
<td>Rewarding/Praising</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to McGregor, the central principle which derives from Theory X, is that of direction and control through exercise of authority. This has been called 'the scalar principle'. The central principle which is derived from Theory Y is that of integration—the creation of conditions which enable the members of an organisation to achieve their own goals best by directing their efforts towards the success of the enterprise. McGregor stated that Theory Y assumptions conceive man as a dynamic positive being with great potentialities for growth and development. These assumptions involve different implications for managerial strategy than those of Theory X. McGregor concluded that managerial strategy based on Theory Y assumptions will be more beneficial for both, the individual and the organization.

3. **Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory**

Fredrick Herzberg's two-factor theory of motivation is also known as Motivation-Hygiene Theory or Motivation-Maintenance Theory. His two popular books are ‘The Motivation to Work’ (1959) and ‘Work and the Nature of Man’ (1966). Herzberg interviewed two hundred engineers and accountants, who represented a cross section of Pittsburg Industry to find out the factors which are responsible for motivation. He used the critical incident method of obtaining data for analysis. He asked them about events they had experienced at work which, either had resulted in a marked improvement in their job satisfaction, or had led to a marked reduction in job
satisfaction. Herzberg found that the set of factors involved in the job satisfaction events were entirely different from the set of factors involved in the job dissatisfaction events. He called the former set of factors as 'satisfiers' (motivators or growth factors or intrinsic factors) and the latter set of factors as 'dis-satisfiers' (hygiene factors or maintenance factors or extrinsic factors). These are mentioned below⁴:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Hygiene Factors</strong></th>
<th><strong>Motivators</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Company policy and</td>
<td>1. Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Supervision (Technical)</td>
<td>2. Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Interpersonal relations</td>
<td>4. Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Supervisor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Working conditions</td>
<td>5. Advancement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Herzberg, these two sets of factors have two separate themes. The motivators describe man's relationship to what he does (his job content). In other words, they are related to the nature of work and are thus intrinsic to the job itself. They are effective in motivating the individual to superior performance and effort. Thus, they do not cause dissatisfaction with their absence while, their presence brings satisfaction. The hygiene factors, on the other hand, describe man's relationship to the context or environment in which he does his job. In other words, they are related to the surrounding or peripheral aspects of the job and are thus, extrinsic to the job. They do not motivate the individual to a better performance and effort. They serve
primarily to prevent job dissatisfaction and maintain status quo. Thus, they cause dissatisfaction with their absence while their presence do not bring satisfaction. Herzberg used the term 'hygiene' in an analogy to the medical use of the term meaning 'preventive and environmental'. In other words, he called the 'dissatisfiers' as the 'hygiene' factors because they act in a manner analogous to the principles of mental hygiene. Hygiene is not curative but preventive. According to Herzberg, hygiene factors lead to job dissatisfaction because of a need to avoid unpleasantness. The motivators, on the other hand, lead to job satisfaction because of a need for growth or self-actualisation.

Herzberg has divided people working in organisations into two categories called 'hygiene seekers' and 'motivation seekers'. Unlike Maslow's theory which is descriptive, Herzberg's theory is prescriptive. Thus, Herzberg suggested the concept of 'job enrichment' as against the traditional concept of 'job enlargement' to motivate members of the organisations. The technique of job enrichment, according to Herzberg, involves the designation of job in such a way as to provide opportunities for achievement, recognition, responsibility, advancement and growth. It does not necessarily involve more tasks to perform, but more autonomy, accountability, and responsibility in terms of planning, executing, controlling, and evaluating of the job. Thus, unlike job enlargement which loads (expands) job horizontally and increases its scope, job enrichment loads (expands) job vertically and increases its depth³.
B. Contemporary Theories of Motivation

The previous theories are well known but, unfortunately, have not held up well under close examination. However, all is not lost. A number of contemporary theories have one thing in common: Each has a reasonable degree of valid supporting documentation. Of course, this doesn't mean the theories we are about to introduce are unquestionably right. We call them contemporary theories not because they necessarily were developed recently, but because they represent the current state of the art in explaining employee motivation.

