Summary
SUMMARY

After Industrial Revolution series of approaches appeared highlighting the interest in improving production but Frederick W. Taylor was first to think about increasing human efficiency in the late 19th and 20th century. He is called to be the "father of scientific management". Taylor who had started his career as a mechanic and by virtue of his skill and capabilities he reached the position of an engineer and retired as a consulting engineer in the Bethlehem Steel Plant U.S.A.

During the end of the last decade of 19th century Taylor formulated certain principles viz., scientific management principles and he was confident that if these principles are applied then human efficiency at work can be tremendously increased. However, after the successful experimentation, he established the fact that human efficiency can be increased if the scientific management principles could have been properly taken care of Taylor's approach to enhance human efficiency at work was management centered. Later, Elton Mayo on the basis of his observation and findings led a movement in association with Roethlisberg and Dickson, called 'Human Relation Movement' focusing on the cravings for the satisfaction of social needs of people at work. This movement started in the mid 1920's and was at its peak during 1930's to 1950's and as a result the history of industrial psychology took turn from management oriented approach (Taylor, 1903) to employee oriented approach (Mayo, Roethlisberg, Dickson, 1930s).
Work on human motivation started from the early 1940's though job satisfaction studies started in 1935. Hoppock coined the term job satisfaction and hence he was considered as pioneer of job satisfaction studies. Usually, people use the term satisfaction and motivation interchangeable, however, there is an operational difference between these two concepts.

After the pioneering work of Hoppock a number of job satisfaction theories appeared. Among these theories Maslowian need hierarchy theory of motivation and satisfaction is one of the early theories which was propounded in 1943 as a general theory of human motivation and was, later on, applied as the theory of job motivation and satisfaction in 1954. Although a number of other job satisfaction and motivation theories have been proposed by different researchers but Maslow's need hierarchy theory occupied prime importance among the various theories of motivation. The study of motivation is pre-requisite for understanding human behaviour as motivation is one of the most important factor affecting human behaviour. In fact the level of performance of an individual is a function of motivation, hence, motivation or will to work is a significant aspect determining work related behaviour and outcome.

Psychologist generally agree that motivation is a goal directed behaviour which revolves around the desire for need satisfaction. Motivation consists of the three interacting and interdependent elements namely needs, drives and goals. Needs are defined as something that
individual do not have and which creates a state of dissonance or tension
in the individual. As it is not a pleasant feeling which one wants to reduce.
Need, thus, becomes the drive force for human action. Krech, Crutchfield
and Ballachy (1962) defined need as "the initiating and sustaining force of
behaviour". According to Norman Maire (1959) a need may be defined as
"a condition requiring the supply of relief", the lack of anything requisite,
desired or useful". In the opinion of Kolasa (1978) "A need is a lack or
deficit of something within the system or organism. Need can also be
defined as a personal, unfulfilled vacancy that determines and organises all
mental processes and all behaviour in the direction of its attainment.

There are various ways to classify needs. According to one
system needs may be classified into following classes :

(1) Basic physiological needs called primary needs.

(2) Social and psychological needs called secondary needs.

In the light of the above contentions and descriptions, it is
imperative to point out that need-fulfilment is necessary for good
performance and effective human actions as needs create tension in human
organism and in order to reduce tension individuals' take action to achieve
desired goal. Hence, motivation is considered to be the goal-directed
behaviour. It is also important to mention here that motivation is an
outcome of need deficiency, hence, intensity of needs determines
motivational level. It is, indeed, true that satisfaction of needs which are
of significant importance are likely to develop positive attitude towards
work and thus reveals greater satisfaction with it. However, the
phenomenon of satisfaction with work can only be understood in its
totality. An individual constantly makes adjustment to satisfy his needs.
Therefore it is essential to study his needs both in and outside the work
situations, for satisfaction or dissatisfaction of which leads to the
development of certain attitudes to life and work, and are "carried over"
from life to work and vice-versa.

Satisfaction or non-satisfaction is equally important for making
adjustments at the work situation. Commenting upon this phenomenon
Lehner and Kube (1956) observes, "People who come to vocational
counselling problems often have difficulties that lie primarily in other
areas of living but which manifest themselves also in work." However,
overall satisfaction in life is associated with the satisfaction of individuals
need pattern. The satisfaction of human needs may be blocked by certain
factors both at work situation as well as outside it creating a state of
tension in the individual hence he constantly makes efforts to satisfy these
needs. If the individual feels that the efforts made by him led to desired
reward, he feel satisfied. But when the individual feels that his efforts to
satisfy his needs have been blocked, then a state of disequilibrium will
prevail and he will feel dissatisfied.

