CHAPTER IV
EVALUATION OF CRITICAL ORGANISATIONAL FACTORS
— (3) EXECUTIVE NEED-FULFILMENT

The rationale

Myers¹ and others provide evidence to suggest that certain support factors such as good working conditions, fringe benefits and fair practices may reduce dissatisfaction to the extent that individuals will stay with the organisation, but that a different group of factors causes managers to be highly motivated towards their work. Myers believes that this later group, which he calls "motivators", includes the factors of achievement, growth, responsibility and recognition.

McGregor² interprets this same motivational problem in terms of the hierarchy of needs developed by Maslow³. He feels that organisations continue to concern themselves with satisfying the physiological and safety needs of their employees by providing better wages, better working conditions, and more fringe benefits even after these two lower level needs have been quite well satisfied. The greatest mistake,

McGregor believes, stems from management's failure to recognize that employees' dissatisfaction and failure to put forth more than minimum effort derive from the lack of opportunities to satisfy their social, ego (esteem and autonomy) and self-fulfilment needs. The needs contained within these three higher level categories, particularly the ego and self-fulfilment needs, closely parallel Myer's "Motivators".

A sense of commitment to organisational goals can only be kept up if reasons for frustration are identified and timely action is taken to remedy them. It is possible to isolate a majority of causes of frustration and counter them by imaginative steps. Maslow's theory of motivation is based on various human needs which, when fulfilled, keep up "morale" and, when unfulfilled, produce frustration.

Maslow observes: man is a wanting animal.\(^1\) When his one set of needs is fulfilled, new needs are created. According to him, there is a definite hierarchy of importance of needs—Security, Social, Esteem, Autonomy and Self-Actualization, on a single continuum of least to most important. He further states that satisfied needs do not motivate behaviour.\(^2\)

The instinct for self-preservation common to the whole animal kingdom including man would always drive him to satisfy

---


\(^2\)Ibid p. 84.
the Security need first. If he is deprived of any of his basic requirements such as food, water, shelter, etc., his very survival is threatened. It is only after satisfying the Security need that he would turn towards the higher need like associating with other fellow beings to complete his Ecological need. If he feels secure and socially adjusted within the community, he would turn to seek prominent place—Esteem—in the society. Once he has achieved it, he desires and needs Autonomy, independence in running his affairs. Finally, he wishes to become "What he can be"—Self-Actualization.

An affluent family would always take good food for granted. It is impossible to change its behaviour by offering it sumptuous food. A starving man on the contrary would be willing to do anything for the sake of food.

The Maslowian doctrine of motivating man to put forth his best efforts by offering him the means to satisfy his needs is an effective tool in the hands of all organizations. But it is difficult to handle. One has to recognize "What the employees need" and to devise the means enabling employees to satisfy these needs. In most of the American studies, more importance is given to human relations on the job, increasing variety and interest in the job and creating psychological incentives other than just increasing the salaries and wages. In contrast, researches with Indian workers show that job
security and pay and working conditions are given greater importance than other job factors. Kushhal\(^1\) and Sinha\(^2\) report Security and Income are most important for workers in India. Bose\(^3\), Ganguli\(^4\) and Veeraraghavan\(^5\) find that other factors such as opportunity for Advancement, facilities for further Training and Development and nature of Supervision have been ranked lower in importance than Security and Salary. In one of the very recent investigations with middle management level, Marigopals\(^6\) finds that middle management personnel are relatively more dissatisfied with Salary, Security and Working Conditions than Status, Supervision and Achievement.

The individual is highly motivated when his Security and Social needs are already satisfied and he tries to

---


\(^5\) P.V. Veeraraghavan, Employee Attitudes (Second Conference of Human Relation in India, South Indian Textile Research Association, 1960), page 83-87.

satisfy his Ego (esteem/autonomy) and Self-Actualization needs. He wants to Actualise his innate potentialities. He does the work for work's sake, sees in it the means for the fulfilment of the Self-Actualization need and is highly productive. The organisational goal of any industry is to achieve this motivational level for each of their employees. But it is to be recognized that, to achieve this motivational level, the other lower order needs must be first satisfied to a moderate extent.

As said earlier, our needs get themselves organized in a hierarchy of importance starting with Physiological needs, through Safety, Social, Esteem and Ego, and ending up with the need for Self-fulfilment. When one set of needs gets satiated, the other needs next in order of importance take its place. Thus, man remains constantly and continuously a wanting animal—if not physiological sustenance or safety against starvation or membership in social groups, it will be recognition, status and, finally, perhaps self-aggrandizement, that will come up to play their role.

The trend of modern theories of motivation is to account for complexity of human behaviour in terms of varieties of needs and not in terms of one or two as in the case of Freud's "libido" or "sex" or Smith's "money" or "material gains".
As one scans through the literature on the Indian industrial milieu for studies of the above type, one feels bereft of meaningful analyses of the above-noted "seeds" in the context of empirical situations. More specifically, whatever studies in India are available, relate to the industrial workers or supervisors rather than to those levels of management which steer the fate of industrial organisations through crucial 'decision-making'. This study is one attempt to fill this gap.

* * *

Management levels

Starting with the Hawthorne experiments in the mid-thirties till the end of the fifties, the behavioural scientists have tended either to ignore the effect of management levels or to concentrate on the simple dichotomy between managers and workers. In this stream can be put such "modern" management theorists as Argyris, Haire, Leavitt, Likert, and McGregor. The importance of


paying closer attention to management level has been well
stated by Pfiffner and Sherwood: "The differentiation of
task between echelons is of more significance to the selec-
tion and training of leaders at the several levels than may
be indicated by the attention accorded to it in recent past.
The psychological adjustment necessary when one goes from
one level to another is often difficult because of the
tendency to continue former behaviour patterns... At first
glance this might appear to be a problem of human relations
rather than of formal organisation, but such a conclusion
would be only partially true. Good job descriptions should
reflect task differentiation at the various echelons. It
is a matter of tasks combined with behaviour".\textsuperscript{1} We shall
briefly survey the literature pertinent to organisational
levels and their impact on—and relationship to—job
attitudes and this will exclude the relationship with or
impact on job behaviour.

* * *

Management levels and job satisfaction

One pertinent issue in the studies which deal with job
satisfactions within management levels is whether or not the

\textsuperscript{1}J.M.Pfiffner, F.P.Sherwood, Administrative Organisation,
satisfaction increases with each higher level, or whether the middle levels have less satisfaction than either the lower or the upper levels. Herzberg et al.\(^1\) conclude: "in large concerns, middle levels of management often have very poor morale". Their conclusion has been drawn on the basis of a critical examination of Benge\(^2\). Both the studies seem to be impressionistic rather than based on empirical evidence. However, there are other studies based on empirical evidence to suggest that job satisfaction or morale does increase monotonically with increasing levels of management and that middle executives are more satisfied than those below them in the organisation but less satisfied than those above. The first such study, by Brown and Keitzel\(^3\), found that morale scores for three levels of supervision were "positively related to the echelon level of the supervisors". Another study by Rosen\(^4\) deals with satisfaction with conditions of work for three levels of management within a single plant.

