Chapter One
Introduction
We all work for a reason and the reasons can be as different as the individuals we are. For most persons their work is their identity and when they lose their work, they feel that they have lost themselves. Therefore, each work has its own values and person performing the work will follow those values. For example, in an organization, sales people, accountants and engineers will have different values according to their specialities and the motivation to work will also vary from person to person. If the total system of the organization is healthy, and the employees are satisfied with their work values then they will be motivated to work. It is beneficial for the progress, profitability and productivity of the organization as well.

For most of the people, the need to work is deep rooted in their psychological make-up and the meaning of work takes on significance beyond mere material well-being and economic satisfaction. If a person does not feel that his job offers challenges to him; if he does not value the skills that the job requires then definitely he is not likely towards lead higher productivity.

Present world is the world of cut-throat competition. Information technology, nanotechnology are the name of the
game. Thus, in such fast growing technological world it is important that the employee and the employer may not only be able to work but be willing to work as well. This willingness comes from a healthy organization environment and high motivation towards doing the job. All of this work environment and job motivation depends upon primarily the work values persisting within an organization.

**ORGANIZATIONAL HEALTH**

Within the field of organizational behaviour it is now widely appreciated that the behaviour and performance of the employee of an organization is determined not only by the individual characteristics of employees, but also by the condition in which they function. One set of such condition is described by the term, “Organizational Health”. The conceptualization of organizational health is based on positive evaluation of organizational attributes (Sayeed, 1980; Sayeed and Mehta, 1981). A healthy organization is one that not only survives in its environment, but continues to cope adequately over the long run and continuously develops and extends its surviving and coping abilities.

Organizational health starts with workplace culture of trust and respect where control, purpose, flexibility,
communication, balance and recognition are all valued. Employee's well being, physical, emotional and mental health is positively impacted. People feel they are much more creative, innovative and productive, and this is what leads to a sound organizational-health. Productivity, effectiveness and competitiveness hit the bottom-line (Sayeed, 1980).

In short, organizational health refers to certain functional and adoptive equalities of the organization, which makes it capable to cope up with the demands of environment efficiently (Patel, 1993). We can say that a particular organization is healthy if it has a strong sense of its own identity and mission and yet has the capacity to adapt readily to. According to Miles (1967; 1973) organizational health is "a set of fairly durable and secondary system properties, which tends to transcend short term effectiveness. A healthy organization in this sense not only survives in its environment but continues to cope adequately over the long run and continuously develops and extends its surviving and coping abilities. Short-run operations on any particular day may be effective or ineffective, but continued survival, adequate coping and growth are taking place."
Miles (1965) has discussed ten second order properties which constitute total organizational health. According to him organizational health is an organization's ability to function effectively, to cope adequately, to change appropriately, and to grow from within. Organizational health, like personal health, may vary from a minimal to a maximal level. Organizational health includes and is dependent upon the following ten dimensions:

- **Goal Focus:** is the ability to have clarity, acceptance, and support for goals and objectives.

- **Communication Adequacy:** is open two-way communication which travels both vertically and horizontally throughout the unit.

- **Optimal Power Utilization:** is the ability to maintain a relatively equitable distribution of influence between team members and their leader.

- **Resource Utilization:** is the degree to which the leader knows and is able to coordinate the talents of team members with minimal stress.

- **Cohesiveness:** is the state when a person, group, or organization has a clear sense of identity. Members feel
attracted to the unit want to stay with it, be influenced by it, and exert their own influence within it.

- **Morale:** is the feeling of well-being, satisfaction, and pleasure for a person, group or organization.

- **Innovativeness:** is that ability to be and to allow others to be inventive, diverse, and creative and risk taking.

- **Autonomy:** is that state in which a person, group, or organization has the freedom to manage those things they believe should be within their sphere of influence.

- **Adaptation:** is that ability to tolerate stress and maintain stability while coping with demands from the external environment.

- **Problem Solving Adequacy:** is the organization’s ability to perceive problems and to solve them with minimal energy. The problems get solved, stay solved, and the problems-solving mechanism of the organization is maintained and/or strengthened.

There are many characteristics of healthy and unhealthy organizations. The characteristics of the healthy organization include widely shared objectives, freedom of people to share difficulties, pragmatic problem solving, functional decision making (decision making being influenced by factors like
ability, sense of responsibility, availability of information, work-load, timing and requirements for professional and management development rather than organizational level), responsibility sharing, respect of judgment of people lower down in the organization, taking problems of personal needs and human relationships, collaboration, joint effort in crisis management, conflict management with openness, use of feedback, joint critiquing, honest relationship (concern about others and trust in others) voluntarism, flexible leadership, high degree of trust, acceptance of risk, learning from mistakes, joint resolution of poor performance, functionalism of procedures, sense of order and high rate of innovation, adaptability, and joint management of frustrations.

Pareek and Rao (1977), stressed autonomy, collaboration and interdependence, creativity, pro-active behaviour, work motivation, functionality (as opposed to bureaucratization), openness and centrality (people feeling central in the organization) as important dimensions of organizational health in a university system. The characteristics suggested by various researchers in this area are different dimensions of organizational health. In the past, researchers on organizational health limited themselves to the study of one or a few
dimensions. For example, Lewis, studied commitment (loyalty) of faculty in a university by using a questionnaire enquiring whether he would leave the present job if he is offered a similar job with the same emoluments in a different university.

