"Man's ability to compare his situation with that of another, and to score himself as 'less than' his fellow worker because he makes less money, has a smaller car and has less status, causes him to suffer greatly. Thus it is apparent that the human capacity to be unhappy is inexhaustible, because the range of stimuli that can cause pain to mankind is so vast and the number of situations in which man can make comparisons is equally inexhaustible."

(Herzberg, 1968, P. 49)

People judge some stimulus or event by comparing it with an appropriate standard. Deprivation is relative, not absolute. People feel unjustly treated or inadequately compensated when they compare themselves to some standard of reference. Because deprivation is relative, it is often true that those who are most deprived in an
objective sense are the ones most likely to experience deprivation. These are the essential concepts of the theory of relative deprivation. They find expression in common sense and anecdotal wisdom.

The freed slave Fredrick Douglass noted:

"Beat and cuff your slave, keep him hungry and spiritless, and he will follow the chain of his master like a dog, but feed and clothe him well, work him moderately, sorround him with physical comfort and dreams of freedom intrude"

(Quoted in Marx, 1967, P.49)

Pieter Sorokin claimed that "Poverty or wealth of man is measured not by what he has at present but by what he used to have before or what others have" (Sorokin, 1925 P.72)

Plato (1965) in the latter part of his discussion of Imperfect Societies in the ‘Repupblic’, analyses certain processes of Social Comparision and the individuals
sense of justice. He pinpoints the importance of perception in accounting for differing patterns of resentment.

He says:

"Such being the state of rulers and ruled, what will happen when they come up against each other in the streets or in the course of business, at a festival or on a campaign, serving in the navy or army? When they see each other in moments of danger, the rich man will no longer be able to despise the poor man, the poor man will be lean and sunburnt, and find himself fighting next to some rich man whose sheltered life and superfluous flesh make him puff and blow and quite unable to cope. Won't he conclude the people like this are rich because their subject are cowards, and won't he say to his fellows, when he meets them in private, 'This lot are not good; they 've had it?"
Similarly, although more obscurely, the invisibility of real pleasure to those with none induces further perceptual distortion. This is because these people will be convinced that the transition from pain to the neutral state brings satisfaction and pleasure, whereas in fact their ignorance of true pleasure leads them to make a false contrast between pain and the absence of pain. Plato explains that it results from the psychological state of the individuals concerned.

Thus (ibid, P362):

"Those, therefore, who have no experience of wisdom and goodness, and do nothing have a good time, spend their life straying between the bottom and middle, and never rise higher to see or reach the true top, nor achieve any real satisfaction or sure and unadulterated pleasure. They bend over their tables, like sheep with heads bent over their pasture and eyes on the ground, they
stuff themselves and copulate, and in their greed for more they kick and butt each other with hooves and horns of steel, and kill each other because they are not satisfied, as they cannot be while they feed on unreality a part of themselves which is itself unreal and insatiable."

Aristotle (1962) argues that any particular society is premised upon some notion of justice and thus a revolution may result when its members cease to agree upon the application of the principles to the existing pattern of inequality.

Thus:

"For those who are bent on equality start a revolution if they believe that they, having less, are yet equals of those who have more. And so too do those who aim at inequality and superiority, if they think that they, being unequal, are not getting more but equal or less. The
lesser rebel in order to be equal, the
equal in order to be greater" (ibid,
P.192)

Bacon (1911) like Aristotle, emphasizes, how
'persons of eminent virtue when they are advanced are
less envied.' Bacon maintains, that 'persons of worth
and merit are most envied when their fortune continueth
long; for by that time, though their virtue be the
same, yet it hath not the same lustre; for fresh men
grow up that darken it. (ibid, P.39). Bacon emphasized
that envy is dependent upon social comparison. Thus,
'envy is ever joined with a comparing of a man's self;
and where there is no comparison, no envy; and therefore
kings are not envied but by kings (ibid). Other point
is that for envy to occur, the envier must clearly
perceive the envied.

He says that:

"Envy is as the sunbeams, that beat
hotter upon a bank or steep rising ground
than upon a flat; and, for the same reason, those that are advanced by degrees are less envied that those that are advanced suddenly and per saltum ... and nothing doth extinguish envy more than for a great person to preserve all other inferior officers in their full rights and preeminences of their places, for by that means there may be so many screens betwen him and envy. Finally, he says that envy is less probable where the rich and successful can justify themselves by virtue of the work, effort or danger involved in their acquisition of such wealth and fame (ibid).