---


\(^2\) S.J. Benge, How to know what workers think of job and boss, Factory Management and Maintenance, 1944.


\(^4\) H. Rosen, Desirable attributes of work: Four levels of management describe their job environments, Journal of Applied Psychology, 1961, 45, 156-160 (9).
He found that the top managers in the plant and the middle managers did not differ significantly from each other in satisfaction, but both groups of managers were significantly more satisfied than the first-line supervisors. Rosen also noted, however, that there was a similarity of profiles of satisfaction among the three levels of management, such that there were high rank order correlations between each pair of levels in terms of the degree of satisfaction with the 24 items.

The third study in the same vein is that of Porter. It sheds some light on the basis of the relationship between level within the managerial hierarchy and job satisfaction. He obtained ratings from nearly 2000 executives concerning the amount of different outcomes, e.g., Security, Autonomy, Esteem, Social and Self-Actualization, which were now connected with their positions and the amount that they thought should be connected with their positions. The degree of perceived deficiency in fulfilment of an executive's need for a particular type of outcome was measured by subtracting his rating of the amount of the outcome now connected with his position from his rating of the amount which should be connected with his position. Respondents were classified

---

into five managerial levels: Presidents, Vice-Presidents, Upper Middle Managers (e.g. Division Managers and Plant Managers), Lower-Middle Managers (e.g. Department Managers), and Lower Managers (First and Second Level Supervisors). Holding age constant, Porter observed a tendency for the amount of difference between ratings—i.e. perceived deficiency in need fulfilment—to increase at each successive lower level of the management hierarchy. However, the strength of this relationship varied markedly from one category to another, being highly significant for Esteem, Autonomy and Self-Actualization but not significant for Social and Security need categories. These results imply that the greater satisfaction of higher level executives is due, at least in part, to greater opportunities to satisfy Esteem, Autonomy and Self-Actualization needs.

The fourth study on the subject was conducted by Opinion Research Corporation\(^1\) wherein attitude data were obtained from 1200 executives showing that the percentage of unfulfilled needs decreased from lower to middle to top management.

Finally, Haire, Chiselli, and Porter\(^2\) found, in a

---


cross-cultural investigation of managerial attitude in 14 countries, that the higher levels of management in the whole reported greater degrees of need satisfaction in their jobs than did the lower level executives. It thus appeared that the phenomenon of increased job satisfaction with increasing level of management was not confined to the situation existing in American companies only but tended to be a worldwide fact of industrial organisations.

In brief, it can be stated with some degree of assurance that the available literature on job satisfaction across different levels of organisations gives evidence of increasing job satisfaction at each higher level. This is true of non-management versus management comparisons, of comparisons of occupational levels in society, and of comparison within the management parts of hierarchies. Again, patterns of satisfaction are roughly similar across different organisational levels, at least within management. This is the finding which this study challenges, in the textile context in India, and it will be examined with the help of empirical data collected from the textile mills in Ahmedabad.

**Perceived Mean Deficiency In Need-Fulfilment At Different Levels In Managerial Hierarchy**

The Porter study had concluded that "...the vertical location of management positions is an important factor in
Determining the extent to which managers feel that they can satisfy particular psychological needs, especially the three higher order needs (self-actualization, autonomy and esteem) of a Maslow-type system of need hierarchies. Our study (See Tables 4.1 and 4.2) partially confirms this assertion in the sense that, taking all needs together, need-fulfillment deficiency goes on decreasing as you go higher up in the managerial hierarchy; and, considering specific needs, this pattern is true of only Self-Actualization and Esteem needs. It appears that there does exist a differential opportunity within management to satisfy Self-Actualization and Esteem needs and also all needs taken together.

**TABLE 4.1**
Perceived Mean Deficiency in Need-Fulfillment By Rank Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need for</th>
<th>Mean Deficiency Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Actualization</td>
<td>9.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>10.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esteem</td>
<td>9.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>10.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gross Deficiency:** 48.66 39.39 32.80
Thus, top level managers may find it necessary to be as concerned with the satisfactions of their lower-level managers as they are with the satisfaction of their blue-collar workers who usually have a union to represent their interests. To the extent top management ignores this aspect, the supervisors' union will gain strength.

Regarding Autonomy and Security, very interesting results have been obtained. For example, in the case of Autonomy, it was found that deficiency in this need-fulfilment is least with the middle management level as compared with the junior and the senior levels. Deficiency is highest in the junior level (10.25), followed by the senior levels (7.3) and is least with the middle level (5.05). This is a curious phenomenon but it can be rationally explained by our field.
observation data that, in the Indian textile mills, we find that senior executives i.e. departmental managers are often busy in settling their score with the owner managing directors/agents to come up with the ever increasing idiosyncratic demands of the latter, a product of professional status based on property rights rather than technical/managerial competence. While departmental managers are busy meeting the demands of top executives, they have hardly any time, energy or inclination left to devote to detailed supervision over the department. They have to leave the details with the middle level managers. This explains why the middle managers feel least deficiency in autonomy need-fulfilment. This reasoning gets confirmed again when we look at the deficiency in need-fulfilment as far as security is concerned. We find that the most insecure is the middle manager, followed by the junior level and senior level managers respectively. Common sense reasoning can explain that more autonomous the middle manager, more insecure he is.

Taking up the fulfilment of the Social need again we find that deficiency is highest with the middle manager followed by the junior and the senior levels. This is a typical phenomenon of the middle managers being master and victim of double talk. The juniors expect least in this area and hence feel less deficiency while the seniors have got the
authority which helps them in satisfying the social need. It is the middle manager who expects it but lacks the resources to satisfy this need.

If we look at the need-fulfilment deficiencies by rank class, we find that unlike in the United States, executive deficiency is highest so far as the security need is concerned—it takes first place for middle and senior levels and second place with the junior level. Autonomy need-fulfilment deficiency is felt more by junior and senior levels. So far as the degree of deficiency is concerned, self-actualization finds the third place. It is in the fulfilment of social need that we find that deficiency is least for all levels of management and this is logically explained as this is one of the least important needs.

The security, self-actualization and autonomy areas seem to be the most critical areas of need-fulfilment deficiencies at all levels of management. All the three areas have always been mentioned as those that are relatively unsatisfied at the non-management worker level, but the implied assumption has also been that these are probably well satisfied throughout management. The results of this study cast serious doubts on this assumption.