The concept of organizational health of an organization is parallel to the concept of health (physical and mental) for an individual. When the individual is physically and mentally well equipped to function to the maximum of his capacities, it is said that he has good health or he is healthy. Similarly, the main component of any organization is its structure and their members are expected to perform certain functions. The organizational health can be controlled to a great extent through structured and unstructured interventions. There are many dimensions on which health of an organization could be assessed, like commitment to work, facilities for work, politics and favouritism. Organizational health could be assessed at many levels: at the individual level, subsystem level and at the total organization level. At the individual level, it is the perception or assessment of the organization on various dimensions (or components) by a single individual.

If an individual assesses an organization on many dimensions as having poor health (having a climate hampering
productivity of the members and thereby the efficiency of the organization), then we say that for him the organization has poor health. However, if such a poor health of the organization is perceived by many members, we say that it has low or poor organizational health. In other words, while organizational health of individual contributes to his efficiency in striving to achieve the organizational goal, the aggregate organizational health of all or most of the members of an organization contributes to the efficiency of the organization in achieving its goals.

The organizational health of an organizational system or any of its sub-systems may be defined as the aggregate of the perceptions of its members in relation to the effectiveness of its structures, processes, roles, role relationships, and various functions that are being performed in the system or sub-systems. The achievement of the organizational goals by the organization or its members depends to a great extent upon how healthy the organization is, that is, how conducive the socio-psychological climate of the organization for working for the goals. In another way, we can say that the probability of an organization achieving its goals increases with increased organizational health in the system. Thus, if the aggregate of
perceptions indicates effective functioning of the systems, the probability of it functioning effectively increases. Organizational health of any system depends upon several variables like the history of the organization, its formal structure, strategies used to achieve the objectives, philosophy, if any, or lack of it, the people that occupy leadership roles, socio-psychological forces, people who join the system bring with them, and an interaction of all these. In organizations that are established for over a period of time and have attained certain amount of stability, change in organizational structure, task structure and strategies are easier than changing the socio-psychological culture of members and the leadership styles. However, changes in the socio-psychological culture and leadership styles will result from structural and strategic changes (Miles, 1965).

The concept of organizational health refers to the health of the total system or several functions that are being performed in the organization as a whole. It is possible to study the health of sub-systems in an organization. Organizational health is an independent variable, which is in the present day world of work scenario has occupied greater importance as a result of humanization of work environment.
Work being central to an organization, motivation to work or values placed on work have been drawing the attention of researchers for developing the strategies to enhance human motivation and the performance in the work situation specially, when rapid changes are taking place in the economic and business environment in the country. Hence, organizations need to transform them radically in order to take advantage of new opportunities, so transformation has to be initiated. It is, in fact, imperative to design such a conducive organizational work environment where people may feel free to work and contribute ideas through their dynamic participation, hence, to develop enriched organizational culture, environment, job satisfaction and job commitment, and then it is necessary that the organization should be healthy in totality.

There are hosts of factors that enrich organizational health. For example today’s steps and all these are directed to develop most humanized work environment when job incumbents have greater say and autonomy with the greater sense of responsibility. As a consequence to such emerging work atmosphere, people feel at-home even at workplace; hence, employees show greater work involvement and commitment and work motivation. Any organization for its
survival requires and expects a certain level of involvement from its members. Commitment and involvement are two most civilized expressions, which are widely valued in organizations and are considered to be correlated with the efficiency at work (Sayeed and Mehta, 1981).

People join organization in various capacities and potentials and have to perform different tasks assigned to them. Joining an organization also results in the restriction of people's freedom as; they do not act according to their own wishes rather they have to follow some laid down rules and regulations. An organization consists of four interacting sub-systems of:
- people,
- structure,
- technology and
- environment,
All of these factors work together to achieve some desired goals. Effective and smooth functioning of the organization not only depends on cheap and best raw materials, latest technology or healthy working conditions, rather upon behaviour of employees, which plays a crucial role. Several social, physical and psychological factors that are the part of working
environment influence employee’s behaviour. Organizations are the coordinated social units created by people having definite objectives or goals which can be achieved by the employees working at different position or levels. An organization consist of five components-
-structure,
-culture,
-system,
-leadership behaviour and
-employee’s psychological needs.

If there is positive relationship among all these components then it results in the formation of a strong organizational health.

Organizational health depends on the achievement of organizational goals and the achievement of organizational goals much more depends on the healthy and conducive organizational climate, culture and environment. Therefore, psychologists, organizational behaviourists management experts always try to improve climate of an organization through improving superior-subordinate relationship of the organization. This improved superior–subordinate relationship results in improved employees motivation, morale, satisfaction and performance. People processing various kinds of skills,
expertise and knowledge join organization to gratify their physiological and psychological needs. It is not necessary that the needs of the employees can be fulfilled in accordance with their expectations because they have to face perceptual or real problems while interacting with their superiors and subordinates. If employees do not get support from their superiors or these are rare promotional avenues, poor peer relationships insufficient financial benefits they become dissatisfied and may think to switch over to other organization where they expect greater support ant various types of benefits. A healthy organization retains it employees and also attracts talented people to its fold and improves overall functioning of the organization. A sound organizational health itself becomes motivator for the employees.

WORK VALUES

Like attitudes, values that a person has are one of the major forces shaping behaviour. Values are convictions and a framework of philosophy of an individual on the basis of which judges what is good or bad desirable or undesirable, ethical or unethical. Values can be defined as global beliefs that guide actions and judgments across a variety situations and represents basic conviction that a specific mode of conduct (or end-state
of existence) is personally or socially favorable to an opposite mode of conduct (or end-state of existence). Further it can be said that values are elements of culture and culture is complex of values, ideas, attitudes and other meaningful behaviour to shape human behaviour in society. Every society has its own culture and people in that society adhere to cultural requirements.

