Chapter-I

EMPLOYEE MORALE
AND
JOB SATISFACTION:
A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK
This chapter discusses and describes the concepts of Employee Morale and Job Satisfaction. It also highlights the determinants of morale and theories of job satisfaction. Finally, an attempt is also made to bring out the relationship between employee morale, job satisfaction and organizational effectiveness.

Employee Morale: Concept and Background

An employee in an organization is a member of a team. The organization irrespective of its nature and type is a world by itself and the employees lead a social life in it. Therefore, the employee rarely functions as an isolated individual and it is in fact impossible to deny the existence of the social structure in any organization. According to Blum “to do so is to refuse to face reality, men and women lead a social life in the job and they make friends and enemies, they exchange confidence, meet socially after working hours, talk together and so on. In short, consciously or unconsciously they form groups. These groups at last become the basic core of morale formation."
Morale is the most frequently used term in organizational literature. Almost all scientists unanimously agree to the importance of morale for it is a hallmark of sound behavioural climate. Morale is a fundamentally psychological and multi-dimensional concept. It is an individual’s attitude in a group endeavour. It refers to the spirit of the organization and the managerial climate. It is mostly regarded as a long-term condition of the employees in an organization. According to Juicius (1971) morale is the extent to which an individual needs are satisfied and the extent to which the individual person perceives that satisfaction is stemming from his total job satisfaction.

Morale can also be understood as a group phenomenon. It refers to the operation of the group. It is the way the group thinks, feels and acts. In the context of an organization, it develops a ‘we’ feeling among the employees. It also develops a sense of belongingness to the group. Blum (1949) holds the view that morale is a by-product of the group and is generated by the group. A similar view was expressed by Tiffin and McCormick said that morale usually has an implication of group notions. Thus, morale is the vital ingredient of organizational success for it reflects the attitudes and sentiments and individual and group has towards the organizational objectives. Management relies on morale measurement as a basis for estimating motivation level of the employees because direct measurement of motivation has several complications. Dwivedi (1995) also
strongly opines that high morale can help enhance job performance, job satisfaction and employment stability in any organization irrespective of its nature and type.\(^9\)

Thus, today the emphasis of industrial psychologists, business executives, academicians and researchers have shifted from the studies of isolated individuals and physical environment to the studies of motivation, morale and job satisfaction in group. The problem of morale has drawn the attention of many organizational experts today. The zeal, vigour and enthusiasm that is found in the work of a group is never found in a single-minded work, perhaps because of the absence of morale. Similarly, the difference between the organization or group that cooperates and unites and the one that does not is surely due to the difference in morale and cohesiveness.

There exists a general impression that if morale is high employees are satisfied and happy about their jobs, working conditions, pay, allowances and perks and various other employment situations. Greater the motivation the greater would be the job satisfaction and resultantly, the greater would be the morale. High morale would also be reflected by little aggressiveness or frustration instigated conflict by a reasonably euphoric work force, by fairly well adjust employees who can become quite ego involved in their work by many favourable attitudes and by the cohesiveness which comes from finding personal need satisfaction within
the group. In the words of John F. Mee: "Good morale is evidenced by employee enthusiasm, voluntary conformance with regulations and orders and willingness to co-operate with others in the accomplishment of an organization's objectives. Poor morale is evidenced by surliness, insubordination, a feeling of discouragement and dislike of the job, company and associates." Similarly, Yoder and others (1958) pointed out that employee unrest, absenteeism and tardiness, employee turnover, grievances, need for discipline, and fatigue and monotony are major indicators of low morale.

Factors Influencing Morale

The factors affecting morale of employees in a work organization can be logically grouped under the following two categories—external and internal.

1. External Factors: These are the factors external to the organization. These comprise of the personality of the individual employee, his psychological make-up, level of intelligence, his physical health, family background and relations with social groups and friends. Every human being is unique just like finger prints. When an individual comes to the work place he carries all these factors with him. These factors influence his perceptions, attitudes that, in turn, affects the morale. Since these are external factors that are outside the control of managers, managers
can do very little to change, control or influence them. But it cannot be denied that external factors also influence morale of employees.

2. Internal Factors: These are the factors that come under the domain of control of management.

(a) Goals of an organization: If the goals set by management are worthwhile, valid and useful, then workers develop a positive feeling toward job and the organization. Allowing workers participation in setting goals enhances morale of the employees to a larger extent.

