Job satisfaction is the result of various attitudes possessed by an employee. In a narrow sense, these attitudes are related to the job and are concerned with such factors as wages, supervision, steadiness of employment, conditions of work, advancement, opportunities, recognition of ability, fair evaluation of work, social relations on the job, prompt settlement of grievances, fair treatment by employer and other similar items.

However, a more comprehensive approach requires that many additional factors be included before a complete understanding of job satisfaction can be obtained. Such factors as the employee's age, health, temperament, desires, and level of aspiration should be considered. Further, his family relationship, social status, recreational outlets, activity in organisations - labour, political or purely social contribute ultimately to job satisfaction.

In short, job satisfaction is a general attitude which is the result of many specific attitudes in three areas, namely, specific factors, individual characteristics, and group relationship outside the job. An attitude of an employee can be considered as a readiness to act in one way rather than in connection with specific factors related to a job. Job satisfaction is the result of various attitudes the employee holds towards his job, towards related factors, and towards life in general.
By discovering attitudes on factors related to the job, an organisation can correct certain bad situations and thereby improve job satisfaction of its employees. From this point of view, it would be justified in being concerned only with this area and neglecting the individual 'ego' and its employees' adjustment to groups outside the plant. An organisation can benefit positively if it knows what individual attitudes contribute to job satisfaction.

It is difficult to imagine any discussion on employee's work motivation without mention of Hawthorne studies. The Hawthorne studies are significant because they represent an honest and concerted effort to understand employees, instead of approaching the problem only from the managerial point of view of increasing 'efficiency' on an economic level. Moreover, they are interesting because they are a type of experiment which is rarely performed in any work organisation. These studies do not try to define a response as a result of the introduction of change; they recognise that it is a result of specific change plus employees' attitudes, his social situation on the job, and his previous attitudes as determined by his personal history and background.

There are many reasons why these studies deserve careful study. Although the studies are old when compared with contemporary literature, they are nevertheless as timely now as when they were first conducted. Many of the findings tend to be rediscovered and in many instances the newer data are not so adequate — for example, on the importance of employee attitude and existence of informal employee groups and their control on production.

The significance of the Hawthorne studies can be understood not only in relation to their findings but also because they are an outstanding example of research that was not steered to pre-determined conclusion and because they raised questions that otherwise might not have been asked.
The individual rarely if ever behaves or responds in a situation as a result of single motive. They clearly recognise the complexity of human behaviour and understand that a person often does not throw the true reason for his behaviour. Because of this complex behaviour, an individual is, in many instances, unpredictable.

A major error in an organisation has been the oversimplification of the concept of motivation. Too often since Taylor's time it has been assumed that the primary reason that people work is to make money. This is both absurd and unquestionably false. Man in an organisation is just as complex as man in any other phase of life, and any attempt to reduce his behaviour to a single system of motivation must result in artificiality and narrowness. Man has many motives, and unless we recognise the part played by each one we cannot possibly begin to understand his behaviour.

When the psychologist talks about motivation, he is concerned with studying the individual with respect to ever-changing physiological conditions and a multitude of previous experiences. Because of these two factors, physiological changes and previous experiences, it must be recognised that motivation may stem from within an individual or from factors acting on him from the outside. Furthermore, these two categories are not mutually independent; on the contrary, they interact at all times.

A good many motives act on the individual as a result of the multitude of his experiences; these are in large part determined by the social pressures of the society in which he lives. Although these social motives are sometimes given only vague and indirect expression, they nevertheless must be recognised
as just as important as the so-called simpler motives if we are to be successful in understanding why man behaves the way he does. Gregariousness, self-assertiveness, acquisitiveness, the desire to conform are only a few of the many social motives that act on man.

MASLOW'S THEORY OF HUMAN MOTIVATION

One way of defining motivation is to talk in terms of a particular state of the individual — a state of imbalance of disequilibrium — as defining a motivated person. The person is motivated to correct any such imbalance, that is, he seeks some way of obtaining relief. Thus one might talk of a motivational cycle as a process having three distinct parts:

1. **Need or motive**: a state of physiological or psychological imbalance;
2. **Response of motivated behaviour**: an action directed toward alleviating the imbalance.
3. **Goal**: that which has to be obtained to reduce the imbalance — the object of the motivated behaviour.

Psychologists interested in motivation have spent considerable time discussing different types of needs. Maslow (1943) has proposed an interesting theory concerning human needs and their effect upon human behaviour. He suggests that human needs may be classified into five different groups or classes:

1. **Physiological needs**: These are the basic needs of the organism such as food, water, oxygen, and sleep. They also include the somewhat less basic needs such as sex or activity.
(2) Safety needs: Here, Maslow is talking about the need of a person for a generally ordered existence in a stable environment which is relatively free of threats to the safety of the person's existence.

(3) Love needs: These are the need for affectionate relations with other individuals and the need for one to have a recognised place as a group member — the need to be accepted by one's peers.

(4) Esteem needs: The need for a stable, firmly based self-evaluation. The need for self-respect, self-esteem, and for the esteem of others.

(5) Self-actualisation needs: The need for self-fulfilment. The need to achieve one's full capacity for doing.

The important thing about Maslow's Theory, however, is not so much his classification system as it is in the fact that he considers these five need classes to form a "hierarchy of needs" structure. That is, it proceeds from very basic needs (groups 1 and 2) to a cluster of higher, social needs (groups 3, 4 and 5).

The hierarchy concept is critical to Maslow, since his basic premises are that:

(1) The behaviour of any person is dominated and determined by the most basic groups of needs which are unfulfilled.

(2) The individual will systematically satisfy his needs, starting with the most basic and moving up the hierarchy.

(3) More basic need groups are said to be pre-potent in that they will take precedence over all those higher in the hierarchy.
Although Maslow first proposed his hierarchy in 1943, it was only in recent years that industrial psychologists attempted to determine its appropriateness as a model for studying motivation in the business firm. The major contribution to the research of Maslow's model in an industrial setting has been by Porter at the University of California. He and his co-workers have published a number of research studies which are of sufficient importance that a brief summary of each will be presented.

In his first study Porter (1961) administered a survey to 64 bottom-level managers (foremen) and 75 middle-level managers from three different companies. The questionnaire contained 15 items designed to provide information about five different motivational need classes which were derived from Maslow.

Porter added an additional category of autonomy needs and also did not include any questions dealing with physiological needs.

Porter then defined need fulfilment as the difference between how much there should be and how much is now connected with management position. He then looked at both need fulfilment and importance scores as shown in Table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need Categories</th>
<th>Bottom Management</th>
<th>Middle Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relative Deficiency</td>
<td>Relative Importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esteem</td>
<td>large</td>
<td>small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>large</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-actualisation</td>
<td>large</td>
<td>large</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Porter's conclusions were as follows:

1. The vertical location of management appears to be an important variable in determining the extent to which psychological needs are fulfilled.

2. The greatest differences in the frequency of need-fulfilment deficiencies between bottom and middle-management positions occur in the esteem, security and autonomy need areas. These needs are significantly more often satisfied in middle than in bottom management.

3. Higher order psychological needs are relatively the least satisfied needs in both bottom and middle management.

4. Self-actualisation and security are seen as more important areas of need satisfaction than the areas of social, esteem and autonomy by individuals in both bottom and middle-management positions.

5. The highest-order of self-actualisation is the most critical need area of those studied, in terms of both perceived deficiency in fulfilment and perceived importance to the individual, in both bottom and middle management. This need is not perceived as significantly more satisfied at the middle management level than at the bottom management level.

The second study in the series (Porter, 1962) was a much more comprehensive survey in that the questionnaire (minus items 14 and 15) was distributed to a nationwide sample of 6,000 managers and executives. Usable terms were obtained from 1,916 of these. Table No. 2 shows a summary of the findings:
Table 2: Ranks of Mean Deficiencies in Need Fulfilment for five Need Categories within Sub-groups of Respondents. Five Management Levels by Four Age Groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Level</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Security</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Esteem</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
<th>Self-actualisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>20-34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55+</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-President</td>
<td>20-34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55+</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper-Middle</td>
<td>20-34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55+</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower-Middle</td>
<td>20-34</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55+</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>20-34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the third study Porter (1963a) examined the same data obtained in Study 2, looking this time at need importance rather than need fulfilment. He found that higher level managers placed more emphasis upon self-actualisation and autonomy needs than did lower level managers. There were no significant difference due to managerial level for the other needs.
Table-3: Showing Ranks of Mean Importance for Five Need Categories Within Each Sub-group of Respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Level</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Security</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Esteem</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
<th>Self-actualisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>20-34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55+</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-President</td>
<td>20-34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>3,5</td>
<td>3,5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55+</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper-Middle</td>
<td>20-34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55+</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower-Middle</td>
<td>20-34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55+</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>20-34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the above studies examined either need fulfilment or need importance as a function of a person's vertical location in an organisation. In his fourth study, Porter (1963b) looked at these two motivational constructs as a function of horizontal differences among managerial positions viz., line versus staff jobs. He divided his managers into three groups: line managers, combined line and staff managers, and staff managers.