Human behaviour represents learned phenomenon unlike other animals, human behaviour have to learn almost everything about how to be human from existence. This is because human beings live in a society having certain cultural characteristics which prescribe to behave in a particular way. Cultural field represents a set of stimuli to an individual and also a set response appropriate to those stimuli. The individual either is directly rewarded for adopting those responses (alternatively punished for not adopting) or indirectly associated them with other stimulus situations that are rewarding. Through this process individuals are encultured or socialized, that is the responses of a set of culture become their own set of response tendencies. Cultural items learned early in life tend to resist change more strongly than those learned late.
in life. This fact is very important from organizational behaviour point of view.

Values are “important” and are passed from one generation to other by specific groups and institutions. Such transmission starts from the family from where the socialization process starts. Apart from family, educational; cultural; religious and ethnic institutions also, transmit cultural values from group to group. Values are “special” that is, cultural habits are shared by aggregates of people living in organized society. An individual’s way of thinking and behaving is not culture, rather group behaviour constitutes culture. Group is developed and reinforced through social pressure upon those who are interacting with one another. Values exist to meet the biological and other needs of individuals of society. Thus elements in the culture gets extinguished when, they no longer are gratifying to members of the society. Society rewards behaviours which are gratifying for members. Culture is adaptive either through dialectical press or evolutionary process. Dialectical or sharply discontinuous change occurs when value system of a culture becomes associated with the gratification of only one group or class in the environment. In such a case, other classes of the society reject the logic of values and
replace it with new values, such as through revolution or other methods. In the evolutionary process, change occurs slowly as a gradual process but not through revolution.

Some researchers see value as consisting of a large set of related attitudes. They have taken values as parts of attitudes. However, some differences exist between values and attitudes. Attitudes are specific and are related to distinct objects, people or ideas; values are general and are not related to any object or situation. Attitudes are people’s belief about specific object or situation. They can be considered as taking a lower place in the person’s hierarchy of beliefs. Another difference is that attitudes can be positive or negative whereas values are always positive, i.e. in favour of something. In addition to being more general than attitudes, values often contain statements of goodness and badness associated with the attitudes which people hold. Values are, then, beliefs about which altitudes we should have or how we should behave.

Thus, values are ideals that guide or qualify personal conduct, interaction with others, and involvement in ones career. Like morals they help to distinguish what is right from what is wrong and inform on how one can conduct his life in a
meaningful way. Values can be classified into four categories. They are –

- **Personal Values**: are principles that define person as an individual. Personal values, such as honesty, reliability, and trust, determine how one will face the world and relate with people.

- **Cultural values**: are like the practice of faith and customs and principles that sustain connections with one's cultural roots. They help to feel connected to a larger community of people with similar backgrounds.

- **Social Values**: are principles that indicate how one relates meaningfully to others in social situations, including those involving family, friends, and co-workers.

- **Work Values**: are principles that guide one's behaviour in professional contexts. They define how a person works and how he relates to his co-workers, bosses and clients. They also reveal person's potential for advancement.

Work values in the work place have long been a topic of interest for both researchers in organizational behaviour and management practitioners alike. Work values are believed to be deeply internalized standard for personal behaviour because they are based on a person's experience. Like basic values,
work values are believed pertaining to desirable end states (e.g. high pay) or behaviour (e.g. working with people). The different work goals are ordered by their importance as guiding principles for evaluating work outcomes and settings, and for choosing among different work alternative. Work values refer to what a person wants out of work in general, rather than to the narrowly defined outcomes of particular jobs (Ros et al, 1999). Finally work values are verbal representation of individual, group and interaction requirements. Work value is a kind of orientation towards work underlies important them when making occupational choices. Viewing work values as specific expressions of basic values in the work setting implies that there should be four general types of work values. Most of the researchers appear to identify the three types of work values, which are

(1) Intrinsic or self-actualization;

(2) Extrinsic or security or materials;

(3) Social or relational

[E.g. Rosenberg, (1957); Crites, (1961); Alderfer, (1972); Mottaz (1985); Pryor, (1987); Brog, (1990)]. One more study was presented by Elizur (1984), it was a related trichotomous classification of work values by considering the modality of
their outcomes such as interest and achievement; affective outcomes such as relations with associates. This classification largely overlaps extrinsic, intrinsic and social respectively.

It is viewed that these three types of work values are conceptually parallel to three of the higher order basic values. Intrinsic work values directly express openness to change values— the pursuit of autonomy, creativity, interest, and growth in work. Extrinsic work values are the expression of conservation values; job security and income provide workers with the requirements of needs for general security and maintenance of order in their lives. The expression of societal and interpersonal work values is the pursuit of self-transcendence values. Work is seen as a vehicle for positive social relations and contribution to society. A person makes his contribution to the society with the help of social or relational work values.

There are some basic individual values. They are of four distinct type of work values, one that parallel the basic self-enhancement higher order value type. This type of work value, like self-enhancement, should be concerned with prestige or power. The items that refer to prestige, authority, influence, power and achievement in work are common in empirical
research on work. These values have usually been classified as extrinsic types of work values (Rosenberg, 1957; Herzberg, Mausner, and Synderman, 1959; Ginzberg, 1966). Few theorists have recognized a distinctive prestige or power type (O’Conner and Kinnane, 1961; Pryor 1987).