Taking all the evidence together, it would seem reasonable to conclude that fairly large number of managers even at high
levels of organisations are not satisfied with their opportunities to obtain the amount of security they think should be available to them from their jobs. The same conclusion would hold true for the autonomy and self-actualization need areas, although to a slightly reduced extent.

* * *

Importance of Various Needs and Organisation Levels

There are two types of studies which enquire into the importance of various needs within the framework of organisational level.

Two studies have made direct comparisons between non-management and management levels with regard to the importance of different motivation factors. Kahn\(^1\) concludes that workers as well as supervisors attach equally high importance to security need but, so far as importance of high wages is concerned, the former attached more importance to it than the latter. The Fortune\(^2\) study arrived at conflicting conclusions viz-a-viz Kahn by reporting that, when security is pitched against high wages in forced-choice manner, high level


executives chose the high wage situation. This only goes to show that extensive research is needed in a wide variety of settings to give generalizations regarding the true nature of various needs at management as well as non-management levels regarding their importance.

Several studies have made comparisons of the importance attached to different needs and conditions of work among different levels within management. Rosen and Weaver\(^1\) study covered the degree of importance attached to various conditions of work which were serially numbered at 24 at three levels of management within a single plant. They concluded that different management levels tend to be similar with regard to what they consider most important. However, in terms of overall importance, the first-line supervisors attached generally more importance to most of the items. Porter\(^2\), however, contradicts this conclusion by pin-pointing the fact that higher level managers tend to attach somewhat more rather than less—importance to various needs, thereby refuting the generalizations of his own (1961) and Rosen and Weaver's (1960) studies. The difference in these findings may be due to the fact that, in the later Porter study, formal

---


education of the managers at all levels was at similar level and they were having higher educational standard. It is conceivable that employees with lower standard of education may be more prone to consider everything as important, whereas those with greater formal schooling may be somewhat more discriminating in attaching importance to different needs and conditions. Therefore, it may be necessary to take into account the difference in formal education when comparing different management levels with regard to the importance attached to different psychological needs or conditions of work.

Finally, the cross-cultural study by Naire, Ghiselli, and Porter showed that, for almost all of the countries in their sample, there was again a strong similarity between upper-level and lower-level managers in the relative importance attached to different needs.

*Importance Of Various Needs At Different Levels In Managerial Hierarchy*

The results of this study are presented in Tables 4.3 and 4.4.

The Porter study had shown that higher the level of management, greater was the importance attached to some of the need items, especially those in the Autonomy and Self-
### TABLE 4.3

**Importance of Various Needs at Different Levels in Managerial Hierarchy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs</th>
<th>Importance Score for</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>Deptties</td>
<td>Dept Heads/Managers</td>
<td>Entire Executive Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Actualization</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esteem</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 4.4

**Rank Order of Various Needs As Per Different Levels Most Important to Least Important**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. Level</th>
<th>Middle Level</th>
<th>Sr. Level</th>
<th>Executives Class-Entire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Act</td>
<td>Sec</td>
<td>Self-Act</td>
<td>Self-Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec</td>
<td>Self-Act</td>
<td>Sec</td>
<td>Sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto</td>
<td>Esteem</td>
<td>Auto</td>
<td>Auto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esteem</td>
<td>Auto</td>
<td>Esteem</td>
<td>Esteem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Social</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Actualization categories. Our results, however, do not confirm these findings. Taken executive class as a whole, Self-Actualization is most important, but the second place is occupied by Security and Autonomy; and, it is true even if we look at the data levelwise. For the junior and the senior levels, Self-Actualization does rank first in importance and the second position is occupied by Security. In the case of the middle level executives, Security comes first and Self-Actualization occupies the second place. This can be interpreted thus: in spite of heavy importance of Security in our cultural-economic environment, Self-Actualization is indeed an important factor for our executives and, to that extent, categorywise importance attached to Self-Actualization is almost similar to that in the case of the United States executives. Regarding Autonomy we can say that it occupies fourth place for the middle and the senior levels but third for the junior level. This is in contrast to the United States executives experience. Is it that, with vast unemployment as a permanent feature of our economy, the Autonomy drive is pushed aside by the Security need? Or, is that our culture does not put much premium on Autonomy as a worthwhile need? With the results of this study as exhibited in Tables 4.3 and 4.4, we are inclined to accept the latter explanation as more rational. In case the all-pervading Security need is pushing aside the Autonomy need, at least
Autonomy should occupy the third place in order of importance. Our data show that Autonomy is having the fourth rank with middle and senior executives and the third one with the junior levels. It is in this context that we conclude that our culture does not put much premium on Autonomy need; rather, Esteem occupies the third place. This is quite in tune with our social system still based on feudal norms. Again, this assertion regarding the feudal system is confirmed by the fact that at least the new generation (junior levels) is placing Autonomy on third rank of importance.

Is it that our cultural norms are in flux? Well this is an open question. Any way, on one point the executives at all levels agree—unlike the United States executives—that Social needs are least important. It seems that such delicacies as social needs have not got much meaning in the cultural-economic ethos characterized by hunger, privation and subsistence level of living. Is it then that the Indian executive is less social basically as he is a product of a repressed society? Or, is it that, once the economic progress takes place, this need will become more resurgent? Well, further research needs to be done to answer these questions.

Finally, one conspicuous fact is the number-one importance given by the middle executive to the Security need. This is a very important question which has been answered when we discussed the perceived deficiency in need-fulfilment at various executive levels.
We can conclude from these data and analyses that Porter's results showing that Self-Actualization and Autonomy needs are more important as you move upward in organizational hierarchy—and even most important when you look at the executive class as a whole—are only true of the American—or Western—culture at the most.

What do our analyses lead to, in operational terms, for the Indian Management? Porter says: "...self-actualization and autonomy needs are seen by all management levels as the most critical psychological need areas for organizations to consider in their relations with their managers and executives...".

In Indian situation it will mean that management has to contend with the self-actualization needs side by side the security needs.

* * *

**Influence In Decision-making And Job Satisfaction**

One of the basic assumptions of those associated with the human relations movement is that persons obtain satisfaction from influencing decisions and controlling their work environment. Terms such as group decision, democratic leadership and participative supervision—all of which have an important place in the literature on human relations—refer to supervisory styles which permit subordinates a
substantial degree of influence on decisions which affect them.

There is considerable evidence that the satisfaction of subordinates is positively associated with the degree to which they are permitted an opportunity to participate in making decisions. Baumgartel¹ studied the effects of patterns of leadership on the attitudes of scientists in eighteen research laboratories. On the basis of questionnaire responses by subordinates, six of the laboratory directors were characterized as providing laissez-faire leadership, seven as providing participative leadership and five as providing directive leadership. This threefold typology of leadership patterns is similar to the conception used in the classic field experiment on mask-making in children by Lewin, Lippit, and White². The scientists working under participative leadership were found to have significantly more positive attitudes towards their director than those under directive leadership. Those who were working under laissez-faire directors were generally intermediate in attitudes to those exposed to the other two leadership styles, although there are attitude items in which they demonstrated more positive responses than either of the other two groups.