1. ERG Theory

Clayton Alderfer of Yale University has reworked Maslow's need hierarchy to align it more closely with the empirical research. His revised need hierarchy is labeled ERG theory. Alderfer argues that there are three groups of core need existence, relatedness, and growth—hence the label ERG theory. The existence group is concerned with providing our basic material existence requirements. It includes the items that Maslow considered physiological and safety needs. The second group of needs are those of relatedness—the desire we have for maintaining important interpersonal relationships. These social and status desires require interaction with others if they are to be satisfied, and they align with Maslow's social need and the external component of Maslow's esteem classification. Finally, Alderfer isolates growth needs an intrinsic desire for personal development. These include the intrinsic component from Maslow's esteem category and the characteristics included under self-actualization⁶.
Besides substituting three needs for five, how does Alderfer's ERG theory differ from Maslow's? In contrast to the hierarchy of needs theory, the ERG theory demonstrates that (1) more than one need may be operative at the same time, and (2) if the gratification of a higher level need is stifled, the desire to satisfy a lower level need increases. Maslow's need hierarchy is a rigid step like progression. ERG theory does not assume a rigid hierarchy where a lower need must be substantially gratified before one can move on. A person can, for instance, be working on growth even though existence or relatedness needs are unsatisfied; or all three need categories could be operating at the same time. ERG theory also contains a frustration-regression dimension. Maslow argued that an individual would stay at a certain need level until that need was satisfied. ERG theory counters by noting that when a higher order need level is frustrated, the individual's desire to increase a lower level need takes place. Inability to satisfy a need for social interaction, for instance, might increase the desire for more money or better working conditions. So, frustration can lead to a regression to a lower need.

In summary, ERG theory argues, like Maslow, that satisfied lower order needs lead to the desire to satisfy higher order needs; but multiple needs can be operating as motivators at the same time, and frustration in attempting to satisfy a higher level need can result in regression to a lower level need. ERG theory is more consistent with our knowledge of individual differences among people. Variables such as education, family background, and cultural environment can alter the importance or driving force that a
group of needs holds for a particular individual. The evidence demonstrating that people in other cultures rank the need categories differently for instance, natives of Spain and Japan place social needs before their physiological requirements would be consistent with the ERG theory. Several studies have supported the ERG theory, but there is also evidence that it doesn't work in some organizations. Overall, however, ERG theory represents a more valid version of the need hierarchy.

2. McClelland’s Theory of Needs

It is also one of three needs proposed by David McClelland and his associates as being important in organizational settings for understanding motivation. McClelland's theory of needs focuses on three needs: achievement, power, and affiliation and they are defined as follows:

- a. Need for achievement: The drive to excel, to achieve in relation to a set of standards, to strive to succeed
- b. Need for power: The need to make others behave in a way they would not have behaved otherwise
- c. Need for affiliation: The desire for friendly and close interpersonal relationships.

3. Cognitive Evaluation Theory

In the late 1960s one researcher proposed that the introduction of extrinsic rewards, such as pay, for work effort that had been previously intrinsically rewarding due to the pleasure associated with the content of the
work itself would tend to decrease the overall level of motivation. This proposal which has come to be called the cognitive evaluation theory has been extensively researched, and a large number of studies have been supportive. As we show, the major implications for this theory relate to the way in which people are paid in organizations.

Historically, motivation theorists have generally assumed that intrinsic motivations such as achievement, responsibility, and competence are independent of extrinsic motivators like high pay, promotions, good supervisor relations, and pleasant working conditions. That is, the stimulation of one would not affect the other. But, the cognitive evaluation theory suggests otherwise. It argues that when extrinsic rewards are used by organizations as payoffs for superior performance, the intrinsic rewards, which are derived from individuals doing what they like, are reduced. In other words, when extrinsic rewards are given to someone for performing an interesting task, it causes intrinsic interest in the task itself to decline.