Thus it may be stated that gratification of human needs generate
satisfaction and non-gratification generates dissatisfaction for the
individual. Since motivation is a complex phenomenon, major motivational
Theories have been developed which are categorised as:

1. Content of need theories
2. Cognitive or process theories
3. Reinforcement theories

The content theories basically look at the motives or needs in individuals that influence behaviour. Maslow, Aldeofe, Murray, McClelland and White are some of the scholars who have made significant contributions to this approach. Attempts have been made in cognitive theories to concentrate on individuals thinking which is used to decide whether or not to behave in a certain way. There are three major cognitive theories namely expectance, equity and goal setting theories that explain work motivation, Adams, Vroom and Porter & Lawler have made some important contribution in the development of these theories. Reinforcement theories emphasized that behaviour of an individual can be moulded, shaped, changed or eliminated by changing the stimuli in people's environment.

Among these theories Maslowian need hierarchy theory of motivation and satisfaction is one of the early theories which was propounded in (1943) as a general theory of human motivation and this was later applied as the theory of job motivation and satisfaction in (1954). Although a number of other job satisfaction and motivation theories have been proposed by different researches, however, Maslow's need hierarchy theory occupies prime importance among the various theories. Maslow
developed five level of need hierarchy.

(1) Physiological Needs
(2) Security Needs
(3) Social Needs
(4) Ego Need or self Esteem
(5) Self-actualization Needs

Though, Maslow's need hierarchy theory has stimulated thinking about the various needs that individuals have, but it has some serious shortcomings too. Researches suggest that needs may cluster into two or three categories, rather than five and more over the hierarchy of needs. As a result of the criticisms against Maslow's hierarchy of need theory, Alderfer proposed an alternative theory known as ERG theory, identifying three groups of needs-existence, relatedness and growth. Thus following the ERG theory, it can be predicted that all the three needs would convey in terms of their perceived importance, and this may be good for both groups of employees. Beside ERG theory another need hierarchy theory has been proposed by Herzberg (1957) who conducted motivational study on about 200 accountants and engineers employed by firms in and around Pittsburgh. He used the critical incident method for obtaining data. The subjects were asked two question (1) when did you feel particularly good about your job - what turned you on, and (2) when did you feel exceptionally bad about your job - what turned you off?
Tabulating these reported good and bad feelings, Herzberg concluded that job satisfiers are related to job content and that job dissatisfiers are related to job context. Herzberg called the satisfiers as motivators and dissatisfiers as hygiene factors. This theory of motivation is also known as two-factor theory.

Although Herzberg's two-factor theory remains a very popular explanation of work motivation but when researchers deviated from the critical incident methodology used by Herzberg, they do not get two factors. There seems to be job factors that lead to both satisfaction and dissatisfaction. These findings indicate that a strict interpretation of the two-factor theory is not warranted.

Murray (1938) developed a list of 28 needs that human beings have among these are the needs for achievement, affiliation, dominance, aggression, dependence, and nurturance. Murray argued that our needs are mostly acquired in life rather than inherited, and needs can be activated or made to manifest themselves by introduction appropriate in the environment.

The above theories are well known but, unfortunately they have not been help up well under close examination. There are some contemporary theories other than the above-mentioned theories. McCelland (1951, 1961) a Harvard psychologist has proposed that there are three major relevant needs in work situation such as the need for achievement, the need for power, and the need for affiliation.
White (1959, 1965) identified the need for effectance as a powerful need. This concept describes our inborn drive to explore and gain mastery over our own immediate environment. Need effectance is manifest even in babies who constantly try to explore their small world. They reach out for things, through crawling and take their first step and feel happy and their explorations. Such explorations of our environment continue throughout our lives. In interacting with the environment constantly, human being experience both successful and failure experiences, and gain varying degrees of mastery over the environment. A successful experience over one's life time, offers one a sense of confidence in his or her own competence. White considered this confidence as a powerful motivator to interact more with the environment so as to accumulate more success experience and feel confident about our competence. White called this confidence as "sense of competence."

Work is a social reality and social expectation to which men seem to conform that provide status to the individual but also bind him to the society. Several authors have stressed the significance of occupations as a source of need satisfaction. According to Roe (1956) "Occupations as a source of need satisfaction are of extreme importance in our culture. It may be that occupations have become so important in our culture just because so many needs are so well satisfied by them."

In order to understand the problem of employees indifference to their work, it is necessary to study the culture of organization and the
expectations that govern the relationship between the individual and the organization.

