CHAPTER – III

JOB SATISFACTION - A BRIEF STUDY

INTRODUCTION

Job satisfaction is one of the most significant areas in industrial psychology and one of the major perplexing problems that management is faced with in industrial organizations. Likert says that one can assess the human resources of an organization by means of attitude surveys and that factors such as job satisfaction will enable organizations to determine the influence of actions on all pertinent organizational resources. Recent literature tended to focus upon job satisfaction and its correlates rather than upon manipulation of people so much so a change in emphasis is shifted from “Personnel Management” to “Psychology of Men at Work (Smith and Cranny, Hinrichs):. As Lawler has pointed out, unlike many other areas in industrial psychology which have depended for their concepts on sister disciplines, job satisfaction is an area where industrial psychologists not only contributed much but an area which is almost considered as synonymous with industrial psychology. Many theories have been offered to explain the behaviour of men at work, such as Maslows’s “need hierarchy theory”, McGregor’s “theory X and Y”, Argyris’s “maturity immaturity theory”, and Herzberg’s “two factor”
theory, to mention only a few. Of the theoretical perspectives, none has given rise to such a proliferation of research articles and doctoral dissertations and none has at the same time given rise to such a heated and often belated controversy as the two factor theory of job satisfaction proposed by Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman.

**Theoretical Foundations of the Two-Factor Theory**

As contrasted with previous research on job satisfaction, the two-factor theory advocated by Herzberg et al, explored job satisfaction from a basically dynamic view and offered an approach to an understanding of motivation to work. Following et al study, Herzberg amplified his theory into a full-blown theory of motivation to work wherein the nature of man in the world of work was presented with a tenderminded idealistic philosophy. Herzberg was concerned to test the proposition that man had two kinds of needs: his need as an animal to pain and his need as a rational animal to grow psychologically. A person's basic needs can be schematically represented as two parallel lines pointing in opposite directions.

Out line points man’s animal Adam nature which is concerned with avoidance of pain raising from environment, and the other concerns with human Abraham nature dealing with possibilities of
psychological growth and self-fulfilment. This is the philosophical approach for the two-factor theory.

The two-factor theory was hypothesized by Herzberg et al., by studying 200 engineers and accountants. This study, was designed to specify attitudes, identify factors, and examine the effects of attitudes expressed by the respondents. A semi-structured interview, known as 'critical incident technique', was employed to elicit the required information. The subjects were asked to think of a time, either recently or any other time, when they felt exceptionally happy or unhappy and were required to tell various events which made them feel so. By means of content analysis, Herzberg and his associates noted an important distinction between two kinds of factors; one group of factors dealt with the nature of job and the other was related to the environment in which the job was done. One set of factors contributed to satisfaction. They are referred to as intrinsic, job content, motivators, or satisfiers-achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, advancement, and psychological growth. Another set of factors was instrumental in bringing about dissatisfaction. They are called as extrinsic, job context, hygiene's, or dissatisfiers-working conditions, salary, relations with co-employees, relations with subordinates, relations with supervisor, technical supervision, company policies and practices, job security, status, and
personal life. Motivators contributed to satisfied feelings, but were found to have little potency for dissatisfied feelings. Similarly, hygiene's contributed more to dissatisfaction than they did to satisfaction. The prepotency and the unidirectionality of the factors in eliciting satisfied and dissatisfied feelings led Herzberg and his associates to postulate that satisfaction and dissatisfaction were two separate, distinct, and independent feelings. They are in other words, unipolar dimensions. The opposite of satisfaction, is no satisfaction and the opposite of dissatisfaction is no dissatisfaction. The traditional view, on the other hand, conceives satisfaction and dissatisfaction as bipolar dimension. According to this view, the absence of the ipso facto indicates the presence of the other. Schematically, the views may be represented as follows:

Traditional view
Dissatisfaction------------------------Satisfaction

Two-factor theory Motivators
No satisfaction------------------------Satisfaction
Hygienes
Dissatisfaction------------------------No dissatisfaction

The two-factor theory was not only applied to job satisfaction but was also extended to management development programmes,
industrial relations, mental hygiene, and psychotherapy. As a prelude to his book, Herzberg offers a "new industrial psychology".