4. Goals-Setting Theory

Gene Broadwater, coach of the Hamilton High School cross-country team, gave his squad these last words before they approached the line for the league championship race: "Each one of you is physically ready. Now, get out there and do your best. No one can ever ask more of you than that." The research on goal-setting theory addresses these issues, and the findings, in terms of the effect of goal specificity, challenge, and feedback on performance.
In addition to feedback, three other factors have been found to influence the goals-performance relationship: goal commitment, adequate self-efficacy, and national culture. Goal-setting theory presupposes that an individual is committed to the goal, that is, determined not to lower or abandon the goal. Our overall conclusion is that intentions as articulated in terms of hard and specific goals are a potent motivating force. Under the proper conditions, they can lead to higher performance. However, no evidence supports the idea that such goals are associated with increased job satisfaction.

5. **Reinforcement Theory**

A counterpoint to goal-setting theory is reinforcement theory. The former is a cognitive approach, proposing that an individual's purposes direct his or her action. In reinforcement theory, we have a behavioristic approach, which argues that reinforcement conditions behavior. The two are clearly at odds philosophically. Reinforcement theorists see behavior as being environmentally caused. They would argue, with internal cognitive events; what controls behavior are reinforcers any consequence that, when immediately following a response, increases the probability that the behavior will be repeated.

Reinforcement theory ignores the inner state of the individual and concentrates solely on what happens to a person when he or she takes some action. Because, it does not concern itself with what initiates behavior, it is not, strictly speaking, a theory of motivation. But, it does provide a powerful
means of analysis of what controls behavior, and it is for this reason that it is typically considered in discussions of motivation\textsuperscript{10}. Reinforcement is undoubtedly an important influence on behavior, but few scholars are prepared to argue it is the only influence.

6. **Equity Theory**

Jane's situation illustrates the role that equity plays in motivation. Employees make comparisons of their job inputs and outcomes relative to those of others. We perceive what we get from a job situation (outcomes) in relation to what we put into it (inputs), and then we compare our outcome-input ratio with the outcome-input ratio of relevant others. If we perceive our ratio to be equal to that of the relevant others with whom we compare ourselves, a state of equity is said to exist. We perceive our situation as fair that justice prevails. When we see the ratio as unequal, we experience equity tension. The referent that an employee selects adds to the complexity of equity theory. Evidence indicates that the referent chosen is an important variable in equity theory. There are four referent comparisons an employee can use:

1. *Self-inside*: An employee's experiences in a different position inside his or her current organization
2. *Self-outside*: An employee's experiences in a situation or position outside his or her current organization
3. *Other-inside*: Another individual or group of individuals inside the employee's organization
4. *Other-outside*: Another individual or group of individuals outside the employee's organization\textsuperscript{11}
So, employees might compare themselves to friends, neighbors, co-workers, colleagues in other organizations, or past jobs they themselves have had. Which referent an employee chooses will be influenced by the information the employee holds about referents as well as by the attractiveness of the referent. This has led to focusing on four moderating variables—gender, length of tenure, level in the organization, and amount of education or professionalism. Research shows that both men and women prefer same-sex comparisons. The research also demonstrates that women are typically paid less than men in comparable jobs and have lower pay expectations than men for the same work. So a female who uses another female as a referent tends to result in a lower comparative standard. This leads us to conclude that employees in jobs that are not sex segregated will make more cross-sex comparisons than those in jobs which are either male or female dominated. This also suggests that if women are tolerant of lower pay it may be due to the comparative standard they use.