His results showed the following:

1. Line managers perceived greater need fulfilment than did staff managers.
(2) Largest need-fulfilment differences occurred in the need for esteem and for self-actualisation.

(3) Line and staff managers did not differ on the importance they attached to each type of need except for the autonomy need, which staff managers found more important.

(4) Differences due to horizontal organisational structure are smaller than those due to vertical organisational structure.

In the next study, Porter (1963) examined need fulfilment and need importance as influenced by the size of the organisation to which a manager belonged. Here he found that at the lower levels of management smaller company managers were more satisfied (had greater perceived need fulfilment) than were large company managers. However, just the reverse was found to be true at higher levels of management. Here Porter found that managers in large companies were more satisfied than small company managers. Size of company was found to have no bearing upon perceived need importance.

These findings are extremely interesting and important. As Porter states (1963c, p.387) :-

There are good reasons for presuming that organisational level might have an interaction effect on size in relation to job attitudes. For example, a worker at the bottom of a large organisation has a much larger superstructure of organisation levels and of sheer numbers of people above him than does a similar worker in a small company. In effect, the worker in the large company, has more bosses above him and has less absolute influence on his work environment than does the worker in the small company.
However, at the other end of the hierarchy — top management — the picture should be reversed. A top manager in a large company controls or "bosses" more people than a top manager in a smaller organisation, and hence has (or should have) more absolute influence in the work situation. To the extent that this analysis of the interaction of size of organisation and level of position within the organisational hierarchy is correct, it would lead to the following hypothesis: the higher the organisational level, the relatively more favourable will be the job attitudes of individuals in large organisations compared with those of individuals in small organisations.

Vroom (1964) has proposed a theory of human motivation which, although quite general in form, takes as its context the individual in the world of work. It is probably the first such attempt at formal motivation "model building" in industrial psychology. Vroom has drawn very heavily on the work of the great social psychologist, Kurt Lewin. Like Lewin, Vroom uses the basic concept of valence as a key notion. He defines valence as "the attractiveness of a goal or outcome". Another definition is "the anticipated satisfaction from an outcome" (Vroom, 1964, p. 15).

Vroom then outlines two propositions (Vroom, 1964, pp. 17-18):

**Proposition 1:**

The valence of an outcome to a person is a monotonically increasing function of the algebraic sum of the products of the valences for all other outcomes and his conceptions of its instrumentality for the attainment of these other outcomes.
Proposition 2:

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

Proposition 1 may be thought of as follows: The desire (valence) for any particular objective (outcome) on the part of an individual is directly related to the likelihood (instrumentality) that the objective will in turn lead to other subsequent objectives of given desirability (valence). Consider a young man who joins the Navy right out of high school. His valence for joining the Navy might be thought of as being a sum of his feelings about all the outcomes (both good and bad) that are apt to result from this action, each being weighted by its anticipated probability. Thus, he knows he will have to postpone his college education ($p = 1.00$), a fact which may disappoint him. Yet he also knows he may have more pleasant duty than if he were to be drafted ($p = 0.80$), a fact which may please him very much. The combination of an 80 per cent chance of for something of very high valence contrasted to a 100 per cent chance for something of moderate negative valence may result in an overall positive feeling or valence about joining the Navy at this time in his life.

Proposition 2 simply states that the greater the valence of any outcome, the more apt is a person to take action. In the case of our young man who intuitively (or even unconsciously) "computes" his valence toward joining the Navy, we assume that the higher the overall valence of this act the greater the force acting upon him to join.
The Herzberg theory of job-satisfaction first published in 1959 (Herzberg, Mausner & Snyderman, 1959), represents an approach to understanding of the motivation to work. In the original study (1959) — investigators concluded that the determinants of job-satisfaction, or motivators, are different from the determinants of job-dissatisfaction i.e., Hygienes. This aspect distinguishes the theory from the traditional theory of job-satisfaction where the job factors are considered to be Bipolar. Traditional theory hypothesizes that if the presence of a variable contributes to job-satisfaction, the absence of that variable will contribute to dissatisfaction and vice-versa. Thus traditional theory predicts linear relationship between satisfaction with job variables and overall job-satisfaction. As a contrast two-factor theory predicts non-linear relationships.

These two different variables, Motivators and Hygienes are also classified as —

- satisfiers Vs. dissatisfiers
- content Vs. context variables
- intrinsic Vs. extrinsic variables.

Job-satisfaction and dissatisfaction represent two separate and distinct experiences, and not just the opposites of the same feeling. What determines job-dissatisfaction are those aspects of the work which essentially describe the environment or surroundings within which one performs his job. The elements of work which contribute to job-satisfaction are those which essentially describe the relationship of the worker to what he does, his task or job content as opposed to context.

Job-content factors or Motivators include factors such as achievement, recognition, work itself, status, advancement, responsibility, and other matters associated with the self-actualisation of the individual on the job. These are essentially responsible for producing satisfaction of the worker in his work place.
Job-context factors such as salary, supervision, general and administrative policies of the company, security, working condition, interpersonal relation and other factors peripheral to the task are termed as dissatisfiers. They are like Hygiene factors, that is to say they have to be taken care of, otherwise they may produce dissatisfaction. But optimisation of these variables do not necessarily produce motivation.

Therefore satisfaction with a dissatisfier should cause no more overall satisfaction than merely being neutral with regard to dissatisfier. So also dissatisfaction with a satisfier should not contribute any more to overall dissatisfaction than being neutral with a satisfier. In other words, the core of Herzberg's concept maintains that Motivators account for variance in overall job satisfaction above a neutral hedonic level with little or no bearing on satisfaction below that level. Hygienes on the other hand account for variance in overall job satisfaction below a neutral hedonic level with little or no bearing on overall satisfaction above that point. As such the Motivator variables operate primarily on the positive side of the overall job satisfaction scale while Hygiene variables operate on the negative side (Herzberg et al, 1959). In effect, a non-linear relationship between the motivator factors and the Hygiene factors is suggested in this theory. Satisfaction is qualitatively different from dissatisfaction. While the presence of a job characteristic will have one effect on the job the absence of the same characteristic will not have the opposite effect.

This radically new approach of Herzberg lead to a number of investigations in this area. The observations arrived at were confoundingly varied, and in an over-view seem to be inconclusive.
REVIEW OF THEORY

Since the publication of Herzberg's theory (Herzberg, Mausner and Synderman, 1959) a number of studies have appeared to test the significance of the theory. As already stated the theory proposes two distinct set of factors 'Motivators' and 'Hygienes' to account for overall job-satisfaction. While the Motivators or satisfiers mainly contribute to job-satisfaction, the 'Hygienes' mainly determine dissatisfaction.

Several studies have essentially replicated the Herzberg's design and have recorded comparable results. Myers (1964) finds his overall conclusions supportive of 'Motivation to work' explanation. Schwartz, Jemusaitis and Stark (1963) report supportive findings based on their study with supervisory personnel. Herzberg (1965) supports his study from his work on supervisors in Finland.

However, there are some basic questions surrounding the research strategy and methodology employed by Herzberg (Ewen, 1964; Vroom, 1964). Number of studies, at least partially, if not totally, fail to support the predictions which one could deduce based on the basic two-factor theory (Ewen, 1964; Friedlander, 1963, 1964; Gordon, 1965; Halpern, 1965; Malinovsky and Barry, 1965; Wernimont, 1966). The basic methodology, essentially a critical incident technique is subject to following criticisms.

Firstly, as the critical incident technique implies, Herzberg in his studies did not try to find out from his subjects, the factors affecting job-satisfaction or job-dissatisfaction in the current job-situation, but rather enquired of his subjects, the factors affecting their job situations at a time when they were particularly happy or unhappy with their job, whether it be their present job or any other job they may have had. As such there is no control over sampling...
frame for the data. Further to that the relative contribution of job-factors to overall job-satisfaction cannot be drawn clearly.

Secondly, it doesn't control either the number of incidents from a given subject or the number of job-factors mentioned with a given incident. Again we find that this method doesn't look at the relationship of job-satisfaction to 'Motivators' and 'Hygienes' across intermediate levels of job-satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

Further to this, Herzberg's theory doesn't accommodate deviant cases — provides no basis for explaining cases which do not conform to the two-factor dichotomy. Moreover it doesn't have much to say about the contribution of critical factors such as personality variables and cultural or social system variables which definitely have to be accounted for in any predictive theoretical statement.

Herzberg's results appear to be method-bound. The conclusions appear to pivot on method variance rather than true content or scale variance (Hullin and Smity, 1967). The deducible results differ whenever different research methods are used (Graen, 1966). This fact finds ample evidence in the reports of several authors (Dunnette, Camphall and Hakel, 1967; Ewen, 1964; Ewen et al, 1966).

The main conclusions of Herzberg's theory as such can be stated a function of the methodology evolved by Herzberg. Brayfield (1960) has suggested this possibility, Kahn (1961) and Vroom (1964) have suggested that the defensive behaviour and displacement could account for Herzberg's findings. Vroom (1964), Vroom and Maier (1961) caution against description of events by individuals as a basis for inferring the actual causes of satisfaction and dissatisfaction.
Thus we find that researches done in the area of Herzberg's two-factor theory can be divided into three categories:

(a) Supportive Studies;
(b) Non-supportive Studies; and
(c) Semi-supportive researches — where certain aspects of Herzberg's theory find evidence in studies carried out by other investigators.