In an investigation in an automobile manufacturing plant, Jacobson\(^1\) related the attitudes of workers towards their foremen and towards their shop stewards to their reports of the extent to which they were involved in decision-making by occupants of each of these roles. As predicted, there was a positive relationship between the amount of participation in decision-making and attitudes towards both foremen and shop stewards. In another study, Vichert\(^2\) compared the questionnaire responses of telephone operators and service representatives who were still in the employ of the company with those who had left. The major differences were in response to questions about the degree to which they could influence conditions on their jobs. Persons remaining on the job more frequently reported that they had a chance to make decisions on their job and that they were making an important contribution to the success of the company.

To Vichert study is weakened by the fact that the completion of the questionnaire by those who left the company followed their resignation. Perhaps the act of resigning results in changes in the way in which persons describe their work roles. This weakness was overcome in an investi-


igation by Ross and Zander. Questionnaire results were obtained on 2630 female workers in a large company, 169 of whom resigned during the fourth-month period following the administration of the questionnaire. Each employee who had resigned was matched with two employees still with the company, on the basis of a number of demographic variables. The largest differences between the resigned workers and the matched continuing workers occurred in their responses to questions about the amount of Autonomy and the amount of recognition they received. The resigned workers reported less frequently that they were on their own when they worked and that they were fully informed about the quality of their work.

All of the above studies suffer from the limitation imposed by the use of subordinates' reports to measure the amount of their influence. Consequently, it is possible that the findings reflect a tendency on the part of the subordinates to ascribe what they conceive to be favourable practices to supervisors towards whom they have positive attitudes and unfavourable practices to those towards whom they have negative attitudes. This "halo effect" constitute an alternative interpretation of any correlational study in which reports of the supervisors' behaviour are obtained from the subordinates.

This difficulty is overcome in a study of white collar workers by Horse. She used the supervisors' reports of their respective subordinate's behavior as the basis for distinguishing between those giving close and those giving general supervision. A comparison of the attitudes of the workers under these two types of supervisors showed a few clear-cut differences. Employees receiving general supervision described their supervisors as more effective in handling people and more frequently showed a strong degree of identification with their division, but they manifested less positive attitudes towards overall company policies than did the employees who received close supervision.

In addition to these correlational studies, there are three field experiments which deal with the effects of participation on job satisfaction. The first of these was carried out by Horse and Reimer in four parallel divisions of the clerical operations of a large insurance company. Two programs of change were employed. One—the autonomy program—was introduced in two of the divisions and was designed to increase the role of rank and file employees in decision-making. The second—the hierarchically controlled program—was introduced in the other two divisions and was designed

1 Nancy C. Horse: Satisfactions in the white collar job (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research, Survey Research Center, 1953).

to increase the role of upper management in decision-making. The introduction of the changes required approximately 6 months, and the entire experiment was carried on for about a year. Job satisfaction was measured just before and just after the experimental year. As predicted, there was an increase in satisfaction under the autonomy program and a decrease in it in the hierarchically controlled program. However, both programs significantly increased productivity, with the hierarchically controlled program resulting in greater increases.

The second field experiment was carried out by French, Israel, and Håg in a Norwegian factory. Nine 4-man groups were given new products to produce. In four control groups the change was introduced in the usual manner. The other five experimental groups were allowed to participate more in the decisions involved in the change. They met with their foremen and representatives of the planning department to decide which of the five new products would be assigned to each group. Also, two of the experimental groups held additional meetings in which they helped to decide about the division of labour into four jobs, the assignment of those jobs to group members and the training for these new jobs. The experimental groups were found to display a higher level of satisfaction than the control group on 10

---

out of 14 satisfaction items but only three of these differences were significant.

The third experiment was carried out by Kay, French, and Meyer in a plant manufacturing aircraft engines. The amount of participation on the part of individual salaried employees was varied within goal-planning sessions with their supervisors, which followed a performance appraisal interview. Half of the subjects in the study were given an opportunity to participate to a major degree in the setting of their goals for the future.

At the end of the performance appraisal interview, they were instructed by their superior to prepare a set of goals for review at the goal-planning session. During the session, the high participation subjects presented their list of goals to the manager who was instructed to be sure that his subordinates had more influence than he did on their final formulation. The other half of the subjects were given much less opportunity to participate in the goal-setting process. The list of goals for each was written by their supervisor who presented them during the planning session and allowed them to react and make suggestions. Interviews conducted with both the high and the low participation subjects after the goal-planning sessions revealed few

---

differences in attitudes. The only significant difference was in the subordinate's reported acceptance of the job goal which was higher under the high than under the low participation condition.

To sum up the findings described so far, there is a fairly clear-cut evidence that people who are satisfied with their jobs tend to report that they have greater opportunity to influence decisions which have effects on them. For the reasons we have indicated, this evidence cannot be regarded as proof of the statement that greater influence increases job satisfaction and that less influence decreases job satisfaction. Field experiments in which changes made in the amount of influence and its effects on satisfaction were measured produced mixed results. Morse and Selzer's experiment provides rather strong evidence that amount of influence does affect job satisfaction, while experiments by French, Israe1, and As and Mayer, French and Mayer have obtained results which are pointers in the same direction but are less conclusive.

Intuitively it would seem that the amount of satisfaction obtained from a given amount of influence might vary considerably with the nature of the decision, the desires of the person and the nature of the social situation in which the influence is exercised. The taking of such variables into account may help explain discrepancies in
findings. The importance of individual differences has been documented in a number of recent studies. In the Morse and Reiner experiment previously described, Tannenbaum and Allport investigated the role of personality variables in determining adjustment to the two experimental programs—one permitting workers greater opportunity for decision-making and the other restricting existing activities. Using pencil and paper tests, they obtained scores which they assumed to represent the strength of various personality trends. They then classified individuals on the basis of the estimated suitability of their personalities to each of the experimental programs. It was found that persons “suited” to the program in which they were placed wanted their respective programs to last longer and were more satisfied than persons who were less suited to the program in which they were placed.

Vroom also obtained evidence suggesting that the effects of participation in decision-making on satisfaction depend on the personality of the participant. In a field-


study of supervisors in a package delivery organisation, he found that the relationship between psychological participation and both job satisfaction and job performance varied with the strength of the need for independence and the degree of authoritarianism of the participant. The amount of participation was most positively related to the satisfaction and performance of persons high in need for independence and low in authoritarianism and least positively related to the satisfaction and performance of those low in need for independence and high in authoritarianism. There was no evidence of any unfavourable effects of participation either on satisfaction or on performance. Vroom's finding is consistent with the results obtained by two other investigators. Sanford found that authoritarian personalities are more likely to state a preference for high status and strongly directive leadership, and Trow found that subjects with a strong need for autonomy (as measured by a questionnaire) expressed significantly lower satisfaction with roles in which they were made highly dependent on others than did subjects with a weaker need for autonomy.