Employees with short tenure in their current organizations tend to have little information about others inside the organization, so they rely on their own personal experiences. However, employees with long tenure rely more heavily on co-workers for comparison. Upper-level employees, those in the professional ranks, and those with higher amounts of education tend to be more cosmopolitan and have better information about people in other organizations. Therefore, these types of employees make more other-outside comparisons.
7. **Expectancy Theory**

Currently, one of the most widely accepted explanations of motivation is Victor Vroom's expectancy theory. Although it has its critics, most of the research evidence is supportive of the theory. Expectancy theory argues that the strength of a tendency to act in a certain way depends on the strength of an expectation that the act will be followed by a given outcome and on the attractiveness of that outcome to the individual. In more practical terms, expectancy theory says an employee is motivated to exert a high level of effort when he or she believes effort will lead to a good performance appraisal; a good appraisal will lead to organizational rewards like a bonus, a salary increase, or a promotion; and the rewards will satisfy the employee's personal goals. The theory, therefore, focuses on three relationships:

1. *Effort-performance relationship:* The probability perceived by the individual that exerting a given amount of effort will lead to performance.
2. *Performance-reward relationship:* The degree to which the individual believes that performing at a particular level will lead to the attainment of a desired outcome.
3. *Rewards-personal goals relationship:* The degree to which organizational rewards satisfy an individual's personal goals or needs and the attractiveness of those potential rewards for the individual.
In Summary, the key to expectancy theory is the understanding of an individual’s goals and the linkage between effort and performance, between performance and rewards, and finally, between the rewards and individual goal satisfaction. As a contingency model, expectancy theory recognizes that there is no universal principal for explaining everyone’s motivations. Additionally, just because we understand what needs a person seeks to satisfy does not ensure that the individual himself perceives high performance as necessarily leading to the satisfaction of these needs.

II. Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is how content an individual is with his or her job. Scholars and human resource professionals generally make a distinction between affective job satisfaction and cognitive job satisfaction. Affective job satisfaction is the extent of pleasurable emotional feelings individuals have about their jobs overall and is different to cognitive job satisfaction which is the extent of individuals’ satisfaction with particular facets of their jobs, such as pay, pension arrangements, working hours and numerous other aspects of their jobs.

At its most general level of conceptualization, job satisfaction is simply how content an individual is with his or her job. At the more specific levels of conceptualization used by academic researchers and human resources professionals, job satisfaction has varying definitions. Affective job satisfaction is usually defined as an uni-dimensional subjective construct representing an overall emotional feeling individuals have about
their job as a whole. Hence, affective job satisfaction for individuals reflects the degree of pleasure or happiness their job in general induces. Cognitive job satisfaction is usually defined as being a more objective and logical evaluation of various facets of a job. As such, cognitive job satisfaction can be unidimensional if it comprises evaluation of just one aspect of a job, such as pay or maternity leave, or multidimensional if two or more facets of a job are simultaneously evaluated. Cognitive job satisfaction does not assess the degree of pleasure or happiness that arises from specific job facets, but rather gauges the extent to which those job facets are judged by the job holder to be satisfactory in comparison with objectives they themselves set or with other jobs. While cognitive job satisfaction might help to bring about affective job satisfaction, the two constructs are distinct, not necessarily directly related, and have different antecedents and consequences.\textsuperscript{13}

From the historical points of views, one of the biggest preludes to the study of job satisfaction was the Hawthorne studies. These studies (1924-1933), primarily credited to Elton May 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 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 labor and piecework towards the more modern of assembly lines and hourly wages. 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 W.L.Bryan, Walter Dill Scott, and Hugo Munsterberg set the tone for Taylor’s work.

Some argue the 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 also be seen within the broader context of the range of issues which after 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 interface, and working conditions.
Measuring Job Satisfaction

We previously defined job satisfaction as an individual’s general attitude toward his or her job. This definition is clearly a very broad one. Yet, this is inherent in the concept. Remember, a person’s job is more than just the obvious activities of shuffling papers, waiting on customers, or driving a truck. Jobs require interaction with co-workers and bosses, following organizational rules and policies, meeting performance standards, living with working conditions that are often less than ideal, and the like. This means an employee’s assessment of how satisfied or dissatisfied he or she is with his or her job is a complex summation or a number of discrete job elements. How, then do we measure the concept?