(a) **Supportive Studies**:

Three studies (Myers, 1964; Saleh, 1964; Elizabeth Walt, 1962; Schwartz et al, 1963) reported results in essential agreement with Herzberg's conclusion that Motivators determine satisfaction and Hygienes determine dissatisfaction. In these studies the nature of the samples were varied. Schwartz et al's subjects were 111 male supervisors. In Saleh's (1964) study the subjects were engineers, scientists, manufacturing supervisors, female assemblers and hourly male technicians. Elizabeth Walt (1962) carried her study with women scientists in the Federal Government. All these studies are criticised for their basic methodology which is similar to Herzberg. Two studies by Friedlander (1963, 1964) provide some support for the theory. In the first study (1963) he found three dimensions, two of which corresponded in part with Herzberg's concepts of Motivators and Hygiene variables, while the third one consisted of both context and content variables. Friedlander (1964) investigated the bipolar assumption of job-satisfaction. Employing correlational and variance analysis he finds for the most part satisfaction and dissatisfaction are unrelated and non-complementary in function. But the basic method is questionable. The same items were given to subjects under two different sets. Further to this the emphasis on the items differed.
Halpern (1966) used a 7-point rating scale on which his subjects (N=93) rated aspects of their best liked jobs. On the basis of his results he concludes that Motivators are primarily related to job-satisfaction. However his results cannot be said to be in total agreement with Herzberg's hypothesis. He finds substantial correlation between Motivator and Hygiene variables. According to Herzberg theory Motivator and Hygiene variables are two separate continua unrelated to each other.

The other supportive studies that suggest the absence or decrease in Hygiene variables as determinants of one's job dissatisfaction are — Herzberg (1965), Schwartz (1963), Myers (1964), Fantz (1961), Gibson (1961) and Lodharas (1963).

(b) Non-supportive Research:

Friedlander (1964) could find little evidence for the bipolarity of job-satisfaction. His results suggested that neither Motivators determine satisfaction nor that Hygienes determine dissatisfaction. One recent study (Lindsey, Marks and Gorlow, 1967) indicates that both Motivators and Hygienes are related to satisfaction, conceived as a bipolar variable. The results further suggest that workers with strong feelings of achievement on a job will remain satisfied even though the surrounding conditions such as management policy, work organisation etc., are regarded as inadequate. These results are at variance with Herzberg's theory that suggests that there is no interaction between Motivators and Hygienes.

The differential strength of relationship between both Motivators and Hygienes taken together and level of satisfaction as reported in the above study find further evidence in other studies also (Gordon, 1965; Halpern, 1966;
Moreover, all these studies suggest that Motivators are more important to satisfaction than Hygienes. Herzberg's theory doesn't account for this aspect as the methodology adopted by Herzberg is not amenable to the quantitative expression of relationship between the variables.

Gordon (1965), Wernimont (1966) and Burke (1966) find non-unidirectionality of Motivators and Hygienes in their effect on satisfaction.

Saleh's (1964) results indicate job context-factors as source of satisfaction among employees in the pre-retirement period.

Ewen et al (1966), Graen (1966), found that dissatisfaction with the job content variables (work itself and promotion) contributed to overall dissatisfaction and that satisfaction with the job-context variable (pay) contributed to overall satisfaction. Taken as a whole these results clearly support the traditional theory.

The results arrived at by Hullin and Smith (1967) provide no support for the predictions which one would make on the basis of the two-factor theory of job-satisfaction. The so-called satisfiers acted as both satisfiers and dissatisfiers, and on the other hand, dissatisfiers acted as satisfier as well as dissatisfier.

Graen (1968) reports that the trends of the means of overall satisfaction seen for all the groups i.e., dissatisfied, neutral and satisfied, with the job variables were increasingly monotonic and essentially linear rather than non-linear as predicted by two-factor theory. In fact, the traditional theory finds support in this study.
Semi-supportive Studies:

Herzberg et al studies were followed by other studies. These studies aimed at testing the generality of Herzberg's theory (Centers and Bugental, 1966; Ewen, 1964; Friedlander, 1964; Halpern, 1966; Malinovsky and Barry, 1965; Wernimont, 1966; Jenusaitis and Startk, 1963; Saleh, 1964; Myers, 1964). But these studies do not support the Motivator—Hygiene theory univocally. Ewen (1964) in his study carried out with Life Insurance Agents reports that some of the dissatisfiers actually acted as satisfiers. Some of the satisfiers caused dissatisfaction, while other satisfiers contributed to satisfaction.

Friedlander (1963), Malinovsky and Berry (1965) following the factor analytic technique find both Motivators and Hygienes associated with job satisfaction. Some of the factors that engaged in their studies, correspond with Herzberg's theory, while other factors were found to include both Motivator and Hygiene variables.

Wernimont (1966) concludes from his study carried on a sample consisting of engineers and accountants that both intrinsic and extrinsic factors can be sources of satisfaction as well as dissatisfaction. However, his findings reveal intrinsic factors to be comparatively stronger as contributors to satisfaction.

Choudhuri and Lahiri (1966) report similar findings that Motivators and Hygienes may be both sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Their study was carried out among skilled workers. But their results differ from Wernimont's (1966) study in that Hygiene factors were found more important than Motivators as contributors to satisfaction. The latter study thus reveals that occupational differences may affect whether it's content-related or context-related factors that act primarily as determinants of one's satisfaction. This fact is made clear
by Centers and Bugental (1966). They found that intrinsic and extrinsic job aspects were valued differently at different occupational levels. The white collar population (managerial, clerical and professional) placed greater emphasis on intrinsic sources of job-satisfaction, while the blue-collar workers (such as skilled, semi and unskilled) placed a greater value on extrinsic sources of job satisfaction.

Most of the researches on the two-factor Motivator and Hygiene theory has involved white collar workers. Bloom and Barry (1967) in their study with 65 blue collar Negro workers report that Hygiene factors were more important to their subjects. Further they state that the two-factor theory may be too simple to encompass the concepts of job-satisfaction and dissatisfaction, at least in the blue-collar Negro. It may be that the two-factor theory is less useful when one considers low-status work.

Of the 13 factors extracted from their factor-analytic data (Bloom and Barry, 1967), eight factors contained both Motivators and Hygiene items, while two factors contained only Hygiene items, and three contained only Motivator items. In general, the Hygiene items had higher loadings and determined more of the variance in the factor matrix than the Motivator items.

Lahiri and Srivastava (1967) report results that partly confirm and partly reject Herzberg's theory. This study confirms Herzberg et al (1959) and Friedlander's (1964) findings that satisfaction and dissatisfaction are not the opposite poles of the same feelings. At the same time the results conflict with Herzberg et al. Constructs of the basic two dimensional nature of job attitude; both 'Motivator' and 'Hygiene' job factors were found to determine satisfied and dissatisfied feelings toward the job.
Hinrichs and Mischkind (1967) report results that partially support Herzberg's theory. They find in accordance with Herzberg's theory that Motivators would be relatively more frequent as positive reasons for high-satisfaction subjects than as positive reasons for low-satisfaction subjects. In contrast they do not find Hygiene variables to be relatively more frequent as negative reasons for low-satisfaction subjects than as negative reasons for high satisfaction subjects.

From the methodological point of view again, we find that different investigators have used different techniques to study the truth or falsity of two factor theory.

Herzberg (1959) used the critical incident technique. The subjects were asked to recall a time in their job tenure when they were either (a) satisfied, or (b) dissatisfied. Then the subjects were invited to discuss the events (incidents) and to specify the factors which contributed to their satisfaction — dissatisfaction experiences.

Malinovsky and Barry (1965) designed a 40 item work attitude survey (W.A.S.) to measure work attitude of blue-collar workers. W.A.S. consisted of 20 Motivator and 20 Hygiene items. The Motivator and Hygiene items were rated on a likert type 5-point scale.

Bloom and Barry (1967) used W.A.S. designed by Malinovsky and Barry (1965).

Ewen (1967) used the Job Description Index (J.D.I.). J.D.I. is an adjective check-list which measures satisfaction with the finer aspects of the job viz., the work itself, the supervisor, the co-workers, pay and promotions. Grayfield-Rothe Index (1951) was also used as a measure of an overall satisfaction. This B.R.I. Questionnaire consists of 18 items and deals with the workers'
feeling towards job as a whole. In this study Motor Face Scale (Kunin, 1955) was also used.

Hinrichs and Mischkind (1967) used a 11-point rating scale as a measure of overall job satisfaction. This was followed by a critical Incident Technique of listing 1 or 2 specific things that most influenced his feelings in a positive way and those that affected him in a negative way in his employment with the company.

Hulin and Smith (1967) used Job Description Index (J.D.I.) to measure satisfaction with five job aspects — work-done, promotional opportunities, pay, supervision, and co-workers. Overall job-satisfaction was assessed by one of three variations of General Motor Faces Scale (Kunin, 1955).