Herzberg further delineates the implications of his theory to the day-to-day industrial relations practices of organizations. Although industrial relations personnel must give importance to both motivator and hygiene needs, they should clearly differentiate the respective roles these variables play in work life. Herzberg advocates job enrichment instead of job enlargement as a way of catering to a person's motivator needs. The "motivator seeker" and the "hygiene seeker", as Herzberg says, have various values, aspirations, needs, personality make-up, and these to "seekers" are distinctly different from each other. Another interesting feature in the Herzberg et al. theory is that motivators not only enable a person to feel satisfied but they induce him to produce and perform more in his job. Hygienes, on the other hand, do not have that potency to contribute to job behaviour. It must be noted, that Herzberg et al., did not clearly spell out in detail about the relation of satisfaction and productivity in the light of their theory. Moreover, the observation that respondents who were satisfied with motivators tended to perform better was based on self-reported verbalized statements of the subjects who though they had performed better when felt satisfied. No objective performance indices were taken into account.
Evaluation of Theory

Amidst the welter of findings, often inconclusive and conflicting, which Herzberg et. Al. had taken into account in their review, the two-factor theory proposed later by Herzberg et al. tried to offer an insightful and dynamic approach to the motivation to work. Dunnette and Kirchner hailed the theory as “an important step forward in our efforts to understand human motivation.....” Vroom observed that “Herzberg and his associates deserve credit for directing attention towards the psychological effects of job content, a problem of great importance in a world of rapidly changing technology”. Despite, their caustic criticism of the theory, Dunnette et al. remarked that Herzberg and his associates “accomplished three important objectives...first, they discovered those features of job situation making the difference between satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Second, they broke with the static tradition of most previous research by emphasizing those job features leading to changes in feelings toward the job. Third, and most important, by analysing the content of the stories, the investigators developed a taxonomy of job situations – consisting of satisfying features which employees presumably would seek to attain or prolong, and of dissatisfying features which employees presumably would seek to avoid or dispel”.
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Inspite of these redeeming features, the theory has been subjected to several criticisms. Even criticised the theory on several grounds such as the narrow range of the jobs investigated the use of only one measure of job attitudes, the absence of reliability and validity of critical incident methodology, and the lack of a measure of overall satisfaction. One of the most pertinent criticisms of the theory is that it is method bound. The theory suffers from the weaknesses inherent in the critical incident methodology. This point was voiced by Kahn, Brayfield, Vroom and Maier, Vroom, and Dunnettee et al. The view is that persons when satisfied attribute the causes of their feelings to themselves. When they are dissatisfied they attributed their own failure to the causes outside themselves. Therefore, the ego defenses are at work when people say they are satisfied or dissatisfied. Further, the categorization of factors into motivators and hygienes requires not only the respondent's accuracy and veracity of self-reports, but also the interpretation of the rater which vitiates the results. The two-factor theory was not base on current satisfaction with the present job situation and hence, as House and Wigdor pointed out, there was no control over the time factor. The subject is asked to think of a time either recently or any other time, when he felt satisfied or dissatisfied, as the case may be, and then report his feelings. As Wernimont pointed out, a currently satisfied person who
responds to his retrospective feelings may have a "satisfied respondent bias". Even further comments on the pitfalls of the theory saying that it is easier to recall incidents related to achievement or to a promotion than incidents which follow no achievement or no promotion. In other words, some motivators may have no easily worded negative obverse and some hygienes may have no positive obverse. Schwab and Heneman pointed out that the analytic procedure employed in the theory exaggerated the claims of the theory. Hinton remarked that once the method departed from the story-telling technique of the theory, the results varied from those predicted by the theory. The two-factor theory was limited by many situational, demographic, and moderator variables. This observation has been expressed in most of the investigations reviewed in this paper.

It must be said, in passing, that most investigators have not tested the theory with the theory's very rationale. They have tested the theory with some bipolar assumptions either in their scales or in the variables of their study or both. This procedure does not test the rationale of the two-factor theory. Most of the psychological constructs are generally considered as bipolar. But, as Thompson pointed out, there is a danger in converting, what is essentially a unipolar construct into a bipolar one. He emphasized the need to
differentiate between what was "convertible" or "tautologous" and "inconvertible" bipolarity. Herzberg is not wrong in his view to treat satisfaction and dissatisfaction as "inconvertible" polar concepts in which negation-involving opposites are separated by strong antithesis but do no completely define each other. The question is not whether Herzberg is right or not in conceiving the concepts of his study but whether, he has succeeded in establishing them or not. When once we treat satisfaction and dissatisfaction as if they are separate and then ask the respondent to report his feeling under the respective dimensions, we not only introduce a "response set" in the subject but also commit the mistake of confusing the sequence with consequence as Sarveswara Rao has pointed out.