The two most widely used approaches are a single global rating and summation score made up of a number of job facets. The single global rating method is nothing more than asking individuals to respond to one question, such as “All things considered, how satisfied are you with your job?” Respondents then reply by circling a number between 1 and 5 that corresponds with answer from “Highly Satisfied” to “Highly Dissatisfied”. The other approach a summation of job facets is more sophisticated. It identifies key elements in a job and asks for the employee’s feelings about each. Typical factors that would be included are the nature of the work, supervision, present pay, promotion opportunities, and relations with co-workers. These factors are rated on a standardized scale and then added up to create an overall job satisfaction score\textsuperscript{15}. 
Is one of the foregoing approaches superior to the other? Intuitively, it would seem that summing up responses to a number of job factors would achieve a more accurate evaluation of job satisfaction. The research, however, doesn’t support this intuition. This is one of those are instances in which simplicity wins out over complexity. Comparisons of one-question global ratings with the more lengthy summation-of-job-factors method indicate that the former is more valid. The best explanation for this outcome is that the concept of job satisfaction is inherently so broad, the single question actually becomes a more inclusive measure.

**Determinants of Job Satisfaction**

We not turn to the question: What work-related variables determine job satisfaction? An extensive review of the literature indicates that the more important factors conducive to job satisfaction are mentally challenging work, equitable rewards, supportive working conditions, and supportive colleagues. The determinants of job-satisfaction are following:

1. **Mentally Challenging work:** Employees tend to prefer jobs that give them opportunities to use their skills and abilities and offer a variety of tasks, freedom, and feedback on how well they are doing. These characteristics make work mentally challenging. Jobs that have too little challenge create boredom, but too much challenge creates frustration and feelings of failure. Under conditions of moderate challenge, most employees will experience pleasure and satisfaction.
2. **Equitable Rewards:** Employees want pay systems and promotion policies that they perceive as being just, unambiguous, and in line with their expectations. When pay is seen as fair based on job demands, individual skill level, and community pay standards, satisfaction is likely to result. Of course not everyone seeks money. Many people willingly accept less money to work in a preferred location or in a less demanding job or to have greater discretion in the work they do and the hours they work. But, the key in linking pay to satisfaction is not the absolute amount one is paid; rather, it is the perception of fairness. Similarly, employees seek fair promotion policies and practices. Promotions provide opportunities for personal growth, more responsibilities, and increased social status. Individuals who perceive that promotion decisions are made in a fair and just manner, therefore, are likely to experience satisfaction from the jobs.

3. **Supportive Working Conditions:** Employees are concerned with their work environment for both personal comfort and facilitating doing a good job. Studies demonstrate that employees prefer physical surrounding that are not dangerous or uncomfortable. Temperature, light, noise, and other environmental factors should not be at either extreme – for example, having too much heat or too little light. Additionally, most employees prefer working relatively close to home, in clean and relatively modern facilities, and with adequate tools and equipment.

4. **Supportive Colleagues:** People get more out of work than merely money or tangible achievements. For most employees, work also fills the need for social interaction. Not surprisingly, therefore, having friendly and
supportive co-workers leads to increased job satisfaction. The behaviour of one’s boss also is major determinant of satisfaction. Studies generally find that employees satisfaction is increased when the immediate supervisor is understanding and friendly, offers praise for good performance, listens to employees’ opinions, and shows a personal interest in them.

5. The personality: People with personality types congruent with their chosen vocations should find they have the right talents and abilities to meet the demands of their jobs; are thus more likely to be successful on those jobs; and, because of this success, have a greater probability of achieving high satisfaction from their work. Studies to replicate Holland’s conclusions have been almost universally supportive. It’s important, therefore, to add this to our list of factors that determine job satisfaction.