Lahiri and Srivastava (1967) used a 10-point graphic scale. 13 'Motivator' and 13 'Hygiene' job factors were checked against these scales over the present job and an imaginary job situation. The subjects were asked to check how far these factors contributed to their satisfaction when they felt exceptionally good about the present job/imaginary job, and similarly the extent to which each factor contributed to dissatisfaction when they felt bad about the present job/imaginary job.

Graen (1968) used Job Description Index (J.D.I.) and General Motor Face Scales.

Scott and Mitchell (1972) observe, the evidence against the theory appear to be more than evidence in favour.

Dayal and Saiyadin (1970) examined the cross-cultural validity of motivation — hygiene theory, employing the methodology of original study. They interviewed 40 male students possessing technical and non-technical work experience.
The job content factors were cited largely as source of satisfaction while job-content factors a source of dissatisfaction indicating similarities in what motivates individuals across culture.

Rao (1970) administered a questionnaire consisting of 15 job factors (seven motivators and eight hygienes) using five-point Likert type scales, one for satisfaction and the other for dissatisfaction to 60 bank managers belonging to three hierarchical levels. The results are as follows:

(a) When mean values of job factors were ranked in order of magnitude, relations with co-workers, responsibility and work itself were high on the satisfaction scale, and promotion, company policy and salary high on the dissatisfaction scale respectively;

(b) Both the motivators and hygienes contributed equally to satisfaction and dissatisfaction;

(c) Motivators contributed both to satisfaction and dissatisfaction; and

(d) Hygienes contributed more to satisfaction than to dissatisfaction.

In the study, while the dimensional independence of satisfaction and dissatisfaction was corroborated, the variable independence of job factors was not. All the 15 job factors incorporated in the study recorded relatively higher satisfaction means. However, the researcher himself disregarded even the former as artificial due to instructional set, it could be concluded that the study was not supportive of the two-factor theory.

Argyris, an eminent Harvard Professor, assumes that the workers are already motivated and the problem facing the management is how to channel their motivation in the proper direction. He believes that all human beings possess psychological energy. Their attempts to use that energy in a manner which satisfies their higher
level needs provide them with the motivation. Accordingly, if the management provides the workers with opportunity to gratify their needs the psychological energy hinders the fulfilment of these goals. This makes it imperative that organisational needs are synonymous with those of the individual workers. Argyris in his treatise titled 'Personality and Organisation' assumes that formal organisations are fundamentally antimaturing and accordingly hamper the satisfaction the self-actualisation need of employees. As parents, we develop our single-skilled children into being multi-skilled. But when they grow up and take up a job, they are placed in situations which are anti-maturing. With a view to utilising human motivation, Argyris advocates the mixed model comparing the factors which channel psychological energy of workers towards the attainment of organisational goals with those which divert from these goals. The factors which direct the psychological energy towards the organisational goals include open communication and democratic distribution of powers.

Factors which divert the energy from the accomplishment of organisational goals include excessive central control and operation within the limited circle of a single work-unit without indicating any significance in the entire organisational setting. Argyris blames the management for demanding the less than the potentials of its people who frequently reveal short-sighted behavioural patterns in their work situations. They tend to concern themselves with the existing immediate gains ignoring future results, shirk responsibility and overlook opportunities. They adopt an apathetic attitude towards their work. For this attitude, a number of factors such as pyramidal organisational structures, formally designated roles, specialisation of work, lines of authority and rigid systems are responsible.
The formal organisation threatens the satisfaction of higher needs such as an individual's sense of personal esteem, involvement in creative work, the feeling of doing something worthwhile and recognition of one's contribution. This necessitates that organisation is oriented to satisfy the individual's needs. In this respect, formation of temporary work-team cutting across the formal lines and comprising individuals with adequate skills is highly promising. Project management where the magnitude of authority varies with expertise, job enlargement and redesigning to suit the interest and skills of the individuals with organisational goals instead of the individuals having to stop into the job, form a positive approach to organisation. Argyris has been criticised on the grounds that unlike most of the behavioural scientist, he stresses individual personalities in work situation instead of a comprehensive standpoint of organisational culture.

Human abilities cannot give result until they are combined with motivation. Although motivation does not mould them, it mobilises and directs them towards the attainment of goals. However, it should be mentioned that extremely high degree of motivation is not necessarily conducive to higher effectiveness. Each job demands an optimal rate of work and efforts and any significant deviation from this will cause injuries to health. Moreover, a high degree of drive increases performance, in complex task, it affects quality and quantity adversely. The problem of motivation, therefore, relates not simply to the finding of incentives which raise output to the maximum but which raise output to the optimal level and maintain it there. An incentive has been defined as the outward stimulus which activates a need or brings the motive to work. The need reveals in useful behaviour only when the proper incentive exists. One set of incentives may be suitable and motivate people at one level whereas another set of incentives is required for people at a different level. This is evident in a study conducted in India which showed that
adequate income was found to be of utmost significance among assistant professors and lecturers whereas assistant lecturers gave top priority to the opportunity for advanced training (Ganguli).

In other countries, the plethora of management literature relates to incentives for effective performance. Monetary rewards form the major motivation for most workers. The workforce cannot be recruited and maintained without a sound wage and salary programme. However, incentive schemes in themselves do not compensate for poor leadership styles for their implementation. There may be individual incentive systems as well as incentives for organization-wide participation. As regards individual incentives schemes, they frequently fail to provide adequate motivation. Incentives for organization-wide participation provide a broader motivation for work. These schemes increase productivity and improve morale by giving a feeling of participation in, and identification with, the company. They include group piece work, profit-sharing suggestion system, consultative committees and the scalar plan. Safety also forms an effective incentive programme. Last but not the least, fringe benefits serve as incentives for effective performance. The success of the benefits programme however, depends upon its effective administration.

**Worker Motivation and Incentives**

The incentives which are frequently offered to the workers include pay and other types of rewards and fringe benefits. On the other hand, are the negative incentives of punishments and reprimands. Different rewards related to a specific job hold different incentive values for the worker. Knowledge of this is imperative if the management intends to motivate its workforce. Several studies have been
conducted in India on the relative importance of different rewards for industrial workers. Sinha has summarised the results of these studies. Some studies are exploratory which analyse the incentives which influence Indian workers and determine their relative strength.

Utilising the ranking method, Ganguli showed that the three most highly ranked incentives are: adequate earning, job security and opportunity for promotion. He concluded that unlike the Western countries were pay was frequently ranked lower in the hierarchy of incentives, in the immediate future, income and job security would be the two most important incentives for the Indian workers. The exact nature of work done, the magnitude of responsibility assigned to the worker and appreciation of work by others were found to be items of relatively low incentive value. The nature of supervision ranked fifth whereas in Western countries it frequently occupies the top position. The incentive value of medical and health insurance, housing, subsidised canteen and other fringe benefits was difficult to evaluate.

Bhatt conducted three studies which showed that of the nine possible incentives, choice of work, advancement and co-worker were ranked first, second and third, respectively. Wages ranked fourth while the fifth place was a tie between benefits and conditions of work, and the supervisor. The last three in priority were security, hours of work and holidays, respectively. The results were startling. Obviously, these exploratory studies on the hierarchy of incentives have provided confusing results. Frequently, wages and job security are given the prominent place while sometimes supervision, promotion etc., are emphasised on. The reasons are obvious. The opinions of the workers depend upon the local factors existing in the company as well as the general conditions in respect of earning and other facilities prevalent there. On the grounds of these studies, it is not easy to finally ascertain a definite hierarchy of incentives for all workers.
Chowdhury and Trivedi conducted studies among textile workers in Ahmedabad. They employed a 'group norm' technique and provided to the workers information regarding breaks and damages as well as quantity of work accomplished by the group within a period of time. Under these arrangements the efficiency of weavers increased substantially and the rates of damages declined significantly. A similar trend was constantly noted in various mills. Thus, these studies conclusively showed how experimental manipulations of a social variable can be a powerful incentive for increasing efficiency.