There is really a dilemma involved in trying to test the theory. On the one hand, we have treat satisfaction and dissatisfaction separately if we are to test the hypotheses of the theory. On the other, by doing so, we introduce many limitations which, naturally, would prove premises from conclusions rather than the reverse as noted above. The fact that investigators, cited above under the heading "studied partially supportive of the theory", consistently proved the dimensional independence between satisfaction and dissatisfaction shows the limitations inherent in the conceptions of the two-factor theory. It does without saying that in most of the studies, the variable
independence advocated by the two-factor theory is has been consistently disproved. The two-factor theory is not only methodologically bound but also conceptually bound, as observed by Sarveswara Rao. When a different methodology and rationale was used to test the theory, the results did not support it.

Behling et al., remarked that efforts must be made to the development of many measuring devices and techniques which will provide reliable and consistent data and.... any attempt to produce a single measure of job satisfaction, whether it is based on a conventional uniscalar on a Herzberg duality analysis, is doomed to failure”. They argued that there was a need for reorientation in the treatment of intervening variables connecting the aspect of work and the work environment to employee behaviours.

The two-factor theory, as Vroom has noted, is casual and prescriptive, Herzberg assumes that the variations in motivator and hygine factors will have their corresponding effects on job behaviour such as productivity, absenteeism, and turnover. Herzberg as Vroom commented, “appears to be arguing that the satisfiers are also motivators, i.e. That those job content conditions which produce a high level of satisfaction also motivate the person to perform effectively on his job”. But there has not been any clear-cut evidence established between satisfaction and productivity as may be seen in
the reviews of Brayfield and Crockett and Vroom. It may be noted that in the Herzberg study, employees reported about their performance effects, and no attempt was made to collect objective indices of their productivity. But, as Friedlander commented, "according to the protestant ethic it is conceivable that self-reports of increased job performance may be nothing more than moral justification for increased job enjoyment". On the contrary, job satisfaction might be a result rather than the cause of effective job performance as the studies of Lawler and porter and Heron go to show.

Cummings and Elsalmi reviewed various studies dealing with the two-factor and the Maslowian theories and concluded that as yet there did not exist a unified theory of motivation (managerial). They enumerated some of the reasons for such a conclusion. Wolf also noted the salient features of the Maslowian and the Herzbergian theories and proposed a "need gratification theory". These studies show not only the limitations of the two-factor theory but the possibility of theory being considered from board perspectives as well.

The present review shows that the two factor theory has more limitations that is willing to admit. It is true that Herzberg et al. made an attempt to systematize the findings which were otherwise
conflicting. When Kurt Lewin was supposed to have said that “there is nothing so practical as a good theory”, he probably had in mind the hypothetico-inductive method which was sino qua non of all sciences. A theory should generate hypotheses from which testable deductions can be made. When a theory falls short of its explanatory power, it should be capable of being tested by alternative, and often competing, hypotheses from the perspective of “strong inference”.

A test of a good theory is that it should not only be capable of being verified but, what is more important, as Karl Popper remarked, it should be capable of being proved wrong. The two-factor theory does not admit of such a contention. An empirical proposition, as Lykken reiterated, besides having statistical significance, must possess substantive meaningfulness. Following Lykken’s terminology, we may say that those who have ‘literally’ replicated the theory mostly confirmed it; those who have “operationally” replicated have not fully supported the theory; and those who have ‘constructively’ replicated have concluded that the theory is too simple, to explain the dynamic nature of occupational life. Both the generality and the validity of the theory are questionable.
WHAT IS JOB SATISFACTION

The term job satisfaction was brought to limelight by Hoppock (1935). He reviewed 32 studies on job satisfaction conducted prior to 1933 and observed that job satisfaction is a combination of psychological, physiological and environmental circumstances that cause a person to say, "I am satisfied with my job". Such a description indicates the variety of variables that influence the satisfaction of the individual but tell us nothing about the nature of job satisfaction.

Perhaps, one way to define job satisfaction may be to say that it is the end state of feeling. Notice the use of the word end. It emphasizes the fact that the feeling is experienced after a task is accomplished or an activity has taken place whether it is highly individualistic effort of writing a book or a collective endeavour of constructing a dam. These tasks/activities could be very minute or large. They may be easily observable or could just be experienced. But in all cases, they satisfy a certain need. The feeling could be positive or negative depending upon whether need is satisfied or not and could be a function of the efforts of the individual on one hand and on the other the situational opportunities available to him.