The Effect of Job Satisfaction on Employee Performance:

Manager’s interest in job satisfaction tends to center on its effect on employee performance. Researchers have recognized this interest, so we find a large number of studies that have been designed to assess them impact of job satisfaction on employee productivity, absenteeism, and turnover. Let’s look at the current state of our knowledge.

1. Satisfaction and Productivity

A number of reviews were done in the 1950s and 1960s covering dozens of studies that sought to establish the relationship between satisfaction and productivity. These reviews could find no consistent
relationship. In the 1990s, though the studies are far from unambiguous we can make some sense out of the evidence. The early views on the satisfaction – performance relationship can be essentially summarized in the statement “a happy worker is a productive worker”. Much of the paternalism shown by managers in the 1930s, and 1950s – forming company bowling teams and credit unions, having company picnics, providing counselling services for employees, training supervisors to be sensitive to the concerns of subordinates was done to make workers happy. But, belief in the happy worker thesis was based more on wishful thinking than hard evidence.

The most recent research provides renewed support for the original satisfaction-performance relationship. When satisfaction and productivity data is gathered for the organization as a whole, rather than at the individual level, we find that organisations with more satisfied employees tended to be more effective than organizations with less satisfied employees. If this conclusion can be reproduced in additional studies, it may well be that the reason we haven’t gotten strong support for the satisfaction causes productivity thesis is that studies have focused on individuals rather than the organization and that individual – level measures of productivity don’t take into consideration all the interactions and complexities in the work process.

2. **Satisfaction and Absenteeism**

We find a consistent negative relationship between satisfaction and absenteeism, but the correlation is moderate. While it certainly makes sense that dissatisfied employees are more likely to miss work, other factors have
an impact on the relationship and reduce the correlation coefficient. For example, let us have the discussion of sick pay versus well pay. Organisations that provide liberal sick leave benefits are encouraging all their employees – including those who are highly satisfied to take days off. Assuming we have a reasonable number of varied interest, we can find work satisfying and yet still take off work to enjoy a three-day weekend, tan ourselves on a warm summer day, or watch the world series on television if those days come free with no penalties. Also, as with productivity, outside factors can act to reduce the correlation.

3. **Satisfaction and Turnover**

Satisfaction is also negatively related to turnover, but the correlation is stronger than what we found for absenteeism. Yet, again, other factors such as labour market conditions, expectations about alternative job opportunities, and length of tenure with the organization are important constraints on the actual decision to leave one’s current job. Evidence indicates that an important moderator of the satisfaction-turnover relationship is the employee’s level of performance. Specifically, level of satisfaction is less important in predicting turnover for superior performers. Why? The organization typically makes considerable efforts to keep these people. They get pay raises, praise, recognition, increased promotion opportunities, and so forth. Just the opposite tends to apply to poor performers. Few attempts are made by the organization to retain them. There may even be subtle pressures to encourage them to quit. We would expect, therefore, that job satisfaction is more important in influencing poor
performers to stay than superior performers. Regardless of level of satisfaction, the latter are more likely to remain with the organization because the receipt of recognition, praise, and other rewards gives them more reasons for staying.

Job satisfaction is on the top of the important targets for an establishment which is in the process of totally quality. Because, the provision of total quality, first of all, is based on the sincere commitment to work of the corporate employees/managers and being satisfied with their jobs; namely, doing their jobs fondly. The role of motivation about the productivity and the efficiency is a topic which has been studied and debated for years. Because, the company’s success depends on employee’s skills and willingness. With zero-error production of services, ensuring full customer satisfaction and employee in a harmonious relationship with their colleagues and work is the primary target of “Job satisfaction”. Composing customer contentment and loyalty, however, depends on making the firm’s employees satisfied and the degree of saturation for their job.\(^{18}\)