Decision-making Authority, Structural Position And Need-Fulfilment Deficiency At Executive Levels

The results of the data—collected by us during this study-investigation and—processed on the subject are presented in Table 4.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making and implementation authority</th>
<th>Mean Deficiency Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>44.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>42.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>40.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be observed that need-fulfilment deficiency within each managerial level is highest with the executives having low decision-making and implementation authority. Similar results persist with unaltering accuracy with the medium and high decision-making and implementation authority. Thus we can supplement Porter's findings that job level in the managerial hierarchy is systematically related to the need-fulfilment of the Executives at each level. Higher the level, lesser the

---

deficiency in need-fulfilment and vice versa. Level being a
gross variable as suggested by Vroom\(^1\), within the level one
factor working to produce the said results is definitely the
decision-making and implementation authority. As we go up
in the organisational hierarchy, we find more authority to
make and implement decisions; no wonder, need-fulfilment
deficiency is least; and vice versa.

In operational terms, the results point out the need
for delegation and decentralisation for achieving high
morale among the executives by reducing the need-fulfilment
deficiencies. We have already observed elsewhere in this
thesis that in the textile industry there is very low dele-
gation and decentralisation and, consequently, very low
decision-making and implementation authority with the pro-
fessional managers and that this is probably one of the
fundamental reasons for the tremendous waste in the use of
its managerial resources. The data presented here success-
fully test the hypothesis: "Higher the decision-making and
implementation authority, lesser will be the deficiency in
need-fulfilment at each executive level." This conclusion
that Morale and Job Satisfaction at executive levels are
positively related to the decision-making and implementation
authority assigned to the respective executives holds true
both intra- and inter-levelwise in the managerial hierarchy.

\(^1\) Victor H. Vroom, *Work and Motivation*, (New York:
This fact gives rise to a serious question. Are the owner-top-managers, who hold their positions not by virtue of technical/managerial competence but by proprietary rights, capable of delegation and decentralisation which will ensure more decision-making and implementation authority at the professional managers levels? Our field observations create a predicament.

* * *

Aspiration Level, Structural Position and Mean Deficiency
In Need-Fulfilment At Executive Levels

A high level of motivation to attain a goal tends to be associated with anxiety or some other strong emotional state which, in turn, impairs performance. The idea that high levels of motivation tend to be accompanied by anxiety is not intuitively unreasonable. Anxiety has been defined by Mowrer as a learned anticipatory response to cues that have in the past been followed by injury or pain. It may be argued that the anticipation of failure in a situation in which failure has high negative valence can be the source of considerable anxiety. It is also agreed—and, experimental studies have proved it—that anxiety impairs performance. Higher aspiration level executives comparatively suffer from more anxiety and this gives their personality a deficient outlook. The expression of deficiencies in need-fulfilment through their jobs becomes a technique of release from their tensions.
The data presented in Tables 4.6 and 4.7 are reflective of certain significant results which will be discussed at some length.

**Table 4.6**

Aspiration Level, Structural Position And Mean Deficiency In Need-Fulfilment At Executive Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position in the hierarchical structure of the organisation</th>
<th>Mean Deficiency in need-fulfilment in &quot;High Aspiration Level Group&quot;</th>
<th>Mean Deficiency in need-fulfilment in &quot;Low Aspiration Level Group&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>32.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>41.50</td>
<td>36.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>43.40</td>
<td>40.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire Executive Class</td>
<td>39.30</td>
<td>36.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.7**

Aspiration Level And Position In The Organisation Hierarchy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational Level</th>
<th>Aspiration Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>73% (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>29% (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>11% (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.7 exhibits a striking pointer, viz., the higher the level an executive reaches in an organisational hierarchy, the more ambitious he becomes; the trend is systematic and persists with unfaltering accuracy at each level. At junior levels, only 27% executives fell in the category of high aspiration level group, at middle levels, the percentage is 70 and at senior levels, it is 89. The conclusion is clear that the aspiration level gets triggered as one goes up the hierarchical level.

The data presented in Table 4.6 show that, taking the executive class as a whole, the executives falling in the high aspiration level group suffer from more deficiency in need-fulfilment as compared with those coming from the low aspiration level group. The same conclusion holds true if we take the executives, hierarchywise.

A closer examination of the data exhibits that, as one goes up from the junior to the middle level, deficiency in need-fulfilment decreases marginally in the high aspiration level group but substantially in the low aspiration level group. And need-fulfilment deficiency difference becomes quite narrow when the executives of both categories reach the senior level. It means that the anxiety/deficiency level among the high aspiration level group does not decrease by initial movement up the organisational ladder, whereas this does happen with the low aspiration level group.
It appears that the high aspiration level group does suffer from more deficiency in the beginning of their careers as compared with the lower aspiration level group. It looks as if the executives of the former category suffer from excessive motivation along with higher failure valence, which results in more anxiety and feeling of more deficiency in need-fulfilment, whereas the executives belonging to the lower level of aspiration are having either less motivation or lower failure valence or both in the beginning and thereby suffer from less anxiety and a feeling of less deficiency in need-fulfilment comparatively but they stay at that level of deficiency almost even when they move to the next higher level unlike the other group with high aspiration level which actually slumps in need-fulfilment deficiencies.

* * *

Inter-generational Social Mobility And Its Impact On Patterns Of Need-Fulfilment Deficiencies At Executive Levels

The Social Status of parents and the education of their children is closely related both to the nature of the latter's first jobs and to the pattern of their later careers. Davidson and Anderson\(^1\) concluded from their researches that "early jobs..."

(are) prophetic of the subsequent careers of respondents. The more socially oppressed a group is, the more restricted in advance is the range of occupational choice of its children...The effect of the material limitations acts in part so as to narrow the perspective of those faced with the occupational choice. The socially under-privileged adolescent has seen less, read less, heard about less, has experienced less variety in his environment in general and is simply aware of fewer opportunities than the socially privileged young person."

Thus¹, the cumulative of disadvantages (or, of advantages) effects the individual's entry into the labour market as well as his later opportunities for social mobility.

Lipset and Bendix² conclude their research study on inter-generational mobility with these words: "If an individual comes from a working-class family, he will typically receive little education or vocational advice, while he attends school his job plans for the future will be vague and when he leaves school he is likely to take the first available job which he can find. Thus, the poverty, lack of education, absence of personal "contacts", lack of

---


²Jaynes Martin Lipset and Reinhard Bendix, Social Mobility in Industrial Society, pp. 197-198.
planning and failure to explore fully the available job opportunities that characterize the working-class family are handed down from generation to generation. The same cumulation of factors, which in the working class creates a series of mounting disadvantages, works to the advantage of a child coming from a well-to-do family."