Identifying personal values is an important part of a successful career plan. In this context, the word “Value” refers to how persons feel about the work itself and the contribution it makes to society. Most people who pursue work that is congruent with their values feel satisfied and successful in their careers. A study was conducted by Ros, et al (1999), a theory of basic individual values is presented and applied in studying work. Work goals or values are seen as expression of basic values in the work place. Basic values imply four types of work values: intrinsic, extrinsic social and Prestige. These four types emerge in re-examinations of past research and in study one of a representative Israeli sample of 1999 adults. Interco relations among these value types support theorizing about the structure of work values. Study two explores the meaning of work as a vehicle for goal attainment. 193 Spanish teachers and 179 education students rated the importance of work and of a comprehensive set of basic values as guiding principles. For the
teachers, work apparently serves to attain social stability and close social relations. For the students, work is associated with these goals and with promoting personal interests independence, and excitement.

There is a difference between general values and the values concerning specific life regions. Work values have a more specific meaning than general values as work is considered to be such a domain. The relationship between general values and work values is being conceived in different ways. According to one view, values have a particular cognitive structure that produces a structural similarity between general values and work values. Elizur and Sagie (1999), represented and empirically supported this view. The other view is that general values produce work values; for example that, work values emerge from the projection of general values to the domain of work. Various researches seem to assume that work values do somehow desire from general values, but they are not very explicit about the causal nature of this process. The similar content of general values and work values has been found in many studies. Kinnane and Gaubinder (1963), found similarity in correlation between general values and work values.
As far as work values are concerned, it has been seen as the source of the development of general values. Work values seem to diffuse easily through such channels as management, literature, consulting and training. In this way modern work practices and standards may generate work related values that generalize the wider social life. A study by Selmer and Deleon (1996), on organizational “acculturation” shows that multinational corporations can play a role in the transmission of values. Yet there is very little empirical evidence to support this study. Robbins (1992), examined the relationship of workaholic type and organizational values supporting work-personal life balance. The findings showed that organizational values supporting work- personal life imbalance were significantly higher in workaholic than non-workaholic types. The study represents practical implications for organizations and management. Burke, Ronald (2002), studied workaholism in organizations: the role of organizational values. Work holism has received considerable attention in the popular media but little research consideration.

It is widely recognized that in modern societies, work values are typical considered as salient, basic and influential on “Work Centrality” carried out in the context of the Meaning of
Work (MOW) Project (England, 1991). The importance of the work role in many cultures make work values into core values that take a cardinal position on the overall pattern of values. A number of studies took place in this context. Schwartz, Shalom (1999), studied a theory of cultural values and some implications for work. Implications of national difference in cultural values for difference in meaning of work are explicated. To stimulate research on cultural values and work, hypotheses are developed regarding the cultural value which emphasize that they are especially compatible or conflicting with work. Another study by Brown, Duane, (2001), studied the role of work and cultural values in occupational choice, satisfaction, and success. The purpose of this article is to rectify this oversight by presenting a values-based theory of occupational choice, satisfaction, and success. Values were chosen as the cornerstone of the theory because work values have been identified as critical variables in the career development process.

Cultural values also play an important role in the occupational choice making process. Although they are the primary factors in choosing and advancing in an occupation, a number of other crucial variables interact with values.
Values do not influence people’s activity directly but rather indirectly through attitudes and goals. Thus, values are seen as a source of motivation for individual action. Although people’s activity in the field work, dividing time between work and family, is likely to depend more on work values than on general values, the role of general values should not be overlooked. As far as work values and motivation is concerned, some studies have taken place. Jolibert and Baumgarter (1997), examined the relationship between the concepts of values, motivation, and personal goals. The findings showed that individuals structure the three concepts into four meaningful dimensions oriented towards success in one’s private life, professional success, and success in one’s social life and humanitarianism. It is suggested that using values in marketing studies may lead to ambiguous results and that a combination of values, motivations and personal goals may prove to be superior. Harvey et al (2000), made a comparison of work values and motives among Zimbabwean and British managers. Work values and attitudes were compared for African, British managers and management students. It was predicted that Africans would place more importance on status, Prestige and rate courtesy, social approval and loyalty more favourably than
British respondents. The findings confirmed the hypothesis relating to status, Prestige, position, tentatively supported that relating to social approval; partly confirmed the hypothesis for loyalty; and the results for courtesy and acceptance of criticism were not proven.

A study by Sagie (1993), shows religiosity to be a factor that determines how young people perceive their work obligations. Stone-Romero and others (1998), studied religious and moral influences on work related values and work quality. Research studies with a sociological origin typically look for differences in the natural environment, economic circumstances and religion as explaining factors (e.g. Parsons and Shils, 1951). Recently, a research has put more emphasis on economic development and the process of modernization resulting from it (e.g. Easter et al, 1993). Furnham, Adrian (1997), studied the relationship between work and economic values. Measures covered such issues as the work and leisure ethic, the role of government in economic affairs, and the free enterprise system. Results showed that a political belief, followed to a lesser extent by social comparison, was the best predictor of these beliefs and values. Thus, lay people have coherent
socioeconomic, ideological, beliefs systems such as the free enterprise system and more state or worker controlled systems.

There are some studies of individual values which consider such societal factors as "distal" and look for more proximal factors, such as the person's occupation, family situation, and demographic characteristics (Triandis, 1972; Zanders, 1993). Work values have been linked with a variety of individual behaviour, including labour market participation (Feather 1990; Lobodzinska, 1996) and career choice (Young, 1984; Kallenberg and Stark, 1993; Zytowski 1994) and work performance (Vora, 1983; Swenson and Herche, 1994). Hochwarter, et al (1999), conducted a study on job satisfaction and performance. They examined the contention that value attainment and affective disposition would demonstrate complex interactions with job performance and satisfaction. Three-way interactions demonstrated that the strongest positive relationship between job satisfaction and performance occurred when high value attainment was coupled with either high positive or low negative affective disposition.