Incentives for Supervisors and Managers

Ganguli conducted a study in an Indian railway workshop employing nearby 12,000 workers. He interviewed 27 supervisors and 140 workers. The results showed that the supervisor expected three things from his job: adequate income, job security and adequate value of his suggestions and recommendations regarding his own work group. On the other hand, most supervisors placed rather a low importance to adequate information regarding management policies and the freedom to deal with their workers in own way. Poor ranking of this last item indicated that like most practical men, these supervisors did not want overriding powers over their subordinates but only that they should have a genuine say in the running of their shops. A comparison of supervisors at various levels, however, revealed some basic differences. It appeared that sympathetic superiors, promotion opportunities, material benefits like medical aid, etc., and settlement of grievances were more important to supervisors at the lower levels than higher up. Supervisors higher up tended to place more stress on their authority and power and technical training. Thus, while supervisors lower down the hierarchy emphasised returns of a material nature, for those higher up the crucial considerations tended to relate more to professional problems. The fundamental expectations regarding income and security remained common to all.
Laxmi Narain conducted a survey on a sample of 1,213 managers working with 47 public sector undertakings in India. Attempts were made to evaluate eight areas of needs for measuring motivation and to analyze eight factors hampering job performance. Major results of the study are shown in the following tables. Among the factors conducive to job performance, the feeling of worthwhile accomplishment was ranked the highest. It was followed by recognition, the opportunity for personal growth and decision making authority. On the lowest rung was job security. Several other motivating factors were also discovered such as challenge in the job, opportunity for taking initiative, satisfaction from inter-personal relations with peers, superiors and subordinates, status, etc. The higher ranking element inhibiting job performance was the lack of a clear definition of responsibilities, followed by inadequate communication and sloth and bureaucracy in management. Several other inhibiting factors were the lack of leadership on the part of supervisors, lack of coordination, social distance between superior and subordinate, lack of team spirit, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>All managers Mean Rank value</th>
<th>Higher level managers Mean Rank value</th>
<th>Middle level managers Mean Rank value</th>
<th>Lower level managers Mean Rank value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision making authority</td>
<td>3.9 3.5</td>
<td>3.6 3</td>
<td>3.6 3</td>
<td>4.1 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for personal growth and development</td>
<td>3.9 3.5</td>
<td>3.8 4</td>
<td>3.9 4</td>
<td>3.9 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>6.1 8</td>
<td>6.7 8</td>
<td>6.4 8</td>
<td>5.9 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige of organisation outside the company</td>
<td>5.4 6</td>
<td>5.1 5.5</td>
<td>5.5 6</td>
<td>5.4 6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of worthwhile accomplishment</td>
<td>3.0 1</td>
<td>2.5 1</td>
<td>2.6 1</td>
<td>3.3 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay, allowances and other benefits</td>
<td>5.5 7</td>
<td>5.8 7</td>
<td>5.6 7</td>
<td>5.4 6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for promotion</td>
<td>4.7 5</td>
<td>5.1 5.5</td>
<td>4.7 5</td>
<td>4.6 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition for good work done</td>
<td>3.1 2</td>
<td>3.1 2</td>
<td>3.1 2</td>
<td>3.0 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: Showing ranking of factors inhibiting job performance by managers at various levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>All managers</th>
<th>Higher level managers</th>
<th>Middle level managers</th>
<th>Lower level managers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean value</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean rank value</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude of workers and their unions</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate communication</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government interference</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of consistency in management policies</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit control</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of clear definition of responsibilities</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of fairness in personnel matters</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The problem of incentive is closely associated with certain psychological facts regarding the individual workers as well as with certain values under which the organisation operates. As the problem of incentives is associated with the core of human personality, it should not be tackled in a piecemeal manner. It is imperative that the management creates a psychological climate — a condition where the individuals are keen to work for the attainment of organisational objectives. More important is the creation of a feeling among the workers that they will be able to satiate their needs through the specific employment relationship in organisational settings.

Notwithstanding the adverse criticism of two-factor theory it remains to be one of the most popular theory of job satisfaction, and industrial psychologists and social scientists very often utilise Herzberg's findings for studies of job satisfaction. The theory has been verified in different cultures including in a Kibbutz.
situation in Israel where salary is not a consideration in determining whether the distinction between motivation and hygiene factors holds and whether the same factors are important. The Kibbutz experience is important in the sense that here is a unique situation when there is nothing which can be construed as salary. Traditional concept of human motivation pays highest importance to salary. Even Herzberg said, "salary is the most visible, communicable and advertised factor in all the world of work. Salary permits the thought and expressions of people when they view their job". The investigators of Kibbutz study wanted to examine the two-factor theory where there is nothing called salary (Macrow, 1972). A Kibbutz is a voluntary, collective, originally based exclusively on agriculture but with admixture of some industry in the last few years. Members of Kibbutz receive satisfaction of all their needs including food, clothing, housing, medical care, education, recreation, care of parent and pocket money, and contribute their work and their participation in the Government of Kibbutz. In Kibbutz experiment four out of five factors support Herzberg's two factor hypothesis. Only one factor, interpersonal relations, which according to Herzberg should have been found to be hygiene factor, has been found as a motivator. The results are presented in the table below:

Table-6:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Dissatisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work itself</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal relations</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working conditions</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Studies have been conducted both in India and abroad on the ranking of job factors. It will be worthwhile to glance through the two factors: one on ranking of job factors in Western countries and other on ranking of job factors in India.
### Table-7: Showing Ranking of Job-Factors (Western Studies)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHANT</th>
<th>HERSEY</th>
<th>WYATT, LANG &amp; STOCK</th>
<th>JÜRGENSEN</th>
<th>HERZBERG</th>
<th>SCHWARTZ</th>
<th>FRIEDLANDER</th>
<th>WERNIMONT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement of promotion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to use ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to learn the job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary or pay</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working conditions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation with co-workers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours of work</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.5*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good boss</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendliness of superior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical competence of superior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For women workers
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8: Showing Ranking of Job-Factors (Indian Studies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recognition</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement or promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for self-expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for training on the job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary or pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation with co-workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours of work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendliness of superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical competence of superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management policies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For non-technical employees
When compared with the job-factors as preferred by Western workers, Indian workers appear to differ in giving great importance to salary or pay, security and working conditions.

The Western studies show great preference on the part of the workers to other factors such as achievement, recognition, nature of work, advancement and good human relations on the job. The importance of these factors to Indian workers is only next in preference to salary, security and working conditions, perhaps rightly so, because of the existing comparatively low conditions of living among the Indian workers. Shister and Reynolds (1949) say that for American workers the three most important job factors are human relations on the job, degree of variety and interest in the job and provision of an adequate standard of living. Gilmer (1961) opines that social aspects of the job such as work-group, leadership, and organisational structure — are more important for American workers of today. Kuchhol (1960) points out that basic urges such as security and income are most important for workers in India. Other factors, such as opportunity for advancement, facilities for further training and self-development and nature of supervision have been ranked lower in importance than security and salary (Bose, 1951; Dutta, 1959; Ganguli, 1964; Veeraraghavan, 1960).

Certain factor-analytic studies have also been carried out in delimiting the job-factors. Reviews of literature (Herzberg et al, 1957; King, 1958; Flath, 1961) have listed the following morale factors showing consistency in the face of widely differing methodologies and organisational settings. These are

- Working conditions
- Wages and salary administration
- Fringe benefits
- Attitudes toward fellow workers
- Attitude toward management and administration
- Communications
- Security
- Attitudes toward supervision, and
- Mobility, Status,
- Recognition and Self-
- Development.
Herzberg et al (1957) in their extensive review of literature on job-attitudes report the differences in relative importance of job-factors to factory workers and office workers. Promotional chances and intrinsic job aspects were relatively highly valued by office workers, while the factory workers considered, working-conditions, wages, security and social aspects of the job as more important.

Relating job-factors to work is not limited to researches in the area of attitudes and job satisfaction alone. Number of investigations have been carried out associating job factors to productivity. Bales, Stephen and Mishler, and Gibb relate size of the work-group to productivity. Katz and Kahn (1951), Katz, Maccoby, Gurin and Floor (1951) and with reference to Indian situation, Sequeria (1961), Chatterjee and James (1965) relate certain dimensions of supervisory behaviour, such as general supervision, employee-oriented behaviour, and other such social aspects of industry, to productivity. Leadership practices and supervisory style and their effect on productivity of the work group have been carried out by number of investigators (Lippit and White, 1958; White and Lippit, McCurdy and Eber, 1953; Shaw, 1955; Morse and Reimer). Halpin (1954) and Fleishman (1953) emphasise on 'consideration' and 'initiating' aspect of supervisory behaviour.

Thus varied job-aspects have been delineated to understand the various facets of human motivation to work.

These various job-factors can be conveniently put into two all-inclusive categories. All job-aspects for convenience may be divided into those aspects related to context or the environment or surroundings of the job, and those related to the content of the job. The job-context factors include salary, social and human relation aspects of the job, supervision, company policies and administrative practices, job security, working conditions and several other factors. Or in other words we can say that job-context factors include those which are peripheral to the
task. The job content factors on the other hand include achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility advancement, status and other aspects associated primarily with the self-actualisation aspect of the individual in job-situation.

This classification of job-aspects into job-content and job-context factors has been utilised by Herzberg in his two-factor theory to account for human motivation. According to him while the 'Motivators' are related to the dimension of job-satisfaction, the 'Hygienes' are the determinants of job-dissatisfaction.

As stated earlier in the introductory Chapter (I), the present investigation is mainly concerned with the 'motivating factors' and in a way the applicability of Herzberg's theory in Indian situation.

From the survey of different literature the following job aspects having high rank order were selected for the study: working conditions, security, work-by-itself, status, salary, inter-personnel relations (relation with subordinates and co-workers), supervision, use of best-abilities, recognition, management policy, opportunity for advancement or promotion, achievement and responsibility. Following Herzberg's classification these were further categorised into two groups — Motivators and Hygienes.

Motivators or job-content factors:

- Opportunity for advancement or promotion
- Recognition
- Achievement
- Responsibility
- Work-by-itself
- Status, and
- Use of best abilities.