Let us take the example of Kulkarni, a foreman in an engineering industry. He has been assigned the task to complete a
special order by a certain deadline. Kulkarni may experience positive job satisfaction because he has been chosen to complete the task. It gives him a special status and feeling that he has been trusted and given a special task. He may also feel happy because he likes this kind of rush job, may get him extra wages, and the over time may keep him away from his nagging wife. The same could be the sources of his dissatisfaction if he does not like rush work, has no need for extra wages and does not mind when his wife nags him. Each one of these variables lead to an end state of feeling we call satisfaction. Sinha (1974) defines job satisfaction as "reintegration of affect produced by individual’s perception of fulfillment of his needs in relation to his work and the situations surrounding it".

In order to understand job satisfaction, perhaps, the first step should be to demarcate the boundaries among such terms as attitude, motivation, and morale. These terms are often used for job satisfaction, perhaps not so rightly.

**Motivation, Attitude and Job Satisfaction**

Motivation, as we have seen in our chapter on work motivation, implies the willingness to work or produce. A person may be talented and equipped with all kinds of abilities and skills but may have no will to work. Satisfaction, on the other hand, implies a positive
emotional state which may be totally unrelated to productivity. Similarly, in the literature the terms job attitude and job satisfaction are used interchangeably. However, a closer analysis may reveal that perhaps, they measure two different anchor points. Attitudes are predispositions that make the individual behave in a characteristic way across situations. They are precursors to behaviour and determine its intensity and direction. Job satisfaction, on the other hand, is an end-state of feeling which may influence subsequent behaviour. In this respect job attitudes and job satisfaction may have something in common. But if we freeze behaviour, attitude would initiate it while job satisfaction would result from it.

**Morale and Job Satisfaction**

More than two and a half decades ago, Seashore (1954) came to the conclusion that there is no definition of morale. It is a condition which exists in a context where people are:

a. motivated towards high productivity
b. want to remain with organization
c. act effectively in crisis
d. accept necessary changes without resentment or resistance
e. actually promote the interest of the organization, and
f. are satisfied with their job.
According to this description of morale, job satisfaction is an important dimension of morale and not morale itself.

Morale is a general attitude of the worker and relates to group while job satisfaction is an individual feeling which could be caused by a variety of factors including group. This point has been summarized by Sinha (1974) when he suggests that industrial morale is a collective phenomenon and job satisfaction is a distributive one. In other words, job satisfaction refers to a general attitude towards work by an individual worker. On the other hand, morale is group phenomenon which emerges as a result of adherence to group goals and confidence in the desirability of these goals.

Most definitions of morale in literature indicate that subordination of personal objectives to the larger goals of the group/organization is an important element of a definition of morale. In job satisfaction no such condition is attached. A given individual may be satisfied with a variety of factors, like salary, co-workers, his own contribution, etc. In fact, morale itself could also be a source of satisfaction to an individual.

MEASUREMENT OF JOB SATISFACTION

Because of some of the problems indicated above, measurement of job satisfaction has come to acquire the same fate as
the measurement of intelligence. Since there is no agreement on a specific definition, generally questionnaires are developed to measure satisfaction with various aspects of work and the resultant behaviour or score is called job satisfaction. Today, as intelligence is defined as what is measured by intelligence test, job satisfaction can also be defined as what is measured by job satisfaction questionnaire.

Most studies of job satisfaction have been concerned with operationalising it rather than defining it. According to Locke (1969) such an approach describes that a certain relationship works but tells nothing as to why it works. This seems to be the case with job satisfaction. Researchers have been found to be more interested in choosing the unit of measurement from the several available but little by way of a definition of job satisfaction has been attempted. One would assume the acceptance of a definition of job satisfaction as a precursor for the choice of the unit of measurement.

However, despite these numerous attempts in the past, various others will be made in future to measure job satisfaction. Perhaps, the earliest of all the known scales of measuring job satisfaction is that by Hoppock (1935). He developed essentially four items, each one with seven alternative responses. These are given in Annexure 1. If a person chooses the “least satisfied” of the seven alternatives, he gets a score of 100, and 700 if he chooses “most satisfied” alternative for
each item. Other alternatives represent a 100 point addition to the previous alternative. Thus, if a person chooses first alternative for all four items his total score is 400. Similarly, if he chooses second alternative in all four items he gets a score of 800, and so on. The maximum total possible is 2800 provided all four seventh alternatives are chosen. But Hoppock takes the average of the four items (range 100-700) for developing the satisfaction index. Although in its original form, job satisfaction index by Hoppock is generally not used now but its variations can be spotted in the literature.