Work values have an influential effect on employees' behaviour at work place. Work values are able to motivate employees and contribute to positive outcomes and supposed to
reduce conflict and improve cooperation. It is widely recognized in both the popular and the scholarly literature that employees’ values contribute to a variety of work-related attitudes, actions and outcomes.

**JOB MOTIVATION**

The study of motivation is necessary to understand all types of human behaviour. Why an individual behaves in a particular manner, is a contradictory factor. The views of some modern psychologists was that all behaviors can be explained on the basis of “drives and motivation” and they also thought that any drive or motive alone does not govern the behaviour of individual, but the interaction of various drives and motives are responsible for the behaviour. Human behaviour, at a particular moment of time, is influenced by the internal state of the organism as well as the external situation to which one is exposed. Realizing that human behaviour is truly complex, the mediating influence of past experience, emergence of needs, interaction with other individual, the over changing sociopolitical and economic scenario cannot be undermined. In the present day world, job provides one with possibilities and opportunities to achieve one’s cherished desire, goals that an individual sets for himself. The needs or life goals are usually
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socially conditioned. Taking all these aspects into account it can be said that job motivation assumes special significance for the individual and the psychologists endeavors to unveil the mysteries of complexities. Thus, we can say that a job motivation is the expression of socio-economic need by a human being.

Job motivation is an internal factor, situation or readiness. Which initiate to begin an act or behaviour, it also determines the direction and degree of work done. Thus, it can be said that the person is internally interested to do a task. In fact, the activities of human beings are causal, and behind every action there is particular motive or need. The need can be defined as feeling of lackness for something and human being tries (activities) to get lackness removed (satisfaction). Thus, human behavior (activities) to get lackness removed (satisfaction). This, human behaviour (activities) is caused by motives or needs, and motivation is the process of inducing persons to experience needs for certain desired behaviour so that organizational efficiency is achieved.

In dealing with human behaviour at work, motivation is considered a very important aspect of behaviour because it makes a person to do well at various positions or jobs, but it is
the established fact that the behaviour that is motivated is goal-directed. It means whenever the motives are aroused it is always directed towards achievement of the goals. As far as the progress, productivity and profitability of an organization are concerned, motivation plays an important role at work place. If a person is “highly motivated” then the result will be “high performance” and if the level of motivation of an individual is low then the result will be low performance. Thus, the key element is motivation. Vitles (1962), has pointed out in his book entitled “Motivation and Morale in Industry” the importance of men’s interest as well as their motivation at work. The significance of human motivation indeed cannot be overlooked as behind every human activity there are some motives that act as motivating force resulting behaviour. Motivation plays an important role in all spheres of human life. It has its impact on work situations too. Job motivation can also be referred to as the intensity of behaviour of employees in the work situation as they attempt to satisfy their particular need structure through the work they are doing.

People differ not only in their ability to do, but also in their will to do, on motivation. The motivation of people depends upon the strength of their motives. Motivation has
been presented as a basic psychological process consisting of primary, general and secondary motives and drives such as the need of power, need of affiliation and need of achievement motives. In order to understand organizational behaviour, these basic motives must be recognized and studied. Beginning in the early 1960's those concerned with work (job) motivation started to search earnestly for a new theoretical foundation and attempted to devise new techniques for applications. From the starting, when human organizations were established people had tried to find out the answer to why people work and what motivated people maximum? People gave many responses for their desires to work. The quality of answer may range from earning money to fulfill one or any other combination of psycho – social needs. When F.W. Taylor (1911) gave the concept of "Scientific Management" and more particularly differential price rate system for motivating workers, then he was of the view that the primary why people work is only to earn money but later this simplified assumption was ultimately rejected. There is no doubt that money is important for everyone because it is the only medium through which things can be exchanged in this modern age but in no way this is the only reason in which context only people work. There are
different and numerous motives either independently or in conjunction with each other determine or influence human motivation. The priorities of motives depend upon the importance and strength of motives in a given time.

As far as the human nature is concerned there have been four managerial assumptions about men at work. Which highlight various needs dominating employees and these become the reason for the people in which field they are working. They are:

**Economic Man Model**

This model gives greatest importance to economic rewards. This concept emerge from Adam Smith (1963), who visualize that man is an extension of machine and is motivated solely by economic rewards. However, the economic man model was modified by Taylor (1911) as ‘Rational Economic Man Model’. It is based on the assumption that human being by nature are lethargic and do not want to work unless they are forced to do so. Hence, they could only be motivated through financial incentives to attain desired goals.

Weber (1946), Opsahl and Dunnette (1966), supported the very concept of rational economic man model. Herzberg (1962), opined that economic man arose out of the dominant
myths of industrial revolution, Max Weber (1946), concluded that individual deserves economic reward for his performance. Verma (1978), pointed out that money does not only fulfill physiological needs but it also ensures the fulfillment of higher order needs. Srivastava (1985), found that higher wages induce greater motives.

The rational economic man assumption was highly criticized by Roethlisberger and Dickson (1939), Trist and Bamforth (1951); Mayo (1945), Homans (1950), and Trist, Higgin, Murray and Pollock (1963), on the ground that although economic incentives are essential but social needs are too important.

**Social and Emotional Man Model**

Man is a social animal. Gregariousness runs in his blood. Thus, the concept of Social emotional man is as relevant as his own identity. The social man model approach was advocated by Zalezenik et al (1958), who found that both worker productivity and satisfaction were unrelated to individual’s pay and job status rather they were related to group membership. Seashore (1954), found the association of higher group cohesiveness with higher productivity and also the sense of confidence in management.
The significance of social factor at workplace is evident from the studies of Walker and Guest (1952), Jasinski (1956), and Schrank (1978).