Hygienes or job-context factors:

- Working conditions
- Security
- Inter-personnel relations — relations with subordinates
- Inter-personnel relations — relations with co-workers
- Supervision
- Salary, and
- Management policy.
In the recent agitation of Policemen, salary and working conditions were important issues and these probably are some of the causes of dissatisfaction but whether these factors could be motivating factors, or whether policemen really agitated for their status are important issues for empirical study. The present study as already indicated would explore the application of two-factor theory in the context of subordinate ranks of Indian police.

GROUP MORALE : DEFINED

At one time or another, almost everyone has ascribed the word 'morale' to indicate feelings of contentment. And, comments to the effect that the War was won because of high state of morale in the army as well as civilian populations are common; to quote an example the battle of Britain.

With increasing frequency of the and of little understanding, the term 'morale' was used since World War I and its further usage become indispensable since World War II to study any organisation.

Just as with many other words of highly abstract meaning this term too has been loosely tossed around with nearly every researcher constructing his own definition. A review of research findings concerning morale would indicate that there is no clear cut, commonly agreed upon definition of the word. Consequently, this invogue subject has as many definitions as there are definers. Each of these is probably correct, depending on the particular vantage point of the definer.

Group morale, says the Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences, is group persistence in the pursuit of collective purposes. Simple dictionary meaning identifies it as the state of mind; of discipline.
Morris S. Vitales (1954), basing his views upon the outcome of the conference on psychological factors in morale, held in 1940 (under the auspices of National Research Council, USA) that there is a considerable support for the view that "morale is an attitude of satisfaction, with desire to continue in and willingness to strive for the goals of a particular group.

Philip B. Applewhite of Yale University (1965) perceives morale quite simple, as a group phenomenon and holds that it must always be defined in terms of an individual-group relationship. He distinguishes between individual and group morale, indicating that morale should apply to groups and not to individuals except when the individual is directly related to the group. According to him, morale is a measure of the summed motivations of group members to work together towards a common goal. This is group morale. "Individual morale" is just a measure of an individual's motivation to pursue with others the common goal of the group of which he is a member.

According to O. Jeff Harris Jr., Professor of Management, Louisiana State University, U.S.A., morale is a group feeling — a group assessment of conditions. In his words, morale is esprit de corps. Morale also relates to the individual worker and his own perception of the existing state of well-being in the organization. He further maintained that group morale and individual morale are interrelated but are not identical.

Melincoe and Menning, author of 'Elements of Police Supervision" says that morale is an intangible quality similar to perhaps embodying courage, zeal and confidence. It is to the mind, what conditions is to the body; fitness, for the task at hand. Thus morale is a spirit of devotion to the endeavours of a group, that it grows from the mutual feelings that the goals of the organisation are good and its members' contributions are appreciated.
Milton L. Blum (1968) defined morale as "the possession of a feeling, on the part of the employee, of being accepted and belonging to a group of employees through adherence to common goals and confidence in the desirability of the goals. It consists of three different aspects:

(a) feeling accepted by one's work group (group identification);
(b) sharing common goals with one's work (goal identification);
(c) having confidence in the desirability of these goals (goal desirability).

The definition approaches that of group cohesiveness, simply defined as a measure of the group’s attractiveness to individuals. If the group’s goals are attractive to an individual, then the individual will tend to have high morale with regard to the group. But high morale will actually be present only when the individual works towards the group’s common goal.

R.M. Guion (1958) collected a number of different definitions of morale from various sources and perceived it as follows:

(a) Morale defined as the absence of conflict.
(b) Morale defined as the feeling of happiness.
(c) Morale defined as the good personal adjustment.
(d) Morale defined as the ego involvement in one's job.
(e) Morale defined as the group cohesiveness.
(f) Morale defined as the collection of job-related attitudes.
(g) Morale defined as individual's acceptance of the goals of the group.

Basing on a study of the above, he defined morale as "the extent to which an individual's needs are satisfied and the extent to which the individual perceives that satisfaction as stemming from his total job situation."
Ross Stagner (1958) defined morale "as an index of the extent to which the individual perceives a probability of satisfying his own motives through co-operation with the group, when the individual's motives and goals are identical with the group's morale will be at its maximum value. When a common goal for group and for individual develops, morale is present in the participation the individual has in the group. Stagner also held that morale depends upon (i) the individual's private goals; (ii) the group goals; and (iii) the perceived relationship between these sets of goals.

It will now be apparent that there is no two identical definitions for morale although largely the majority of the definers have based the construction on similar parables. The survey of the definition has only set out to prove that there is unity in diversity amongst the definers.

For a simplistic understanding morale in its pure form implies that the 'I' is absorbed in the 'We' of the group. The satisfaction found is in what the group is, and in what the group does. The individual shares in the rewards of the group accomplishment and in turn is driven to contribute enthusiastically to that accomplishment. It is the driving force that conditions one to willing persistency in attaining the group's goal and is an elementary attitude of being glad to belong to a group because there is great satisfaction built into that state of belonging.

DETERMINANTS OF MORALE

The determining components of morale, Ross Stagner (1958) maintained that morale depends upon (i) the person's perception of himself as a component of a group (group identification); and (ii) perception of his goals being identical to or contiguous with group goals. He gave examples of the latter aspect diagrammatically.
as per illustration I and II given below:

**Illustration - I**

| Individual | Group goal (reward) | Individual goal (prestige) |

In the visualised situation, achievement of the group implies achievement of the individual goal. An example is a situation where the staff of the police station by collective efforts were able to prevent a crime outbreak attracting suitable rewards for all and the officer-in-charge of the police station acquires more prestige for the job done. According to Stagner morale will be at a maximum under such situations.

**Illustration - II**

| Individual | Individual goal (prestige) | Group goal (reward) |

In the visualised situation, achievement of the group goal and the individual goal may be accomplished separately or independently. In an analogous situation as cited in illustration I, the officer-in-charge works independently without taking in the assistance of the staff and without taking them into confidence about the task, motivated for his singular achievement and reward under such situation morale is at its lowest nor the job is accomplished.

As against this theory of Ross Stagner, Milton L. Blum considered that morale can be best understood in terms of the three determinants. He listed them as follows:

(a) group identification;
(b) goal identification; and
(c) goal desirability.
GROUP IDENTIFICATION OR COHESIVENESS

Employees in a normal work situation rarely function as totally isolated individuals. Whether the organisation is likely to be aware of it or not, the employees are likely to form a group of a number of sub-groups. The ideal situation and one which makes for the highest morale, is the one which makes for the highest morale, is the one which there is a single group that includes employees, employers and representatives of the employers. The extent to which the organisation attempts to achieve this is the extent to which high morale is likely to be present.

GOAL IDENTIFICATION

Promoting group co-operation is easier if the group has a goal to achieve. Advancement, security, increased earning, welfare can all be goals, provided organisation encourages them and the employee has evidence that they are real and attainable. Doing the best one can as the job may constitute a goal provided the employee receives evidence that this goal is understood.

GOAL DESIRABILITY

Morale also involves specific and meaningful tasks for the individual in the group to perform and a sense of participation in the group's work towards the goal. In other words, if the task is not meaningful and is not duly accepted by the employee as it is to their advantage, the goals are not likely to be welcomed.

The concept of Blum relating to determinants of group morale is best illustrated as follows:

Illustration-III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Identification</th>
<th>Goal Identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group Morale</td>
<td>Goal Desirability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


To explain, greater the group identification, greater the goal identification and greater the goal desirability each progressively contributing for the other, higher is the group morale. In an erected triangle this is visualised in an ascending level and conversely in an inverted triangle, in a descending level, meaning thereby the lesser of these determinants, lower is the group morale.

MORALE COMPONENTS

Milton Dlum’s study was largely aimed at identifying the determinants and his three factors cannot be thought of as operationally defining it. Barzel E. Roach (1958) did a study of about 2,000 employees by administering an employ opinion survey. A factor analysis of the morale components made by him revealed 12 factors, viz;

(1) General attitude towards company
(2) General attitude towards supervision
(3) Satisfaction with job standards
(4) Consideration supervisor shows works
(5) Workload and work pressure
(6) Degree treatment as an individual by management
(7) Pride in the company
(8) Satisfaction with the salary
(9) Attitude towards formal communication system
(10) Intrinsic job satisfaction
(11) Satisfaction with progress and chances for progress
(12) Attitude towards co-workers.

It was thus identified for the first time that job satisfaction is part of morale and in fact contributes to it. Guba’s study made subsequently substantiated this aspect indicating that job satisfaction must be present before morale can be considered as being high. Job satisfaction is then a precursor of morale, and it also follows that states of low job satisfaction and high morale are incomparable for the first generates the energy required by the second.
There was yet another study by Bachr and Renck (1965) which corroborated the fact that job satisfaction is a component of morale. He categorized all the items relating to dimension of morale into 14 categories, namely: (1) job demands, (2) working conditions, (3) pay, (4) employee benefits, (5) friendliness and cooperation of fellow employees, (6) supervisor-employee in personal relations, (7) confidence in management, (8) technical competence of supervision, (9) effectiveness of administration, (10) adequacy of communications, (11) security of job and work relations, (12) status and recognition, (13) identification with the company, (14) opportunity for growth and advancement. A factor analysis of the items produced, five factors that accounted for 96.7% of the total variance. The factors are (1) organization and management (image), (2) immediate supervision, (3) material rewards, (4) fellow-employees, and (5) job satisfaction.