In the second volume of de Tocqueville's 'Democracy in America', he argues that in aristocratically dominated societies, revolution is less likely because individuals get used to their poverty and most especially they are not concerned with physical comfort since 'they despair of getting it and because they do not know enough about to want it'. (1966,
The upsetting of this world 'when distinctions of rank are blurred and privileges abolished' leads the poor (to) conceive an eager desire to acquire comfort, and the rich think of the danger of losing it' (ibid).

Veblen (1899) starts by noting that in the primitive stage of social development, there is a weak incentive to emulate, but as development occurs, so the opportunity and incentive to emulate increases greatly in scope and intensity. Invidious comparison between men become ubiquitous.

Emulation contributes to the accumulation, ownership and the development of property (ibid) and this reacts back-upon the form of comparative reference. In primitive communal society, the object of comparison is the enemy, the other group, from whom the plunder has been acquired. In modern society based on individual ownership, invidious comparison is made with members of one's own group. The dimension of such inter group comprison is that of individual ownership (as well as physical process) those who are deprived suffer from
lack of esteem from others and thus from themselves. (ibid P.27 - 30). The incentive to emulate is never assauged, first because if the comparison reveals that an individual is deprived then until he reaches 'the normal pecuniary, standard of the community' (ibid P. 31), he will become chronically dissatisfied; while second, once he reaches this normal standard he will experience a restless striving to heighten the distance between himself and the average. Veblen's argument is well indicated by the following (ibid P.31-32):

"The invidious comparison can never become so favourable to the individual making it that he would not gladly rate himself still higher relatively to his competitors in his struggle for pecuniary reputability". Relative success, the outcome of invidious comparison becomes the end of action (ibid P.33)

Marx (1954) argued that inequality was steadily widening and said that increasing misery meant not to heightened psychological dissatisfaction but increased physical impoverishment. Marx's most explicity
statement supporting this interpretation is that in proportion as capital accumulates, the lot of the labour, be his payament high or low must grow worse. Thus what is important is the relationship between the power of capital and that of labour. His theory implies that an actor's satisfaction or dissatisfaction depends upon how much he has in comparison with others.

He commented:

"A house may be large or small, as long as the neighbouring houses are like wise, it satisfies all the social requirements for a residence. But let there arise next to the little house a palace, and the little house shrinks into a hut" (ibid P. 33)

He further states that as capital is accumulated and productivity enhanced, there is realized an increased disjunction between the power of labour and of capital (ibid P. 39)
Thus:

If, therefore the income of the worker increases with a rapid growth of capital, there is at the time a widening of the social chasm that divides the worker from the capitalist, an increase in the power of capital over labour, a greater dependence of labour over capital.

And (ibid P.33)

Rapid growth of productive capital calls forth just as rapid a growth of wealth, of luxury of social needs and social pleasures. Therefore, although the pleasures of the labourer have increased, the social gratification which they afford has fallen in comparison with the increased pleasures of the capitalist which are inaccessible to the worker, in comparison with the stage of development of society in general. Our wants and pleasures have their origin in society; we therefore measure them in relation to the society; we do not measure them in relation to the objects which serve for their gratification. Since they are of social nature, they are of a relative nature.

Durkheim indicates the importance (for suicide...
rather than relative satisfaction) of crises which upset the taken-for-granted world of the actor.

He says:

"If therefore industrial or financial crises increase suicides, this is ... because they are crises, that is disturbances of the collective order... In the case of economic disasters ... something like a declassification occurs... So they are not adjusted to the condition forced on them, and its very prospect is intolerable... It is the same if the source of the crisis is an abrupt growth of power and wealth... there is no restraint upon aspirations... nothing gives satisfaction and all this agitation is uninterruptedly maintained without appeasement. ... All classes content among themselves because no established classification any longer exists."
The reason for the significance of such crises is that regular and consistent poverty is according to Durkheim the best protection against suicide. The less that one has, the less one aspires to, while the less one feels, the intolerable any and all limitation appears. (ibid P.254)