The emotional man approach came into light with Freud, who believed that childhood frustration and biological urges are the basis of behaviour (Brill, 1995). This became the very concept of human relation programme at jobs. It fitted in the burgeoning bureaucracy concept which manages the huge production organizations.

**Self Actualization Man Model**

Maslow (1954), Argyris (1964), Mc Gregor (1960), they came out with the conclusion that the workers remain aloof as many a times the assignment which they are given to fulfill do not allow them to use their competencies, skills in a mature and productive way.

**Complex Man Model**

Complex man model states that man is complex within himself. He tends to differ from the persons with whom he interacts like, spouse, relatives, friends, neighbours, co-workers, and etcetera. This exhibits the patterns of his/her own complexity. Grusky (1962), Argyris (1964), Lawler (1972), Pigors and Myers (1977), have supported this complex man
model. A study was conducted by Vroom and Mann (1969), which give the findings that workers with different personalities prefer different leadership styles in their supervisors.

Many new researches are being carried on motivation, however, they all emphasize that due to complex nature of human being no generalization is possible. Moreover, the findings of research studies and theories are not universally applicable and these are affected by time, country and circumstances. In this context, it is imperative to have a knowledge about various theories of motivation and how these affect the behaviour of human beings Many psychologists are engaged in find out the answer of the question relating to what motivates people, their approaches have differed resulting into a number of theories concerning motivation. Many scientific and objectives efforts have been done to provide an answer to it. Psycho–anthropological approach argues that the primitive man’s motive to work was merely to fulfill the basic needs of his survival. Mores and Weiss (1955), found that people worked “even if they had enough money to support themselves, working gives them the feeling of being tied into the large society of having something to do, of having a purpose in life”,
work is the intrinsic part of life. Many other assumptions or models have been put forward time and again to explain as to why people work and behave in the way they do so. The motivation to work is very complex. There are many internal as well as environmental variables that may also influence the job motivation of employees. Various theories have been proposed with regard to job motivation. These theories can be broadly classified as:

**Content Theories:**

These theories are associated with human need. These are included with Maslow’s Needs Hierarchy and Herzberg’s Two Factor Theory.

**Process Theories:**

Vroom’s theory of Instrumentality and Porter and Lawler’s Multivariate Model are included in process theories.

In modern life, people have many motives which change in roles, with situations et cetera. Today man strives for growth and development, responsibility, autonomy and also he is capable of making decisions in the organization (Ganguli, Chaudhury and Guha, 1980; Grusky, 1962; Argyris, 1964; Pigors and Myers 1977) but we find that such studies conform some theoretical models. In the absence of concrete
theorization such findings could not properly explain many aspects of job motivation. In this respect we find that contemporary models such as content and process theories explain job motivation in more systematic way. Job motivation according to content theorists explain search for the specific things within individual’s, which initiate, sustain and direct behaviour towards a goal. Maslow’s (1943), theory gave new impetus to the understanding of human motivation. In 1954, his theory of “Need Hierarchy” was applied as a theory of “Job Motivation”, which became very much popular and also widely accepted as a most popular theory of motivation and it occupied prominent position in organizational behaviour. Maslow’s needs hierarchy theory focuses on both as a theory of human motives by classifying them as basic needs in hierarchy and also as the theory of motivation that relates these needs to general behaviour. The hierarchy of needs is an ascending order of prepotency that is the physiological needs, safety and security needs, the belongingness of social needs, esteem needs and the need for self actualization. The physiological needs include all the biological needs such as hunger, thrust, shelter, sex and other bodily needs. In the category of safety needs include security, and protection from physical and emotional
harm. Social needs include love affection, belongingness, acceptance and friendship. Esteem needs include internal esteem factors for instance, self respect, autonomy and achievement. The external factors are status, recognition and attention. The self actualization needs include the drive to become what one is capable of becoming for example growth, achieving one’s potential and self-fulfillment.

In the theory of need hierarchy Maslow classified these five needs into lower and higher level of needs. Physiological and safety needs into lower order whereas esteem and self-actualization as higher order needs. According to him the lower order needs are satisfied externally by such things as money, wages, union contracts, tenure, pleasant working conditions, whereas higher order are satisfied internally. When employees’ lower need is not satisfied they stick to this need but as soon as it satisfied they need to higher level needs. Thus, we can say that, once the lower order needs are satisfied, need next in order of hierarchy come into prominence and so on.

The theory of need hierarchy has much implications and utility in management because the predicting managers should have to consider that to what extent the lower and higher order needs of the employees are satisfied. A number of researchers
in India as well as abroad apply Maslow’s theory of need hierarchy in management practices and reported that self-actualization, esteem and social needs were satisfied more at the higher level of job hierarchy (Porter, 1961; 1962; Porter and Lawler, 1968). More or less, similar findings were also reported by many Indian researchers Narain, (1973); Natha, (1980); Daftuar, (1982), who examined need satisfaction at different levels of job hierarchy and indicated that as one moves up in job hierarchy, one gets to secure satisfaction of higher-order needs. Manju and Akhtar (1991) found that the managers who are occupying higher position in the organization were found to be satisfied by autonomy and decision making needs. Other researchers Saiyadain, (1977); Kamarraju, (1981), Vikas and Mukesh, (1986); Mohan, Sehgal and Rana, (1991), found the same things in their findings.