Yuzuk R.P. (1968) (Ohio State University, 1961) has reported the results of a study on employee morale which provides considerable information concerning the many facets and complexity of the term. From out of 186 items by a factor analysis study, he found morale to consist of nine different dimensions:

1. Adequacy of communication
2. Hours of work
3. Overall competence of fellow employees
4. Interpersonal relations with fellow employees
5. Status and recognition
6. Condition of work
7. Interpersonal relations with supervisor
8. Technical competence of supervision
The study of Yuzuk has merited recognition, in that his factor analysis study has brought forth to light all the possible dimensions of morale. It is also acclaimed that the dimensions projected by him practically encompasses all the dimensions envisioned by different proponents, in its broad meaning and perspective.

For the purpose of this study, the dimensions identified by Yuzuk were taken as the one appropriate for framing a suitable questionnaire to assess the level of group morale.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN GROUP MORALE AND JOB SATISFACTION

Phillip B. Applewhite after extensive study of literature on job satisfaction and group morale came to two conclusions after maintaining that the relation between job satisfaction and morale approaches one to one. First, the naming of the factors is subjective and hence while the factors appear semantically the same, they may differ operationally. Second, though components for both may be the same, operationally, distinction must be made reserving the term satisfaction for individuals and morale for groups. Therefore, if the individual displays these factors at a specified level, then he has job satisfaction and if the group he is in possesses them, the group has morale.

Paul M. Whisenand, author of "Police Supervision" (1976) also held similar views that job satisfaction is a part of morale and contributes to it. In his view, job satisfaction must be present before morale can be considered high. This is to say that if high morale is to be present high job satisfaction must also be present, because it provides further energy for use in pursuing group goals.

A similar conclusion has been arrived at by Milton L. Blum, an eminent industrial psychologist. According to him, job satisfaction is the result of various attitudes the individual holds towards his job related factors. Morale is the composite
expression of the attitudes of various individuals. It is generated by the group and may be considered as the by-product of the group. He has proceeded to illustrate the same, by holding a view that an organisation's morale may be low even though many employees enjoy considerable job satisfaction. Even one or two completely disgruntled workers, who are not recognised as such but rather are respected by their fellow employees (isn't it true in police organisation) will tend to lower the morale of the group appreciably, although most of the factors contributing to job satisfaction are present.

Converse is equally true where a few people may have noticeable effect in raising morale even when little is offered to most of the employees in terms of the specific factors of job satisfaction. Thus the fact that morale is a by-product of the group and can often be generated by segments of the group is important. If an inefficient and troublesome worker is discharged, it may have no effect on the morale of the group if the group has not considered him a part of it. If he is liked and is part of the group, the same action will lower the morale. If the group positively dislikes him, the group morale could conceivably raise.

Blum discusses another paradoxical situation, namely, the workers strike. It is commonly perceived that workers strike when their morale is low. The Union organisers contradict it by claiming that morale must be high before a strike can be restored to. Now morale cannot both be high and low at the same time in the same group. Obviously in interpreting such statements, the point of view must be considered. From management's point of view, the morale is low, but from union's point of view, the morale is high under these circumstances.

It has been well recognised that morale is a complex phenomenon and each of its dimensions has a broader spectrum of connotation. There is consensus among majority from the above viewpoint that the job satisfaction is a distinct and an individual feature, and contributes to morale. Thus in the dimensions of group morale, job
satisfaction as a whole constitutes one such factor, while encompassing different
other variables.

**CRITICAL DETERMINANTS OF AN CONTRIBUTORS TO THE GROUP MORALE**

Work studies made identified certain critical determinants distinct from
theoretical or conceptual ones. These critical determinants contribute for high or
low morale depending upon the workers' perception of various factors. So identified
critical determinants are three which are as follows:

1. Workers' perception of the status of organisational factors over
which they have no control.
2. Workers' perception of the level of satisfaction attained from
rewards previously granted to them.
3. Workers' perception of future opportunity and conditions whereby
additional rewards can be gained.

These factors on which the workers have no control have been identified as
follows:

1. Type of supervision.
2. Co-operative or uncooperative spirit of his fellow workers.
3. Organisational policies.

Favourable perception of these factors will lead to high morale. Similarly,
future expectation, if positive, will lead to high morale. The interplay of these
factors leading to high or low morale and its perceptive effects thereof is projected
in illustration VI.

**DIMENSIONS OF MORALE**

While determinants characterise a concept or term dimensions operationalise
the same. Investigative studies to operationalise morale are numerous from out which
a basic concept but consists of a number of dimensions.

Nigel Walker took job satisfaction, pride in the working group and cohesiveness
into consideration in operationalising morale.
### Illustration-VI

Relationship among worker perception, level of morale and effect of morale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workers perception</th>
<th>Level of morale</th>
<th>Effect of morale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Workers perception of how favourable or unfavourable factors out of his control are towards himself and his fellow workers.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(i) High level of co-operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Willing to deserve organisational rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) More careful in handling organisational property and equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(iv) Loyalty to and respect for organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(v) Harmonious relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(vi) Work without grumbling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(vii) Low absentism, more efficiency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Worker's perception of level of satisfaction he has received from past rewards for previous performance.</td>
<td>High morale if perceptions are positive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(i) Lack of co-operation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Failure in deserving rules and regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) Indifference to company's goal and objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(iv) Lack of concern and lack of interest in fellow employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(v) Increased complaints and grievances about work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low morale if perceptions are negative</td>
<td>(vi) More absentism, less efficiency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Perception leading to high morale

---

Perception leading to low morale

---

Workers perception of favourability of how favourable or unfavourable factors out of his control are towards himself and his fellow workers.
STUDIES ON GROUP MORALE IN INDIAN CONTEXT

Several Indian researchers attempted various studies relating to group morale. All of those that were came across by the syndicate related to organisations other than police organisation. Some of those relevant are quoted below to infer the relationships, dimensions, organisational variables, etc.

S.K. Bose (1955) in a research study concluded that employee centred supervision was found to have positive relationship with morale of the workers and pride of workers in their work groups.

Gangrade (1955) held a moral survey and in the same analysed the different aspects of employer-employee relationship which result in creating good and sound morale.

Ganguli H.C. (1956) conducted various studies. His observations were (i) there is a significant relationship between income and group morale, and (ii) there is no positive relationship between group morale and absentism. Significantly, he identified three dimensions of morale, viz., (i) workers' satisfaction; (ii) supervisors' competence in handling men; and (iii) supervisors' competence and effectiveness in performing his duties.

Ganguli T. (1958) observed that group participation in an effective technique to improve the industrial workers' attitude and morale.

In a conference held under the auspices of Indian Institute of Public Administration in January 1959 on "morale in the public services", the following were considered as factors affecting morale:

(1) Recruitment, training policies and working conditions.
(2) Internal relationships, communications and human relations in an organisation.
(3) Attitude of the people towards the public servant.
Q.P. Minocha (1977) in his study maintained that it is determined by eight factors which include (i) job contents, (ii) supervisors, (iii) recruitment and selection policy, (iv) training and placement, (v) promotional policy, (vi) remuneration, (vii) socio-physical working environment, and (viii) image of the company.

RELATIONSHIP OF MORALE TO OTHER ORGANISATIONAL VARIABLES

In a majority of the research studies conducted in this realm, the overlapping meaning of the terms job satisfaction and morale, as applicable to the individual and group respectively have been perceived in coming to rational conclusion, by maintaining that some components apply to both.

MORALE AND PRODUCTIVITY

It was assumed by most in the early days that a positive relationship existed between morale and productivity. The studies of Katz and Heyman (1950) lent support to the same. The result of widely known studies of survey Research Centre and notably the ones by Robert L. Kalm and Nancy Morse shattered this concept because no meaningful co-relation could be found. It was learnt that employees could be quite happy with their job and accomplish nothing. Conversely, the employees could dislike the job and yet be productive.

It was held that if high morale is present, the greater the motivation to work for the common goal and higher the productivity of the group — only if productivity is the group goal.

The reasons for the deviation was analysed by Kalm and Morse and it was found that non-inclusion of the following factors resulted in the same:

1. Pride;
2. Level of aspiration; and
3. The nature of work.
They considered that these factors contribute actually to high morale linked to high productivity and wherein an organisation these have not been catered for, result is bound to disappointing. Police being service-oriented, means of measuring, out-turn of work have not been clearly spelt and similar relationship, if existing, is yet to substantiate by research study.

MORALE AND ABSENTEEISM, JOB TURN OVER

Nancy Morse (1953), Ross and Zander assert in a research study that the level of general satisfaction may be a predictor of the individual's desire to stay or leave the organisation. It was further held that workers whose personal needs are satisfied in the job, are more likely to remain in the organisation. Linguist added to the same by holding that opposite effect is felt is not sufficiently independent, interesting and lacks adequate supervision. Mahoney (1956) found that low morale was significantly related to absences.