The persistence of the establishments depends on enriching the palette of products and services offering their customers and producing better quality, cheaper and more useful products, improving business processes by continuously analyzing and increasing their performance. In this sense, for establishments, measuring organizational devotion, job satisfaction for local customer contentment, quality, time, structure of organization and its strength gain a high importance. It can be only so possible for the employees who communicate with customers one-to-one
and the employees in manufacturing to process by fulfilling their duties impeccably (perfectly), obstruct the wastage of enterprise and exhibit positive behaviours like this, with construction of an emotional bond with their job and establishment. When the employee likes the job he made and feels himself as a precious person in enterprise, he won’t spare to exhibit beneficial attitudes for the enterprise. He will work as if he were working in his own job with this satisfaction. Establishments cannot overlook this positive atmosphere resulting from job satisfaction, even if, for their own benefit. Establishments should organize social activities, to instill a sense of job satisfaction for their employees and should do activities which would cause the employees, no matter what they do (cleanliness, transportation, production, management), to thinking that if they didn’t do their job, the production process would cease and create the feeling for an individual employees as if he were doing the most important job in the enterprise, establishing a social networking.

Job satisfaction is a general expression of workers’ positive attitudes built up towards their jobs. Workers maintain an attitude towards their jobs as a result of diverse features of their job, social status that they’ve gained about their jobs and experiences in their job environment. This attitude can be also negative towards work. If the economic benefits, the social status, the job’s own specific characteristics and the job expectation employees hoped, are appropriate for employees’ desires, there is job satisfaction. Positive attitudes of employees towards the whole business environment as a result their experiences of work-environment are called job satisfaction. There is not an admirable relationship between the behaviours and attitudes of staff and their performances. Even though it can be said that there are
some studies, which prove no relation between job satisfaction and productiveness of workers, generally, conditions in practice opposite that. Because, the positive effect of satisfaction on motivation and effectiveness cannot be denied.

**Relationship of Job-satisfaction and Attitudes**

Job satisfaction is an attitude that workers put on towards their jobs. Attitude is one of the important subjects focused on in social sciences. Attitude is the process of enthusiasm and recognition resulting from specific values and beliefs, in relation to one aspect of an individual’s own world’s internal world. It is also possible to define attitude as the summation of sense, belief and thoughts which the individual forms in direction with his perceptions about his environment. In a sense, attitude is the stimulant of behaviour or the knowledge which prepares the individual for behaviour. Attitude, especially about sense, have importance because of the fact that they give continuity to the personality of individual, they give meaning to his daily activities and mentalities and that they facilitate his attempt made in order to gain various aims.

Attitudes are composed of three main elements. These are emotion, thought and behaviour. The element emotion is related with the condition of individuals being positive, negative or neutral towards things. The element of thought is composed of individual knowledge towards things. The element of behaviour is related with action area, which is the outer appearance of knowledge and emotion elements. The most important feature of behaviours is that they generate with the interaction of biological, psychological and social elements of behaviour.
Attitudes are formed under the influence of environmental factors. Job satisfaction, as an attitude, is also shaped under the influence of environmental factors. Environmental factors are family, religion, legal and moral rules and values, history, the prevailing mindset of the society in general, cultural elements etc. Because of that there is a close relationship of attitudes that accepted or rejected by employee with their socio-economic and socio-cultural personalities.

Theories Explaining Job Satisfaction

One of the most important theories which explain the job satisfaction is Lawler’s theory. He explains job satisfaction in four basic conditions; The Fulfillment Theory which explains the reaching of the things needed. The Discrepancy Theory, deals with difference, contradiction and conflict theory. The Equity Theory is about equality and the fourth one is the two-factor theory.

1. According to the Fulfillment Theory, the basic rule of the happiness of workers is to satisfy their demands and getting their wishes. Workers are satisfied if their demands are totally provided. Namely, the more a workers earns the more he is satisfied and the less a worker earns the less he is satisfied. A higher rank job or an interesting job can satisfy them too.