Various studies are there for verifying Maslow’s hypothesis, Lawler and Suttle (1972), conducted a study on managers in two different organizations but found little evidence to support Maslow’s theory of human needs for showing that there ever existed a hierarchy of levels in needs. Hall and Naugain (1964), Castello and Sang (1974), Vig (1978), did not find strong evidence for the need hierarchy
theory. Some other have also criticized need hierarchy theory on the basis of empirical findings like Raymond and William (1968), Kumar and Bharguvathi (1989), Mathur and Khurana (1990), they did not find the occurrence of the need hierarchy in the similar order as proposed by Maslow. Yet the theory of Maslow has attained a lot of recognition, not only recognition but also practical application all over the world. This theory is still valid in today’s context and practiced in various organizations.

Another theory regarding job motivation is proposed by Herzberg et al (1959), which provides us a different view. This theory of job satisfaction that was adapted to motivational theory by Herzberg (1966) in his book. His theory is known as “Two Factor Theory of Job Motivation”. The major inferences from the original study on the feeling and experiences of two hindered engineers, relate to the distinction between what are called motivator factors and hygiene factors. The events that are associated with high job attitudes generally are linked directly or indirectly with the job activities; these categories are achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility and advancement. These factors are related to job contact, which means that they are intrinsic to the job itself. Positive
expressions of these factors are associated with high job attitude situations. They have been called motivators, satisfiers, intrinsic or content factors. The events predominantly associated with low job attitude situations are those extrinsic to the work itself and are associated with the job context rather than with job activities. These have been called hygiene factors, dissatisfiers, extrinsic or context factors. According to the theory, self-realization can be achieved only through the fulfillment of factors intrinsic to the work-itself, in other words, the motivator factors.

In the beginning, the theory has been surrounded by controversy. The major criticism of the theory was directed at the assumed independence of motivator and hygiene factors. Critically evaluating the empirical investigation, we find that a large number of individuals following critical incident methodology endorse two-factor theory Dunnette, Campbell and Hakel (1967); Barns (1967); Hersey and Blanchard (1977); Hant and Hill (1971); Vroom (1964); Houser and Wigdor (1967); Dayal and Saiyadain (1970); Pestonjee and Basu (1972); Pareek and Keshato (1981); Misra and Jain (1986); Mohan and Kakkar (1990).
The contradictory findings especially if the researchers used methodology different that of Herzberg. They claim that two factor theory suffers from being methodology bound and defense-mechanism by and large found to influence the findings of many scholars namely, Backman (1971); Pestonjee, Akhtar and Diwedi (1971); Akhtar and Bhargava (1974); Basu and Pestonjee (1974); Davis (1977); Agarwal (1978); Merwi and Phil (1984) and Nirmala (1985);

Studies of Gorden (1965); King (1970); Rao and Ganguli (1972) have a partial support to the two factor theory, used a different method than that of Herzberg.

There is more or less comparison between Herzberg and Maslow’s theories. Maslow centers on needs of the psychological person, while Herzberg focuses on job condition for need satisfaction. The Herzberg model says that in modern society, many workers have satisfied their lower-order needs, so that they are now motivated mainly by higher-order needs. The lower-order needs are no longer strong, driving forces for an employee. Rather, they merely ensure maintenance at the current level of progress.

Alderfer (1969), criticized both Maslow’s (1954), need hierarchy and Herzberg’s (1959), two factor prepotency theory
and gave more emphasis on continuum of needs than levels. Alderfer (1972), offered an alternative theory closely related to Maslow's. He modified and reduced give levels of needs into three levels, he termed his theory Existence, Relatedness Growth (ERG) theory. The name reflects the three basic needs postulated by the theory. They are-

**Existence Needs:**

These needs are concerned with the physical existence of the organism. They include basic such as food, cloth and shelter and the means provide by work organizations to attain these factors; for example, pay, fringe benefits, safe working conditions and security.

**Relatedness Needs:**

These needs are those interpersonal needs that are satisfied through interactions with others both on an off the job.

**Growth needs:**

These are needs for personal development and improvement. They are met by developing whatever abilities and capabilities are important to the individual.

Alderfer's list of needs may be neither more complete nor more conceptually clear than Maslow's, the process he
proposed do offer some improvements. In his theory he described that individual can be motivated by three factors such existence (concerned with survival or physiological well-being); relatedness (stress the interpersonal relations); growth (Concerned with the individual intrinsic desire for personal growth and development). Unlike Maslow and Herzberg, he does not contend that a lower level need is aroused or emerged or that deprivation is the only way to activate need. Yet Alderfer’s ERG theory appears to be the most promising version of the need hierarchy theory available at this time.

Some studies were conducted for the verification of Alderfer’s approach. Rausherberger, Schmidt and Hunter (1980), conducted a study and they rejected Alderfer’s approach according to their findings. Schneider and Alderfer (1973), and Mayes (1978), also rejected Alderfer’s approach. Wahaba and Birdwell (1976), criticized the acceptance of Maslow’s need hierarchy without any criticism as it lacks empirical evidence for being scientific. Wanous and Zwany (1977), have supported Alderfer’s hierarchy of three needs. But they have questioned the theory’s universality; there is some evidence that this theory will be applicable in some organizations not in every organization.
In process theories, Vroom (1965), has proposed a theory of human motivation which although quite general in form, takes as its context the individual in the world of work. This theory is known as "Expectancy Valence Motivation Theory". This process theory of job motivation gave emphasis on identifying the variables that influence job motivation of employees at work place. This theory explains the interaction between individual's goal and the probability associated with the attainment of goal. It is probably the first such attempt at formal motivation "model building" in industrial psychology. Vroom has drawn very heavily on the work of the goal social psychologist Kurt Lewin. Like Lewin, Vroom uses the basic concept of valence as a key notion. He defines valence as "the anticipated satisfaction from an outcome" Vroom then outlines two propositions:

Proposition 1:

The valence of an outcome to a person is monotonically increasing function of the algebraic sum of the valences for all other outcomes and his conceptions of its instrumentality of the attainment of these other outcomes.