MORALE AND AGE, SKILL, LENGTH OF SERVICE

Morale vary according to age and skill of worker. Nancy Morse (1953) provides an excellent discussion of the age and skill level relationship to morale. According to her, the shorter the time the employee has been the more satisfied he is with his salary and his chances for progress in it. Conversely, the older employees are dissatisfied when their expectations of advancements and salary increases are not commensurating. Study also indicated that the higher skills level result in high morale in all age levels.

MORALE AND SIZE OF THE ORGANISATION

Talacchi (1960) considered in a research study that the size of the organisation directly affects the individual through changing both the nature of the job and the nature of inter-personal relations on the job. His results indicated that
a significant negative relationship existed between size of the organisation and morale. Similar findings were reported by Meltzer and Salter.

**MORALE AND PHYSICAL AIDS**

Vivert (1957) reported that when industrial accidents occur, high morale workers attribute the cause of accidents to themselves, while low morale workers attribute the accidents to management's negligence.

**MORALE AND SUPERVISION**

It was found in various research studies that there is positive relationship between morale and the attitudes and behaviour of the supervisor. Where the attitude and behaviour of the supervisor is not conforming to the expectation of workers, the morale is likely to be low.

**POLICE AND GROUP MORALE**

Police administration encompasses two distinct areas, organising the police department and the managerial processes which transpire within the organisation. Organisation refers to structure of the arrangement between or within the various units. Managerial process refer to actions which take place within the organisation. In organising police department, the police administrator's goal should be to integrate and satisfy the goals of the police organisation and the individual goals of the employee.

Studies of various authors did not distinguish morale in police organisations from that existing in other organisations. Conceptually, it was found to be the same like in any other organisation. Different authors, dealing with police supervision have, however, given different and individualistic definitions for group morale but a careful reading of the same would in effect mean the same. Even in
identifying dimensions no new variable was found added to the well-tested nine dimensions of Yuzuk which serves as the basis of our study and whatever that was propounded a new finds adequate catering in one or more dimensions. Emphasis was found varying though in respect of individual dimensions. To quote a few:

William J. Osterlon (196), Professor, Administration of Justice, Osonce College, Canada, in his book 'Police Supervisory Practices' defined morale as the pure enthusiasm of the individual for his group, which inspires him to accomplish the organisation's objectives with proficient and efficient endeavour.

N.F. Iannone (1975), Chairman, Police Science Department, Fullerton College, Los Angeles, U.S.A., defined morale as a state of mind reflecting the degree to which an individual has confidence in the members of his group and in the organisation, believes in its objectives and desires to accomplish them.

Majority of definitions found were more operational in nature throwing in the dimensions.

Allen P. Bristow (1971), Professor, Department of Police Administration, California State College, Los Angeles, U.S.A. maintained that from an operational standpoint, it would seem sufficient to say that high morale is a complex combination of many factors that make people do what the organisation expects them to do. He arrived at three primary elements of police morale.

(1) Material Aspects — which includes such items as salary, leave, fringe benefits, sick leave, uniform allowances and general standard of living.

(2) Psychological Aspects — include the need to feel that one is doing something worthwhile for the society. Some officers derive this feeling from the excitement and adventure connected with the police service, others experience satisfaction through feelings of authority and responsibility, while still others may experience satisfaction through pride in their organisation.
(3) Social Aspects — this include the image of the personnel, that is to say, what the public thinks of him and his department. Also included in social aspects would be the status and recognition of the personnel in the society.

N.F. Iannone (1975) in his operational conception identifies factors such as the quality of leadership to which the group members are exposed, the level of discipline in the organisation, the existence or absence of attainable goals, remuneration received by employees, working conditions and other amenities provided. He further maintained that morale is a fluctuating condition. It exists within individuals and in groups. It may be high and low moving up and down as it is influenced by a variety of stimuli. An ill-conceived act of a supervisor, an intemperate outburst, the application of an unjustified punishment, a display of partiality or the like may adversely affect the morale of the groups or the individual.

A DISTINCT FEATURE OF POLICE MORALE

William J. Osterloh (196__) in his study visualised a distinct nature of police morale, though none else seem to hold similar such view.

According to him, because the police are visible and tangible, they are singled out for onslaught when the actual grievances is elsewhere, not the police. Such vulnerability has a potential bearing on group morale. It was conjectured by him that the real and fancied assault from the outside may lead to higher morale as well. This upsurge will result from the increased cohesiveness in the organisation that comes from being under attack and from being discredited from all around. Consequently pressures to which a police agency is exposed actually may raise the level of morale that ordinarily may be quite low. The hostile attitude all around may actually be compensating for the lack of other dimensions in the police organi-
sation. Thus higher morale may result from the cohesiveness caused by outside attack.

**MEASUREMENT OF POLICE MORALE**

Level of morale in the police can be measured by any one of the survey methods which are in vogue, much in a similar way adopted to determine level of morale in any other organisation. The commonly adopted methods are observation method, objective surveys, descriptive surveys, interviewing method and record keeping. The prevalent one, of course, is objective surveys.

**OBSERVATION METHOD**

Close observation of certain trails among the personnel within an organisation may indicate their state of morale. Excessive and unwarranted use of sick leave is usually a prime indicator of low morale. Similarly high turnover rate of personnel might very indicate low morale as identified by William, B. Mellicos (1965).

General deterioration of the appearance like neglect of conditions of uniforms may foretell falling state of morale. Careless treatment of equipment, careless report writing, increasing bickering and arguments among personnel, circulation of rumours are some surer signs.

William R. Spriegel (1957) in support of the observation method proceeded to propound that when the following conditions exist, one can almost be sure that morale within the organisation will be high:

1. Objectives are well-known to all personnel
2. Individuals are treated fairly in disciplinary actions
3. Group enjoys reasonable sense of security
4. The training within the group is high
5. Recognition is granted to accomplishments
6. Rumours are eliminated promptly
7. Maximum information on problems is provided to all levels
8. Supervisors display strong leadership
9. Complete delegation of authority commensurate with responsibility
10. Participation of lower level employees in decision-making.
William J. Osterloh visualises that the field supervisor does not have to be too skilled to diagnose signs of plummeting morale. An increase in cynicism growing suspicions loss of humour a decrease in spontaneous response to duty are all symptoms of sagging morale. If the supervisor listens and looks carefully the evidence will be unmistakable.

**OBJECTIVE SURVEY**

The prevalent method of determining the level of morale within police organisation is to conduct a survey of its members by questionnaire.

One such survey recently conducted by the International Association of Chiefs of Police, Field Services Division, attempted to determine the feeling of police personnel with respect to following subject areas:

1. General feelings about the department
2. Effectiveness of departmental operations
3. Opportunity for advancement
4. Working conditions and attitudes towards police work
5. Recognition and status in the department
6. Supervision and relationships with supervisors
7. Performance evaluations
8. Workload and its distribution
9. Downward communications
10. Upward communications
11. Employee relationships
12. Training
13. Selection techniques

In this survey, it was possible to compare the answers or opinions of those officers responding with their rank in the department and the number of years they had been with the department. It was possible to determine comparatively the feelings of the men with respect to the various morale problems that were revealed by
unit, age and rank. Conclusive statements were not possible in this study about the ranking of elements causing low or high morale although the factors were accepted as indicators of morale. However, it was noticed that the ratings given often.

**FACTORS AFFECTING POLICE MORALE**

In a broad framework morale may be measured to quote N. F. Iannone by factors such as quality or quantity of work, the rate of turn over, the number of disciplinary cases, the number of grievances, the amount of absenteeism, acts of disloyalty to the organisation, a sharp increase in bickering among its members and the like; but the most obvious indicator that morale is slumping is a general deterioration in the appearance of the personnel, which is usually a gauge of organisational pride.

William J. Osterloh, in his book on 'Police Supervisory Practices' maintain that the following factors as contributing for good morale:-

1. Clear channel of communication both upward and downward.
2. Recognition of good work done
3. Sense of security
4. Performance evaluation
5. Effective leadership and adequate supervision
6. Training
7. Fairness in dealing with personnel
8. Good physical aids; and

He considers that the primary prescription formulate is absolute fairness in dealing with subordinates and recognition of work well done. As for leadership, he holds that morale is built up when the men see the supervisor as true bridge to command i.e., the top.
Relying upon a number of research studies conducted by Alien P. Bristow, identified the following factors as the most significant which materially affect morals:

1. Pay and working conditions
2. Job satisfaction
3. Recognition
4. Court decisions
5. Promotional and advancement opportunities
6. Internal discipline systems
7. Supervision and leadership.

A great many authors have held that leadership would probably weigh more heavily than any other variable.

In the recent agitation of policemen, salary and working conditions were important issues and these probably are some of the causes of dissatisfaction, but whether these factors could be motivating factors, or whether policemen really agitated for their status are important issues for empirical study. The present study as already indicated would explore the application of two-factor theory in the context of subordinate ranks of Indian Police.