Our analysis (vide Table 4.9) shows that, taking executives class as a whole, need-fulfilment deficiency is

**TABLE 4.9**

**Upward Mobility, Structural Position And Mean Deficiency In Need-Fulfilment At Executive Levels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position in the hierarchical structure of the organisation</th>
<th>Mean Deficiency in need-fulfilment in &quot;High Upward Mobility Group&quot;</th>
<th>Mean Deficiency in need-fulfilment in &quot;Low Upward Mobility Group&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire Executive Class</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

less in High Mobility Group and more in Low Mobility Group. But, when we subject the data to levelwise analyses, we find that while the said relationship persists at junior and middle levels, it gets reversed at the senior level. It has got very serious implications. It seems that, in High Mobility
Group, once an executive moves from junior to middle level his need-fulfilment deficiency falls drastically but this does not happen at all in Low Mobility Group. However, this position gets suddenly reversed when we reach the senior level. It seems quite rational to assume that High Mobility Group executives, when they reach the senior level, start feeling diffident. This is most probably due to increased insecurity whereby their need-fulfilment deficiency suddenly goes up. The converse happens in case of executives coming from Low Mobility Group. They feel diffident as far as they stay at junior and middle levels and at these levels their need-fulfilment deficiency is highest; but, once they reach the senior levels, they feel confident, relaxed and experience a feeling of fulfilment unlike the High Mobility Group executives.

These conclusions have serious repercussions in terms of business policy. It means that personnel policies should push up the High Mobility Group up to middle levels and no more whereas, for senior positions, they must look for executives who came from higher strata of society. These observations may look unsocialistic in the current climate of the country but they are the result of this objective empirical study.

An analysis of Table 4.9 gives us, again, some striking results. It shows that Low Mobility Group executives coming
Free better strata of society move up more easily than the High Mobility Group executives. At junior level, low group is 27% of executive population, whereas at senior level, it forms 36% of executive population. This confirms the results of the studies of Davidson and Anderson, and Lipset and Bendix presented herein, earlier.

TABLE 4.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational Hierarchy</th>
<th>Upward Mobility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(24)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Technology and management

Many researches in recent times by scholars like Thompson & Batos\(^1\), Mann and Hoffman\(^2\) and Hoos\(^3\) and


\(^3\)I.R. Hoos, Automation in the Office (Washington, 1961).
Janowitz\(^1\) have shown the importance of given technology and its influence on the organisational structure(s) and, consequently, on the behaviour and attitudes of the managerial and non-managerial members of organisations. By technology is meant the mechanism or process by which an organisation turns out its product or service. Organisational structure refers to properties essentially internal to an organisation such as levels of authority, as contrasted to essentially external or "setting" factors such as an organisation's location or environment.

Of the writers concerned with Technology and Management, Joan Woodward explored the relationships between technology and variations in organisation structure. She analyzed 100 manufacturing firms\(^2\) in the South-East Essex area of England. She grouped those firms along a scale of "technical complexity" — the term having been defined as "the extent to which the production process is controllable and its results predictable". She concentrates on three basic modes of production: (1) Unit or small batch production. (2) Large batch or mass

---


production. (3) Continuous flow or process production. In terms of Woodward's scale, process production is the technically most complex, mass production is less complex than process, and unit production is the least complex of all.

Woodward investigated some organisational characteristics from the perspective of different technological modes. Her findings were as follows:

(1) There is no significant relationship between technological mode and organisational size.

(2) The number of levels of authority in an organisation increased with increasing technical complexity.

(3) The ratio of managers and supervisors to total personnel increased with technical complexity.

It should be noted that the last two relationships hold with size controlled.

Woodward also sought to incorporate Burns' distinction of "organic" and "mechanistic" management systems in her research. In Burns' general terminology, the "organic" system is considered to be characterized by such features as less formal definition of jobs, greater emphasis on

---

adaptability and communications along with the hierarchy tending more to take the form of consultations rather than commands; the "mechanistic" system is the polar opposite and is characterized by a rigid breakdown of jobs into functional specializations and precisely defined duties. The latter system is also characterized by a well-developed command hierarchy along which communication that takes the form of orders rather than consultations. In connection with this distinction of the two modes of organization, Woodward found that the firms at both ends of the scale of technical complexity were more likely to be characterized by organic systems than those in the middle range of the scale. In a nutshell, she looks at the unit, mass and process modes of production as being arranged on an ascending scale of technical complexity.

In the logical reasoning of knowledgeable persons this sequence may be viewed as a move towards technical simplicity rather than complexity if it is thought that the need for innovation is more a characteristic of unit rather than process production. In his recent researches, Edward Harvey¹, chooses to use the typology of technical diffusion and technical specificity standing on two extremes of technological complexity and technological simplicity.

He defines technical diffuseness and technical specificity thus: ...technical diffuseness implies a firm in which a number of technical processes yield a wide range of products. Furthermore, the actual products included in this range are more likely to vary from time to time as a result of model changes and changes in technological production processes. The more technically diffuse a firm, then, the greater the degree of "made to orderness" in its products. In this sense, the technically diffuse production mode would correspond most closely to Woodward's distinction of "unit production". The electronics industry with its characteristically high rates of innovation and technical change is a good example of "unit production". Some firms, however, such as oil refineries, are characterized by much less product variation and change. The move in this direction is termed as technical specificity. It closely parallels Woodward's "process production".

The distinction between Harvey's typology of diffuseness and specificity and Woodward's typology of unit, mass and process technologies is that the latter takes into account only the form of technology whereas the former considers the amount of change within a given form. It is conceivable, for example, that a unit production firm might produce the same kind of products more or less all the time. Such a firm might well exhibit organisational characteristics
generally associated with technical specificity rather than technical diffuseness. Harvey's modification of Woodward's approach is an attempt to suggest a scheme which would provide for such contingencies.

Harvey collected data on 43 industrial organisations pointing to the existence of relationships between an organisation's technology and aspects of its internal structure, including the number of specialized sub-units, the number of levels of authority, the ratio of managers and supervisors to total personnel and the degree of program specification within the organisation. A primary finding was that the less changeful an organisation's technology, the more likely the foregoing aspects of structure are to increase. The findings hold with size and a number of other organisational variables controlled. The importance of considering technology in the comparative analysis of formal organisations is emphasized. It was also suggested that the technology variable, in connection with other aspects of organisational structure, serves to establish a rudimentary typology of socio-technical organisation and that the use of the typology does provide a useful analytic tool for the investigation of a number of organisational processes, including those of decision-taking and patterns of intra-organisational conflict.