Proposition 2:
The force on a person to perform an act is a monotonically increasing function of the algebraic sum of the products of the valences of all outcomes and the strength of his experiences that the act will be followed by the attainment of these outcomes.

Proposition 1 may be thought of as follows: The desire (valence) for any particular objective (outcome) on the part of an individual is directly related to the likelihood (instrumentality) that the objective will in turn lead to other subsequent objectives of given desirability (valences).

Proposition 2 simple states that the greater the valence of any outcome, the more apt is a person to take action.

The theory of Vroom is different from those of Maslow and Herzberg as it shows a process of cognitive variables that reflects individual difference in work motivation. Vroom is not able to describe what is the content is and what are the individual difference. It does not make specific suggestions for human motivation in organization. Vroom’s theory only indicates the conceptual determinates of motivation and their relation. This model has emerged as an important modern theory of work motivation. It recognizes the complexities of work motivation. Expectancy model can provide the manager
with a framework for explaining the direction of behavior of employees and for emphasizing some organizational influences that may have an effect on their motivational behavior.

The practical implication of Vroom's theory seems to be quite restricted and difficult and it has been also found difficult in transforming into empirical researches. Some researchers criticized the theory for its validity and predictability. Filley, House and Kerr (1976), Criticized the theory for the same. This theory was supported by Mitra and Battacharya (1983), they said that expectancy theory should be regarded as work motivation. Wofford (1971), also supported the expectancy theory and said that it has a greater promise for understanding and predicting job motivation and satisfaction than either Maslow's need hierarchy or Herzberg's two factor theory. Sheridon et al (1975), studied the expectancy model of Vroom in relation to work performance and partially supported the theory.

There came Porter and Lawler (1968), they modified and extended Vroom's model to establish the relationship between satisfaction and performance on the basis of motivation model. The model is called as 'Multivariate Model'. This multivariate model explains the complex relationship which exists between
job attitudes and job performance. According to Porter and Lawler's model the individual first try to figure out whether the reward which he is going to receive from doing a job will be attractive to him. If the reward to be obtained is attractive then the individual will decide to put the necessary effort to perform the job. On the other hand, if the expected reward is not attractive then the individual’s effort will not be desirably activated to perform the particular task.

The multivariate model of Porter and Lawler suggests that there is not direct leading of effort to performance. It is mediated by abilities or traits and role perception. Performance leads to satisfaction that is significant effect of events from traditional thinking. Similar to the Vroom’s model, Porter and Lawler model is an expectancy model based on motivation theory. The multivariate model has four variables; these are:

- effort,
- performance,
- reward and
- satisfaction.

The variable “effort” refers to the amount of energy exerted by an employee on a given task. Effort is more closely related to motivation than to performance. The second variable
“performance” represents the pragmatic result that can be measured objectively by organizations. Performance depends not only on the amount of effort exerted but also on the person’s ability. The third variable “reward” is included by Porter and Lawler in their model as a single variable but further they divided it into two categories extrinsic and intrinsic. They realized that the intrinsic rewards are much more likely to produce attitudes to satisfaction which are related to performance. The last variable “satisfaction” is not the same as motivation. It is an attitude, an internal cognitive state that is definitely not motivation. According to this model satisfaction is only one of the variable which is derived from the extent to which the actual rewards fall short, meet or exceed the person’s perceived equitable level of rewards. When the person receives actual reward then satisfaction is determined in that particular part.

The multivariate theory was criticized on the ground that this study was conducted on the sample of managers; hence, such results have been obtained. This theory was also criticized on the basis of its complexity. The theory refers human motivation as a process so that it can only be used in particular context.

The other process approach to work motivation is Inequity Theory of Adams (1963). It is another cognitively based
motivational theory. According to this theory the major input to job performance and satisfaction is the degree of equity that an individual perceives in his work situation. For particular types of the needs, a person’s performance level for the thing that fulfills the need is affected by the process of social comparison. By this equity theory, a person compares his pay or other job benefits with that of workers who have similar job, seniority and skill. If a person’s pay is higher or less than the compared person then he will perceive it to be inequitable. This theory explains job motivation in terms of equity and inequity. It states that if persons perceive a difference between the amount of rewards they received and their effort then they are motivated to reduce it. If the difference is greater then the persons are more motivated to reduce this difference.

Some criticisms are labelled against Adams’ theory of inequity with reference to problems related to the classification of reference persons, testing of theory in real life organizations. The equity, presently, is somewhat in state of transition. According to Yukul and Wexley (1971), in recent days the researchers are concentrating on the motivational implications of the inequity theory. Goodman (1974), commented that this inequity theory is
being focused almost entirely on the outcome of pay which may not be the only factor by which the persons are motivated.

Thus, keeping in view the vital importance of all these three variables, namely, organizational health, work values and job motivation in organizations, they have been taken as the variables of the present study.

**Objectives of Proposed Study:**

The major objectives of the proposed study are formulated in accordance with the topic under investigation. They are as follows-

➢ To determine the relationship between organizational health and job motivation among overall textile industry workers.

➢ To determine the relationship between work values and job motivation among overall textile industry workers.

➢ To determine the relationship between organizational health and job motivation among technical group of textile industry workers.

➢ To determine the relationship between work values and job motivation among technical group of textile industry workers.
To determine the relationship between organizational health and job motivation among non-technical group of textile industry workers.

To determine the relationship between work values and job motivation among non-technical group of textile industry workers.