In Weber's contribution, there is a sense in which the notion of comparative reference is recognized and he argues that the degree to which 'communal action' and 'Societal action' emerge from the 'mass actions' of class members depends on 'the extent of the contrasts that have already evolved' (1948 P.184). He also outlines the conditions in terms of which a perceived deprivation is judged to be unjust. He argues that this is linked both to general cultural conditions, especially to those of an intellectual sort (ibid) and to 'the transparency of the connections between the causes and consequences of the class situation'. He pinpoints the importance of the development of the feeling among the fortunate that they have a right to their good fortune.
Weber (ibid) says:

"He wants to be convinced that he deserves it and above all, that he deserves it in comparison with others. He wishes to be allowed the belief that the less fortunate also merely experience his due. Good fortune thus wants to be "legitimate" fortune"

David Lockwood called the heading of the 'class situation' as 'work situation'. Work situation as distinct from 'market situation' is defined as the set of social relationships in which the individual is involved by virtue of his position in the division of labour. What this means is that manual workers as a distinct stratum in the economic system, need to be seen not only as vendors of the labour power, on the Marxist model, but also as persons whose location is the process on the market habitually separates them, as workers from those engaged in clerical or managerial tables. Class situation, therefore, is itself a complex phenomenon which embraces aspects of a person's economic situation.
in society which need not be in strict correlation with each other. They all, however, reflect inequalities directly deprived from the productive system so that to speak of a person's 'class' is to speak of his approximate, shared location in the economic hierarchy as opposed to the hierarchies of prestige or power.

Alder (1965) postulates an innate striving for superiority within man. Thus 'Individual psychology has shown that the striving for superiority and perfection... is given to every person and must be understood as innate, as a necessary and general foundation of the development of every person'. All human life is based upon such striving for perfection.

Interest in social comparison was first stimulated by Herbert Hyman's pioneering investigation of the psychology of status published in 1942. Explicitly beginning with a judgmental analysis, Hyman, interviewed a wide variety of people, seeking to learn how they assessed their own status. He found that they generally made these evaluations by comparing themselves with other persons, certain people or
groups, rather than total population, was selected as the comparison standard. That is we judge how well off we are - whether this is in terms of our social standing, prestige, popularity or our intellectual, cultural or economic status, 'by juxtaposing ourselves against particular people especially those with whom we have the closest association. Although Hyman coined the term, the concept has become one of the central analytical tools, being used in the construction of hypotheses concerning a variety of social phenomena.

Modern theorizing about relative deprivation dates from World War II. The potency of comparison processes in establishing and sustaining self identity is perhaps most keenly demonstrated in work involving the concept of relative deprivation. Samuel Stouffer (1949a, 1949b) and his colleagues' monumental study of the American soldier demonstrate the impact of others' positions have on our judgments of our own well being. The findings of the study are as follows:

1) A married soldier comparing himself to his married civilian friends, felt that his induction into the army
was a great sacrifice.

2) A black soldier comparing himself to black civilians in the south felt that he was relatively well off.

3) More highly educated soldiers who were not promoted felt a greater sense of personal failure than less educated soldiers who were not promoted.

4) Men in the Aircops who did not get promoted felt more failure than an MP who was not promoted.

A broad instructive point the investigation suggests is that as persons expectations for upward mobility increase, not moving upward should produce greater feelings of deprivation and failure than in someone who has minimal hope for upward movement.

Merton and Rossi (1968) outlined the relationship between Stouffer's use of relative deprivation ideas and the concepts of group membership and reference groups. Merton argues that a high rate of mobility induces excessive hopes and expectations among members of the group so that each is more likely to
experience a sense of frustration in his present position and dissatisfaction with the chances for promotion. (Merton and Rossi A 1957, P.237). But no definitions or propositional system based on those ideas appeared until Davis's work in 1959 and 1963. Since then three comprehensive and detailed theories of relative deprivation (Davis, 1959; Gurr, 1970; Runciman, 1972 a, 1972 b, 1974) have been articulated. Closely related theories about social justice (Adams, 1963 a, 1965; Homans, 1961; Lawler, 1968; Patchen 1961 a, 1961 b; Thibaut and Kelley, 1959) and about patterns of revolutions (Davis, 1962, 1969, Olson, 1963) were developed during the same period.