2. The Discrepancy Theory is concerned on what the workers are expecting and what they are getting. Their expectations, evaluations and hopes of workers about their works are more important than what they are having in real. Difference between expectations and gatherings are the base of this theory in light of these three questions.
a. What do workers wish?

b. What are their expectations?

c. What can they get actually?

3. According to the Equity Theory, workers ponders about what are his qualifications, contribution to the work and the job’s contribution to him. It means creating an attitude of worker against the work he does. If the worker is paid over his work, he will feel guilty but if he is paid under what he deserves, his feeling for justice will rise.

4. The Two Factor Theory regards the elements of reasons of fulfillment. Negative elements are lower wages, no job guarantee and such factors. Fulfillment elements are, as Herzberg (1976) stated; realization of worker himself and reaching his goals. By this two factor theory, Herzberg advanced Maslow’s main, physiologic and self realization theory and fortified it with his. Maslow’s theory is based on the comparison of the best and worst conditions at work. The conditions in which the workers fell well are called the motivators; the bad conditions are called defensive factors (hygiene). According to him, preserving factors lead unsatisfactory conditions and contrary motivator elements lead fulfillment. The bad factors are: corporation policies and management, work condition, salary, status and relations with co-workers. The motivators are: success, fame, specialties’ of work, responsibility, awards and advancement. There are many studies about job-satisfaction. Some prove a direct connection between motivation quality and job-satisfaction.
Employee’s Expression of Dissatisfaction

Employee’s dissatisfaction can be expressed in a number of ways. For example, rather than quit, employees can complain, be insubordinate, steal organizational property, or shirk a part of their work responsibilities. There are following four responses that differ from one another along two dimensions: constructiveness / destructiveness and activity / passivity.  

1. **Exit**: Behaviour directed toward leaving the organization. Includes looking for a new position as well as resigning.  

2. **Voice**: Activity and constructively attempting to improve conditions. Includes suggesting improvements, discussing problems with superiors, and some forms of union activity.  

3. **Loyalty**: Passively but optimistically waiting for conditions to improve. Includes speaking up for the organization in the face of external criticism and trusting the organization and its management to “do the right thing”.  

4. **Neglect**: Passively allowing conditions to worsen. Includes chronic absenteeism or lateness, reduce effort and increased error rate.  

**Top 10 Reasons for Job-Dissatisfaction**

According to Jean Scheid, if you employ even one person, you will hear a complaint from time to time. What are the top turn them into
positives? Jean Scheid, a business owner, offers examples and solutions. The following are top 10 reasons for job-dissatisfaction of the employees.

1. My pay is too low
2. I do it all
3. We have no benefits
4. I’m always working
5. I never get overtime
6. I can’t work with her
7. I hate my boss
8. What am i supposed to do?
9. What are our goals?, and
10. I feel like i’m in jail!

Key Reasons for Job Dissatisfaction

According to Rose Johnson, many employees feel dissatisfied with their jobs at one point or another. Some employees leave their jobs for better opportunities. Employees with low job satisfaction can negatively affect a company because they typically lack motivation, perform possible symptoms can directly affect a company’s bottom line. Managers should understand the following reasons why employees are unhappy and dissatisfied.

1. Under paid
2. Limited career growth and advancement
3. Lack of interest. and
4. Poor management
Thus, in this part, researcher has clearly and appropriately enumerated the traditional theories of motivation, such as, Needs Hierarchy Theory, Theory X and Theory Y and the Two-Factor Theory; and the contemporary theories like ERG Theory, Theory of Needs, Cognitive Evaluation Theory, Goal-Setting Theory, Reinforcement Theory, Equity Theory and the Expectancy Theory. The researcher has also brought out the measurement of job-satisfaction, determinants of job-satisfaction, the effects, relationship between job-satisfaction and attitudes, theories, employees, expression of dissatisfaction, top 10 reasons and key reasons for job-dissatisfaction. Such an understanding over the theories and principles of motivation and job-satisfaction leads us to study the role of ONGC in HRM in fourth coming chapter.
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