(b) Structure: In a sound structure where lines of authority are clearly specified and responsibility is precisely defined and where there is candid communication among the people, morale tends to be high. Further, if the structure of the organization is such that employees associate with management at least now and then, helps remove the sense of isolation and misunderstanding among employees, about the organization serves to build morale. Normally, in decentralized structures morale will be high.

(c) Nature of Task: Perhaps the biggest factor that affects morale of employee is the nature of the task he confronts. If he is asked to do time and again the dull, monotonous and repetitive jobs, he might feel depressed adversely affecting his morale. On the other hand, if
an employee is asked to do some challenging tasks his morale may be high. Management has to consider the skills, competence and willingness of the individual to perform the job. A job that may be quite dull and dead may be satisfying to the individual resulting in high morale.

(d) Managerial Philosophy: An employee’s strong feeling toward his job may be seen by some as caused by how permissive his supervisor is. The treatment of subordinates by their leader can have profound influence on the morale of the employees. Further, the style of leader also affects morale. It is generally felt that a participative style will enhance morale and a directive style will have a negative impact on the morale.

(e) Working Conditions: Morale will be generally high when employees are placed in a clean, safe, comfortable and pleasant environment. People generally feel suffocated if they are placed in a congested environment, which adversely affects the morale. Good working conditions are, therefore, sine-qua-non for high morale of the employees in an organization.

(f) Compensation: Morale of the employees is also influenced by the compensation schemes in the organization. Inadequate compensation leads to low morale and low job satisfaction and may
also result in low productivity. Organizations cannot afford to ignore the financial and non-financial rewards to the employees.

\textit{(g) Group:} Each individual has a unique storehouse of perceptions, attitudes and beliefs about the work environment, organizations and people. Social forces and work groups also exert strong influence on these individual perceptions and attitudes and to this extent the morale of individual employees will also be affected.

**Job Satisfaction: Concept & Background**

The term job satisfaction came in vogue in 1935 with the publishing of a book “job satisfaction” by Hoppock. He was the first industrial psychologist who provided the concept of job satisfaction. Hoppock defined job satisfaction as any combination of psychological, physiological and environmental circumstances that causes a person truthfully to say, I am satisfied with the job.\textsuperscript{13} He included both on the job and off the job factors.

According to the Oxford Dictionary, job satisfaction is an “application of effort to a purpose, force in action, doing of something, a task or materials to operated on doings or experiences of specified kind, employment especially as a means of earning monthly, a thing done or made, a product or manifestation.”
Sinha gave support to the expression the "job satisfaction covers both the satisfaction derived from being engaged in piece of work, or in any pursuit of a higher order. It is essentially related to human needs and then fulfillment through work. In fact, dissatisfaction is generated by individual perception of how well his job on the whole is satisfying to his various needs.\textsuperscript{14}

It has been contended by a number of psychologists that job satisfaction is global term which includes not only the adjustment made by the worker in his job environment but also the adjustment of the individual in several other areas.

Krech and Crutch suggested that the causes of workers satisfaction are not restricted to "in plant" factors but they also run the whole gamut of man's needs and aspirations.\textsuperscript{15} In the opinion of Harrell, job satisfaction is derived from and caused by many different factors.\textsuperscript{16} Broadly speaking these are divided into:

(a) Personal factors – age, sex, number of dependents, time on the job intelligence, education and personality.

(b) Factors inherent in the job – type of work, skill required occupational status, geography and size of the plant, and
(c) Factors controlled by the management – security, pay, fringe
benefits and opportunity for advancement, working conditions, co-
workers, responsibility and supervision.

Morse, suggests that an organization can be evaluated in terms of
human satisfaction.\textsuperscript{17} Likert considers job satisfaction and other satisfaction
derived by members of organization as one of the inertia proposed for
evaluating the administrative effectiveness of an organization.\textsuperscript{18} According
to Jurgensen accurate data importance ranking of job factors are a valuable
in designing and revising personal policies and practices including
recruitment programme and supervising, training and in diagnosing
employee morale.\textsuperscript{19}