Davis (1959) was the first theorist to develop a formal theory of relative deprivation. He calls relative deprivation both a "subjective feeling" and a belief that there is differential treatment. He makes no absolute distinction between the two. According to his formulation, an individual who lacks a desired good or opportunity (x) experiences a sense of injustice whenever he perceives that similar other possess X. Strongly implied in Davis's theory is the notion that
the individual who perceives the similar others possess X feels entitled to possess X himself. The necessary determinants of felt deprivation then according Davis, are that the individual must (a) perceive that a similar other has X (b) want X and (c) feel entitled to X. When any one of these elements are lacking deprivation does not occur.

Runciman (1966) suggests that the magnitude and intensity of relative deprivation may be independent and that one may feel just as strongly about a small discrepancy as a large one. Hence, to Davis's three determinants, he adds the fourth, and states that the individual must think it feasible to obtain X. Inclusive of the fourth determinant, accordingly to Runciman, allows a distinction between unrealistic hopes or day dreams on the one hand, which do not lead to felt deprivation. Runciman also differentiates between two types of relative deprivation, fraternalistic and egoistic relative deprivation. Fraternalistic deprivation occurs when a person feels that his class or stratum is deprived of status, power or wealth. The egoistic relative deprivation occurs when an individual
feels as an individual, he is deprived of status, power and wealth.

Gurr (1970) uses the term relative deprivation to denote 'the tension that develops from a discrepancy between 'ought and the is', and also defines it as a perception of discrepancy between values to which one feels entitled and those one feels capable of attaining'. Gurr calls the cognitive/perceptual component the degree of relative deprivation and the affective/emotional component the intensity, suggesting the two covary. This is in contrast to Runciman, and claimed that individual experiences deprivation, or a sense of grievance, only when he thinks it is not feasible to obtain X. Gur claimed that

\[
\text{relative deprivation} = \frac{\text{value expectations} - \text{value capabilities}}{\text{value expectations}}
\]

' Value expectations 'are those goods and opportunities that the individual wants and to which he feels entitled, based on comparison with similar others.
(including himself in the past). 'Value capabilities' are those goods and opportunities that the individual possess or thinks that he can possess.

Crosby (1976) attempted to trace the entire relative deprivation process starting from a set of necessary and sufficient predoncitions through the subjective experience of 'deprivation' to behavioural outcomes. She tied together a large number of factors which bear on these phrases of the process. She formally added a fifth precondition to Runciman's fourth precondition and suggested that the individual must take no responsibility for their not having X. So in order for an individual to feel resentment, five preconditions must be met. So a person who lacks X, must

1) see someone else (other) possess X
2) want X
3) feel entitled to X
4) think it feasible to obtain X
and
5) lack a sense of personal responsibility for not having X.
Philosophers and social scientists both seem to agree that social comparison processes are indelibly linked with perceptions of 'fairness', 'justice' or 'equity' (Frankena, 1962; Boulding, 1962). Scholars agree that questions of fairness or justice inevitably arise from subjective, evaluative judgments, and second that such judgments can occur only after an individual locates himself within some frame of reference. Thus the affective and behavioural reactions to injustice require some type of comparative cognitive appraisal. The theories of inequity and social justice are closely related to the theories of relative deprivation. Although they differ from each other in one or more ways, their basic concepts and assumptions are similar.

The two major theoretical formulations of the equity process are the exchange formulation. (Homans, 1961, 1974; Adams, 1965)

Adams (1963) specified that inequity exists for person whenever he perceives that the ratio of his outcome to inputs and the ratio of others' outcome to
others' input are unequal. Thus inequity is the result of input output discrepancies relative to others. Thus not-have, want, and social comparison with another in exchange relationship have a role in Adam's theory.

According to the exchange perspective, there are no absolute standard of justice but rather comparisons of the relative fairness of individuals' reward levels. Through the application of the role of "distributive justice", that is, that rewards should be in line with each other person's respective contributions to the exchange (Homans, 1961, Adams, 1965, Walster et al, 1976), a person can decide whether his / her reward receipt is just, in comparison with another. While the exchange formulation implicitly suggests that persons relay on existential more than utopian standards in defining the social outcomes. Berger et al (1972) have argued that distributive justice issue arise only in the presence of stable frame of reference from which the meaning of justice derives.