We will consider only one finding of Harvey, viz., more technical specificity in any organisation will lead to more
number of levels of authority and vice versa...more diffuse
the technology lesser the number of levels of authority and
vice versa.

Another study by James C. Worthy is worth relating.
at this stage, to the findings of Harvey. He states: "...the results of our research suggest that over-complexity of
organisational structure is one of the most important and
fundamental causes of poor management-employee relationship
in our modern economic system...in viewing many business
enterprises, one cannot but be impressed by the number of
different departments and sub-departments into which they
are divided...in a very large number of cases, employees
perform only elementary, routine functions because jobs
have been broken down "scientifically" into their most
elementary components...the evidence of the studies conduc-
ted in our own company strongly supports this conclusion,
for we have found that where jobs are broken down too
finely we are more likely to have both low output and low
morale...in organisations characterized by many levels of
supervision and elaborate systems of controls, the indivi-
dual not only has little opportunity to develop the
capacities of self-reliance or initiative but the system
frequently weeds out those who do."

---

1James C. Worthy, Organizational Structure and Employee
Morale, American Sociological Review, Vol. 15, No. 2, pp. 169-
179, April 1950.
Survey concluded that "technical specificity leads to increased number of specialized sub-units and increased number of levels of authority". Worthy concluded that "complex organisational structure and more levels in hierarchy lead to low morale, lack of creative initiative and organisational adaptability". Ultimately this leads us to the point where we can say that technical specificity in an organisation leads to low morale, lack of creative initiative and organisation adaptability. Conversely, technical diffuseness could mean high morale, creative initiative and dynamic/adaptable organisation. From this we hypothesize that organisations characterized by technical diffuseness should offer more need-fulfilment to its members and, conversely, the members of organisations characterized by technical specificity should be more deficient in need-fulfilment.

The rationale behind the classification of technology in textile industry has already been explained in the Chapter on methodology wherein we place mechanical processing as characterized by specificity and wet processing by diffuseness. The analysis in Table 4.10 shows that the impact of technology in need-fulfilment is clear-cut and the pattern of deficiency successfully tests the above-lined thesis.
Technology And Deficiency In Need-Fulfilment At Executive Levels In Textile Industry

**TABLE 4.10**

Perceived Mean Deficiency In Need-Fulfilment
By The Type Of Technology Employed By Two Groups Of Executives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Mean Deficiency Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing</td>
<td>43.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Processing</td>
<td>33.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The conclusion is that deficiency in need-fulfilment gets reduced as one moves up in the organisational hierarchy but at the same time need-fulfilment deficiency can also get reduced if one moves away from (1) technological specificity, (2) technological simplicity, and (3) non-change/non-innovative type of technology, and starts moving in the direction of (1) technological diffuseness, (2) technological complexity, and (3) innovative and changing type of technology.

* * *

Alienation

The concept of alienation had been used earlier by Calvin (with religious connotations) and Feuerbach (to express the
strivings of the Romantic movement—the recovery of spontaneous emotional life) and later by Karl Marx, in his early writings, in the modern sense.

Marx's Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts\(^1\) depicted alienation as the essence of the capitalist order: "Private property is therefore the product, the necessary result of alienated labour, of the external relation of the worker to nature and to himself." An alienated man experienced himself not as an agent but as a patient, not as a creator but as a creature, not as self-determined but as other-determined. The products of man’s labour were transformed "into an objective power above us, growing out of our control, thwarting our expectations, bringing to naught our calculations..." Because he has alienated from the product of his labour, man also became alienated from other man\(^2\). This estrangement from the human essence leads, in Fromm's words, to an "Existential egotism", or, as Marx stated it, man becomes alienated from "his own body, external nature, his mental life, and his human life". To sum up, by alienation is meant a mode of experience in which the person experiences himself as an alien. He has become, so to speak, estranged from himself\(^3\).


\(^2\)Erich Fromm, Marx's Concept of Man, pp. 52-53.

In his early days Marx developed the concept of alienation in its ethical setting to depict the functioning of society but it appears from his later writings that he abandoned it in favour of his new concept "Exploitation". This switch-over seems to be a tactical move for Marx wanted to use his concepts not for philosophizing but rather to achieve practical ends. To him alienation appeared to be (though true) a philosophical/ethical flavour giving concept which might not be able to move millions on the militant path but might, instead, introduce metaphysical confusion in peoples' minds. This view has been expressed by Tucker\(^1\) --"Young Marx\(^2\), like his fellow Hegelians, regarded man's history as one of alienation." In this context it would not be correct to "regard alienation as characteristically a phenomenon of modern society"\(^3\).

There have been a variety of usages of "alienation" in contemporary social analysis. As a concept it is deemed to be multifarious and various modes of alienation like alienation of (1) class society, (2) competitive society, (3) industrial society, (4) mass society, (5) race, and (6) the generations,

---


\(^{2}\)Karl Marx, *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts*.

\(^{3}\)Nathan Glazer once described "alienation as an omnibus of psychological disturbance having a similar root cause—in this case, modern social organisation." *The Alienation of Modern Man* *Commentary* Vol. IV, 1947, p. 320.
can be identified in current literature.

The question arises: if alienation is so multiform, can it be given a precise operational meaning which would be useful in social analysis? Knowledgeable social scientists have tried in recent years to define the dimensions of alienation and to construct scales which would enable one to measure statistically a person's degree of alienation. Melvin Seeman has tried to distinguish between five variants in "alienation"—Powerlessness, Meaninglessness, Normlessness, Isolation and Self-estrangement. The opposite of all these are Power-possession, Meaningfulness, Norm-orientedness, Involvement, and Self-acknowledgement.

Seeman gives an operational definition of "Meaninglessness": it is a mode of alienation which is characterized by a low expectancy that satisfactory predictions about future outcomes of behaviour can be made; the person senses that his ability to predict behavioural outcomes is low.1 According to him, alienated man is a person who finds himself at odds with popular culture and one who attaches a low value "to goals or beliefs that are typically highly valued in the given society". The alienation of Self-estrangement is equated by Seeman with the notion of "other directedness" made famous by David Riesman. The child is conditioned to

---

other-directedness when it learns that whatever he does must not be valued for himself "but only for his effect on others", and this Seeman translates as making one's behaviour dependent upon anticipated future rewards; the person becomes self-ostracized because he enjoys nothing for its own sake. The categories Inner Directedness and Other Directedness are limited in clarifying the modes of alienation. For, what is omitted in the quality of the feeling experienced toward the self, others, family, God, nation or tribe.