Hoppock’s index is, perhaps, the only direct measure of job satisfaction. Others (and there are quite a lot) have indexed job satisfaction in terms of the responses to a variety of questions which deal with factors that are directly or indirectly connected with jobs. These responses are usually measured on a variety of scales ranging from simple yes-no to 7-point or 5-point agree-disagree type of scales.

In Indian context one of the first few satisfaction measures developed by researchers is the S-D inventory by Pestonee (1973). The S.D. inventory consists of 80 interrogatory type of statements in Hindi, English and Gujarati. The items lead to yes-no type of responses. There are 20 items in each of the following four areas.
These areas and representative items under each one of the areas are given below.

1. **Job:** Nature of work, hours of work, fellow workers, opportunities on the job for promotion and advancement (prospects), overtime regulations, interest in work, physical environment, machines and tools, etc.

   a) Do you think that the work you are doing is interesting?
   b) Do you think that your work is hard and difficult?

2. **Management:** Supervisory treatment, participation, reward and punishment, praise and blame, leave policy, favouritism, etc.

   a. Do you think that promotions to employees are given impartially?
   b. Are the employees dismissed from the job on simple and trivial matters?

3. **Social Relations:** Neighbours, friends and associates, attitudes towards people in community, participation in social activities, caste barriers, etc.

   a. Do you get upset for a long time when criticized by somebody?
   b. Are you frequently worried due to illness of your family members?

4. **Personal Adjustment:** Emotionalism, health, home and living conditions, finances, relations with family members, etc.
a. Do you often feel that you are alone in this wide world?

b. Are you troubled by the feelings of caste and creed in society?

These areas include both on the job and off the job factors. The statistical treatment of the individual items and the test as a whole showed significant discriminatory potential.

Another attempt to measure job satisfaction has been through need satisfaction. Porter (1961) developed a questionnaire consisting of 13 items classified into Maslow type need hierarchy system. Each item of the scale measures not only the existing degree of need fulfillment but also the expected levels of fulfillment and its importance to the respondents. Items are answered on three 7-point scales, one each for expected, existing, and importance. The anchor points of scales are labeled as maximum and minimum. The discrepancy between expected and existing is taken as an indicator of job satisfaction. The higher the discrepancy the lower is the job satisfaction.

**Importance of job satisfaction:**

Should managers study the job satisfaction of their employees and seek to improve it where appropriate? From a desire to apply the "golden role" or build a better organization or society. The answer revolves around three critical questions
i) Are substantial numbers of workers dissatisfied?

ii) Is job dissatisfaction related to detrimental behaviours?

iii) Are those behaviours costly to the organisation?

**Job Satisfaction and Performance:**

Some managers may assume that high satisfaction always leads to high employee performance, but this assumption is not correct. Satisfied workers may be high, average or even low producers and they will tend to continue the level of performance relationship that previously brought them satisfaction. The satisfaction — performance relationship is more complex than the simpler path of "satisfaction leads to performance".

A more accurate portrait of the relationship is that high performance contributes to high job satisfaction. The sequence is that better performance typically leads to higher economic, sociological, and psychological rewards. If these rewards are seen as fair and equitable then improved satisfaction develops because employers feel that they are receiving rewards in proportion to their performance. On the other hand if rewards are seen as inadequate for one's level of performance, dissatisfaction tends to arise. In either case, one's level of satisfaction leads to either greater or less (or) commitment which then affects effort and eventually performance. The result is a
continuously operating performance — satisfaction — effort. Three examples of negative employee behaviours that flow from dissatisfaction will be discussed.

Profile of satisfied workers:

Job satisfaction is related to a number of variables that allow management to predict which groups are more likely to exhibit the problem behaviour associated with dissatisfaction. Some of these variables describe the employee others job environment.

Higher level occupations tend to be more satisfied with their jobs. They usually are better-paid and have better working conditions, and their jobs make fuller use of their abilities; therefore they have good reason to be more satisfied than skilled workers, who tend to be more satisfied than semiskilled and unskilled workers. The Steepness of the lines in the figure indicates that occupation is more strongly related to job satisfaction than age. Those who work at high occupational level are considerably more satisfied than unskilled workers.
Summary:

Job dissatisfaction often leads to absenteeism turnover, and theft; so employers want to develop satisfaction among their employees. The vast majority of workers in the United States report that they are satisfied with their jobs although perhaps dissatisfied with specific elements of them. High performance and equitable rewards encourage high satisfaction.

Higher job satisfaction usually is associated with lower turnover, fewer absence of employees and higher occupational levels. Larger organizations tend to have employees with slightly lower levels of satisfaction unless vigorous attempts are made to build high satisfaction.