Theories of relative deprivation are similar to other simpler psychological theories. Psychological
theories that have been invoked in explaining about anger and dissatisfaction are similar to what we have called as component of relative deprivation. Frustration - aggression theory was developed by Dollard, Doob, Miller, Mowrer and Sears (1939) and modified by Berkowitz (1972). Basically the theory posits that an individual's anger is positively related to his need or desire for a particular object, the extent to which attainment of object is currently blocked, and the extent to which he used to believe it was feasible for him to attain the object. Thus want, not have and feasibility and presumed to function as determinants of the level of frustration and level of anger related responses.

The notion of subjective deprivation was described in social evaluation theory (Thibaut and Kelley, 1959). According to the theory, a person may be motivated to act because a situation leads him / her to make an unfavourable evaluation of his / her attitudes, ideas and abilities, or life situations, one which results from comparing them with those of referent people.
The final theory resembling relative deprivation is Davis's (1962) J-curve theory of revolution. According to Davis, individuals who lack X feel angry about the situation of (a) want X and (b) they possessed X in the past. The major difference between relative deprivation and J-curve theory is that the former posit that individuals must also feel entitled to X. In addition, relative deprivation theorists see comparison with others in the present as being equally important as comparison with oneself in the past.

Deprivation is the general term which refers to the absence withholding or denial of something to an individual. It is useful however to distinguish between physical and social deprivation. Physical deprivation refers to the absence of basic requirements for physical survival. Whereas social deprivation is defined not by physical requirements but by social standards and life chances i.e. income, prestige, social power, educational and occupational opportunities, and other benefits that society considers important as well as more basic
advantages such as long life expectancy and good health. Marx and Engels stated, "our desires and pleasures spring from society, we measure them, therefore by society and not the objects which serve for their satisfaction. Because they are of social nature, they are of a relative nature".

There is an important difference between absolute deprivation and relative deprivation. No relationship between them need exist. An individual's level of absolute deprivation, eg. his income, may improve substantially but there may be no change, or there may be even decrease in his level of deprivation. Marx and Engels in their discussion of deprivation of industrial workers stated, 'Although the enjoyment of workers (may) have risen, the social satisfaction that they give has fallen in comparison with the increased enjoyment of the capitalists, which are inaccessible to the workers.

There are two aspects of relative deprivation, objective and perceptual. Objective deprivation refers to how well off a person or a group actually is relative
to other persons or groups in terms of life changes. The perpetual aspects refers to how well off one views his position in relation to the positions of the others. If the perception of one’s position is not perfectly correlated with his actual position the individual is, in Marx’s terms ‘falsely conscious’.

Quite simply, ‘feelings of relative deprivation’ refers to anxious dissatisfaction or discontent with one’s present level of achievement with respect to a specific goal (Merton, 1954), as the word deprivation implies. The term relative indicates that all feelings of deprivation arise in reference to objects which have been cathcted as goals to a social standard which has been internalized in the form of self-expectation. This implies that a person may feel deprived with respect to one goal not another, hence feelings of relative deprivation are goal specific and not diffuse. To measure the feels of deprivation it is necessary only to ascertain the feelings of deprivation, that they are relative can be assumed.

Human beings are constantly striving towards
goals which gratify their complicated biological and social needs. Many of the goals are achieved through individual endeavour, which some require for their satisfaction with other individuals. Sometimes people reach their goals with relative ease. Quite often the motives are thwarted by some obstacles that lie between the needs and the goals.

The obstacles that interfere and produce deprivations are due to environmental, personal or conflict causes. Environmental factors provide more common and serious obstacles in the forms of laws, tacit conventions and prejudices that prevent free and easy fulfilment of needs. Personal limitations, either real or imagined in the form of inferiority feeling stand in the way of satisfaction of many of the aspirations and ambitions.

But the commonest source of deprivation in modern man is the conflict of incompatible motives. With ever increasing complexities of modern life human motives have multiplied and their satisfaction has become complicated and difficult.
In view of the apparently universal nature of the phenomenon relative deprivation little emphasis was placed by industrial sociologists. A study on this concept assumes importance in industry since it can provide a systematic and comprehensive picture of workers' feeling embedded in their minds and reveal many specific relations.