Job satisfaction is of great significance for efficient and profitable
functioning of any organization. Satisfied workforce are the greatest asset
of any organization and dissatisfied employees the biggest liability. In fact,
no organization can successfully achieve its goals unless and until those
who constitute the organization are satisfied in their jobs. It is believed that
employees dissatisfied with their jobs may be militant in their attitudes
towards the management. Hale and Locke in their study in Rownteer
Cocoa plant also regarded dissatisfaction as an important determinant of
employees morale and employee – employer relationship. A discontented
employee, what-so-ever may be the understandingly cause, is for more
interested in his own misfortune than in his job and tends to have an
undesirable and demoralizing influences on all those who work near him. Dissatisfaction infections and quickly speeds to other workers and shape the morale in the organization. The amount of co-operation that the management may derive from the employees would depend greatly on the extent of satisfaction amongst them. A dissatisfied employee may seriously cause damage to the reputation and property of the company and harm its business interest.\textsuperscript{20}

Thus, job satisfaction means good or positive attitude or feeling toward one's job. It is important to mention that an individual may hold different attitudes towards various aspects of the job. Individuals with high positive morale have more likely to be satisfied with their jobs. Reverse is true for individuals with high negative morale.

**Determinants of Job Satisfaction**

The evidence from research studies indicates that the more important elements that contribute to job satisfaction are the nature of work, equitable reward system, promotion, quality supervision, supportive colleagues and conducive working conditions. A description of these is as follows:\textsuperscript{21}
Nature of Work

Most employees crave intellectual challenges on their jobs. Therefore they prefer to jobs that offer them challenges and an opportunity to use their skill and abilities. However, while too much challenge in job creates frustration and feelings of failure, too little challenge causes boredom. In fact, it is the conditions of moderate challenge in which employees experience pleasure and satisfaction.

Pay and Promotion

Employees want their pay systems and promotion policies as unambiguous and in line with their expectations. Accordingly, if they see pay as fair, based on job demands and employees skill and as per community pay standards, it results in job satisfaction.

Not surprisingly, employees consider promotions as their ultimate achievement in their craves. When they achieve it, they feel satisfied with their jobs. Besides, promotions made on a fair and just manner are also likely to create job satisfaction for the employees.

Quality Supervision

Quality or supportive establishes cordial and supportive personal relationships with subordinates and takes interest in subordinates’ well-
being. These characteristics of supervision create satisfaction for employees on their jobs.

**Supportive Colleagues**

Experience shown that employees get more out of work than only money or tangible achievements. It happens primarily by having opportunities for interaction with colleagues. Work team fills the need for social interaction. Thus, having supportive colleagues also leads to employees' job satisfaction.

**Conducive Working Conditions**

Employees are concerned with their environment for both personal, comfort and facilitating doing a job. Therefore, the physical surroundings that are safe, clean, comfortable and with a minimum degree of distractions result in a good or positive feelings.

**Age:**

The relationship between age of the employees and their satisfaction from the job is both complex and fascinating. Research reveals that old workers are satisfied workers. Job satisfaction usually tends to be high when people enter the work force, it plummets and then plateaus for several years up to the age roughly thirty years, after which there will be gradual increase in satisfaction. Another plausible reason could be people,
when they begin their job-life, have a tendency of over estimating themselves and seek flexibility and want to be placed in good organizations. After some period when they get settled down in a particular job they become realistic and may be contempt with it. But certainly just before retirement, satisfaction may fall due to the fear of future.

Educational Level

Keeping the occupational level as constant, there found a negative correlation between the level of education of employees and their satisfaction. One plausible explanation could be that people with higher educational levels have a tendency to set higher expectations from their jobs. Dissatisfaction will be more when educated person are employed in lower rungs.

Theories of Job Satisfaction

There are vital differences among experts about the concept of job satisfaction.²² Basically there are:

1. Fulfilment theory
2. Discrepancy theory
3. Equity theory
4. Two factor theory
Fulfilment Theory:

The proponents of this theory measure satisfaction in terms of rewards a person receives or the extent to which his needs are satisfied. Further, they thought that there is a direct/positive relationship between job satisfaction and the actual satisfaction of the expected needs. The main difficulty in this approach is that job satisfaction as observed by many is not only a function of what a person receives but also what he feels he should receive as there would be considerable differences in the expectations of persons.

Thus, job satisfaction cannot be regarded as merely a function of how much a person received from his job. Another important factor/variable that should be included to predict job satisfaction accurately is the strength of the individual's desires or his level of aspiration in a particular area. This led to the development of the discrepancy theory of job satisfaction.