In another noteworthy effort to measure alienation, Dwight Dean has devised several scales to measure three components—Powerlessness, Normlessness, and Social Isolation, opposites being Powerfulness, Normfulness and Social Involvement. Regarding the operational definition of "Powerfulness", Dean takes his clue from Weber, Hegel, and Marx—"worker's separation from effective control over his economic destiny; of his helplessness; of his being used for purposes other than his own." The individual experiences powerlessness when he feels himself incapable "to understand or influence the very events upon which his life and happiness is known to depend."

---

3 Cited in Herbert Marcuse, Reason and Revolution, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1941) p. 34.
4 Marcuse, op. cit. p. 273.
The next component "Homelessness" is derived from Durkheim's concept of Anomie. According to Durkheim "sudden economic losses or gains result in situation where previous scales cannot remain unchanged, the "calibration" is turned... topsy turvy...yet no new graduation can be quickly improvised." Three distinct sub-types of Homelessness may be differentiated. The first sub-type, "purposelessness", has been noted by Maciver, who has described Anomie as "the absence of value that might give purpose or direction to life, the loss of intrinsic and socialized values, the insecurity of the hopelessly dis-oriented. The second sub-type of Homelessness may be considered as conflict of Norms when a person internalizes conflicting norms or values like competitiveness/cooperation, active/quietist directives, Christian ethics/success imperative, stimulation for higher living/practical denial to majority, and Freedom/Social-organisational constraints.

The third component, "Social Isolation", may also be traced to Durkheim's conception of Anomie, which included "a feeling of separation from the group or of isolation from group standards, a lack of faith in people."

---


Our conclusion is that "Alienation" lies in every direction of human experiences where basic emotional desire is frustrated, every direction in which the person may be compelled by social situations to do violence to his own nature. Alienation is used to convey the emotional tone which accompanies any behaviour in which the person is compelled to act self-destructively; that is, the most general definition of Alienation and its dimensions will be as varied as human desire and need.

**Alienation and its correlates**

The concept of Alienation, rooted deeply in sociological tradition, has recently enjoyed a new popularity. Theorists have suggested its numerous possible correlates such as Apathy\(^1\), Authoritarianism\(^2\), Conformity\(^3\), Cynicism\(^4\), Hoboism\(^5\), Political Apathy\(^6\), Political Hyperactivity\(^7\), Personalisation in Politics\(^8\).

---


\(^8\)Adorno, op. cit. p. 618.
Prejudice, Privatization, Psychosis, Regression and Suicide. Ours is an attempt to correlate the concept with Job Satisfaction in the industrial organisation i.e. need-fulfilment deficiency on the job and its relationship with alienation as such.

**Alienation And Deficiency In Need-Fulfilment At Executive Levels.**

We have already discussed the deficiency in need-fulfilment at various levels in the organisational hierarchy. Though the needs-sises data did present systematic relationships in some cases, the pattern was found to be different in the Indian setting as compared with the ones in similar studies in the United States.

Similarly, while discussing the meaning of alienation and its constituent components we have found that alienation,

---

more or less, is multiform and consists of feelings of Homelessness, Powerlessness, Social Isolation, Meaninglessness and Self-estrangement, it is true that the importance or relevance of each component will depend upon the view with which we look at alienation. We have found that alienation (see Table 4.11) does tend to decrease at each higher level in the organisational hierarchy. In other words, it means that alienation from society is the product of one's on-the-job experiences and such experiences are not shaped by the structural components of the society as asserted by Durkheim.

**TABLE 4.11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Alienation</th>
<th>By Rank Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational Level</strong></td>
<td><strong>Measure of Alienation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managery/Department Heads</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputies</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Line Supervisors</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, when we looked at each component of the alienation individually—Homelessness, Ideological Intensity and Social Isolation—we found that the pattern of "higher the job in organisational hierarchy, lower the alienation as a
whole" was true of Social Isolation only. Thus, we conclude that Lack of Faith in People or Social Isolation at least is a function of the extent of need-fulfilment at the job. Our data presented in Table 4.12 does lead to these conclusions.

Table 4.12
Perceived Social Isolation
By Rank Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational Level</th>
<th>Measure of Social Isolation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Positive Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ideological Intensity and Homlessness did not show the same pattern at each level as would be seen from Tables 4.13 and 4.14.

Table 4.13
Ideological Intensity
By Rank Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational Level</th>
<th>Mean Positive Responses for Social Integration (Low)</th>
<th>Mean Negative Responses for Social Integration (High)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4.14

Perceived Homelessness

By Rank Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational Level</th>
<th>Measure of Homelessness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Positive Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding Homelessness ( Vide: Table 4.14) we find that it is highest in the middle executives. In Table 4.1 we had found that insecurity is highest in the middle executives. Similarly, we find in Table 4.13 that Ideological Intensity is least in the middle executives and the middle executives also are most autonomous.

From these multi-relationships we can conclude that a feeling of insecurity leads to homelessness and that more autonomy on the job makes one less rigid in his idea systems i.e. ideological intensity.

From the earlier analyses it will be clear that there does exists some relationships between Job Satisfaction (Need-Fulfilment) and Alienation in terms of the levels in the managerial hierarchy. Our analyses of data as presented in Tables 4.15 and 4.16 show that Political Estrangement gets
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational Level</th>
<th>Measure of Estrangement</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive Responses (Mean)</td>
<td>Negative Responses (Mean)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers/ Department Heads</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputies/ Number Twos</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Line Supervisors</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 4.16**

**Measure Of Hostility Against Business**

By Bank Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational Level</th>
<th>Positive Response (Percent)</th>
<th>Negative Response (Percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managers/ Department Heads</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputies/ Number Twos</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>(25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Line Supervisors</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
reduced but Hostility towards Business gets increased at each higher level in the managerial hierarchy. Again, the data underline the fact that Job Satisfaction and Need-fulfilment at the job do play a crucial role in framing a network within which the individual life experience rotates.

These very data also present us empirical evidence to show that social responsibility of business is not something which learned professors discuss in conferences along, but it is a matter which will affect the very survival of private enterprise. Industrial organisation has come to stay. The only debatable points are: Will it thrive under the public sector and state ownership or will it survive under the overlordship of private enterprise. There is empirical evidence in our data to prove that, if free enterprise does not help the people in rectifying the deficiencies in need-fulfilment, their increasing hostility to business will only pave the way for Government-State Ownership of the industrial organisation. The broad facts of the situation are: (1) Deficiency in need-fulfilment decreases at each higher level. (2) Alienation decreases at each higher level. (3) Political Estrangement decreases at each higher level. (4) Hostility to Business increases at each higher level. An analysis of these four facts clearly tells us that increased job-dissatisfaction and alienation will mould and move the public opinion
not against Government but against free enterprise.

Thus, Social Responsibility of Business is not something which is merely academic polemics; rather, it is the very condition for the survival of free enterprise. The base at which business people have to work is to make all-out efforts to decrease the deficiencies in need-fulfilment of the people on the job.

* * *