Discrepancy Theory

The proponents of this theory argue that satisfaction is the function of what a person actually receives from his job situation and what he thinks he should receive or what he expects to receive, when the actual satisfaction received is less than expected satisfaction, it results in dissatisfaction. In the words of Locke "job satisfaction and dissatisfaction
are functions of the perceived relationship between what one wants from one's job and what one perceives it is offering. This approach does not make it clear whether or not over satisfaction is a part of dissatisfaction and if so how does it differ from dissatisfaction. This led to the development of equity theory of job satisfaction.

**Equity Theory**

The proponents of this theory are of the view that a person's satisfaction is determined by his perceived equity, which in turn is determined by his input-output balance, compared to his comparison of other's input-output balance. Input-output balance is the perceived ratio of what a person receives from his job, relative to what he puts in the job. This theory is of the view that both under and over rewards lead to dissatisfaction. While the under reward causes feelings of unfair treatment, over reward leads to feelings of guilt and discomfort.

**Two Factor Theory**

This theory was developed by Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson and Capwell, who identified certain factors as satisfiers and dissatisfiers. Factors such as achievement, recognition, responsibility etc., are satisfiers, the presence of which causes satisfaction but their absence does not result in dissatisfaction. On the other hand factors such as supervision, salary, working conditions etc., are dissatisfiers, the absence of which causes
dissatisfaction. Their presence however does not result in positive satisfaction. The studies designed to test this theory failed to give any support to this theory as it seems from the formulation of this theory that a person get both satisfaction and dissatisfaction at the same time, which is not valid.

Morale and Job Satisfaction

When we refer to the observations projected in various studies, it can be understood that job satisfaction is perhaps the most important aspect of morale. Michael observes, "Morale and job satisfaction are closed tied to the basic concepts of attitudes and motivation." Morale has a positive relation with individual behaviour also, since morale is an indicator of need satisfaction. Obviously job satisfaction and job involvement will be greater when the morale is greater. At the same time both morale and job satisfaction are closely linked with attitudes morale and productivity have also a positive correlation, though empirical evidence is not easily available for this purpose. Studies of Katz and his associates, Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman have also produced a valuable result in this respect.

Employee Morale, Job Satisfaction and Organizational Effectiveness: An Indispensable Link

Any organization irrespective of its nature and size consists of individuals and groups. The effectiveness and efficiency of the
organizations can, therefore, be attributed to individual and group effectiveness. As is known, through synergistic efforts, organizations are able to obtain high levels of performance than the sum of their parts. Organizational effectiveness is the result of a blend of vast number of variables including technology, environmental constraints, and above all personal competence of the employees. The causes of individual effectiveness include physical attributes, personality traits and much more than that individual’s motives, morale and their level of job satisfaction. R.M.Steers (1975) reviewed seventeen different approaches and found that the employee morale and job satisfaction as one of the most important criteria besides profitability, productivity and adaptability – flexibility approaches for assessing the organizational effectiveness.

Employee morale and job satisfaction can sometimes be used as synonymous since they are mutually interrelated and interdependent. Job satisfaction of the employees can not be understood isolating the morale environment. From the research studies it has been found that employee job satisfaction, though it is a subjective factor, but invariably be associated with the conducive and favourable attitude of the employees. Therefore, it can be premised that high morale will lead to positive motivation and this in turn will lead to job satisfaction. This ultimately, determines the organizational effectiveness. Thus, survival, success
including failure of an organization can be attributed to employee morale and the level of job satisfaction felt by the employees.

Job satisfaction is a dynamic and subjective factor. In a sense, job satisfaction will be changing from organization to organization and within organization from person to person and within human mind, it will be changing from time to time. Job satisfaction is the ultimate result and favourable attitude of the employees towards various organizational and job related aspects in the changing competitive organizational world.

Summary

To sum up it can be observed that high morale can result in job satisfaction, constructive attitude, higher productivity and better performance, cost reduction, cohesiveness, low absenteeism, better identification with the organizational goals, etc. At the same time low morale can lead to low productivity, low job satisfaction, apathy and antagonism, fatigue and monotony, absenteeism and high rate of man days lost, high rate of migration of workers, strikes, conflict, and confrontation and disputes, negative attitude etc. Thus, there is an indispensable and implied relationship between employee morale and job satisfaction, and organizational effectiveness.
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