Organizations are created to achieve certain objectives through a collectivity termed as groups. The achievement of organizational objectives is possible only through team effort. Work is to be sequentialized and managed by man. In most cases these are hierarchical arrangement of position in an organization and each position is being managed by a human being.

According to Herskovits, (1955) culture is the man-made part of the environment. Since 1970's the term "culture" has been increasingly used in studies of organizational behaviour because of the growing realization among organizational scientists and management consultants that the culture of an organization has much influence or organizational effectiveness. This rises interest in researchers to study on organizational culture.

Beside sociology and anthropology, social psychology has played an important role on the development of the study of organizational culture. Many organizational scholars e.g. Festinger (1957), Kelley (1977) have been influenced by the tradition in psychology of studying the disjunction between expressed intention and observed behaviour. The second significant line of social psychology for he study of organizational culture has been study or organizational climate (Forchand and Gilmer, 1964, Tangiuri, 1968). Studies on climate have been sometimes undistinguishable from some current studies of organizational culture.
A comprehensive pragmatic definition of organizational culture is provided by Schein (1984) as "culture is a pattern of basic assumption invented discovered, or developed by a given group as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration—that has worked well enough to be considered valid and therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think and feel in relation to those problems."

As the interest in organizational climate began to wane, behavioural scientists began investigating organizational culture. Many issues discussed in terms of organizational climate are being discussed by culture researchers. According to Uimstot (1984) one way to measure the organizational culture, at least in part is by evaluating its organizational climate which consists of the way people perceive their organizational environment. Robbions (1984) proposed that culture "is a relatively uniform perception held by the organization, it is a descriptive concept, and it has common and stable characteristics that make it possible to distinguish one organization from another." According to Robbins, first organizational culture is a perception, but it exists in the organization not in the individual. As a result, individuals with different backgrounds or at different levels in the organization tend to describe the organization's culture in similar terms. They perceive a unique set of characteristics that are substantially organization-specific. Second, organizational culture is a descriptive term. It depends on how members perceive the organization, whether they like it or not, finally, what is culture, is a perception about
the dynamically persisting working conditions and the environment, generally, generated by the supervisory behaviour.

To capture the essence of an organization's culture there are ten primary characteristics highlighted by Robbins (1990). They are - (1) Member identity, (2) Group emphasis, (3) People focus, (4) Unit integration, (5) Control, (6) Risk tolerance, (7) Reward criteria, (8) Conflict tolerance, (9) Means-end orientation, and (10) Open system focus.

Robbins has derived these characteristics from the work of Hofstede et al. (1990) and O'Reilly (1991).

Generally, people think that an organization has a uniform culture. According to the concept of anthropology, it is more accurate to treat organization "as if" they had a uniform culture. According to Morey and Luthans (1985). "All organizations 'have' culture in the sense that they are embedded in specific societal cultures and are part of them." According to this view organization culture is commonly perceived by the organization members. Every one share this perception at different degree. As a result, there is dominant as well as subculture in an organization. If an organization has no dominant culture and is composed of number of subculture then the value of organizational culture as an independent variable would be lessened.

An organization may have strong as well as weak culture but it is very difficult to differentiate between strong culture and weak culture. In
words of Wiener (1988) "a strong culture is characterized by the organization's core values being both intensely held and widely shared". The more members accept the core values and greater they are committed to those values, the stronger will be the culture. Parallel to this definition strong culture has greater influence on the behaviour of its member than will a weak culture. The specific result of a strong culture should be low employee turnover.

Saffold (1988) put forward the idea that cultural factors may be linked to exceptional level of performance. Barney (1986) and Gordon & Tomaso (1992) found that culture was associated with better performance. As soon as the organizational culture started and begins to develop new employees who are not adjustable to this culture because of their non familiarity with the organization expectations, need help of adapt this culture. This adaptation process is called socialization. The process of socialization is made up of three stages Pre-arrival, encounter, and metamorphosis. These three stages have a great impact on the new employee's work productivity, commitment to the organizations objectives and make decision to stay with the organization.

Like organizational culture, dependence proneness, a personality dimension, is also important to be studied in relation to need satisfaction.

Rapid progress generally requires, besides capital, know-how, and conductive institutions, a fair sized band of imaginative entrepreneurs who may challenge the old disfunctional values and practices and who may
explore, and accept new possibilities and actively manipulate the environment in a pragmatic fashion and have sense of security. Unfortunately, as observed by Rath (1965) and Sinha (1968) Indian people do not seem to respond to measures directed to improve their living conditions. They not only refuse to challenge the old disfunctional values and practices, and to take the initiative to adopt new ways which are conductive to the economic growth but also fail to utilize the opportunities extended to them. This apathy has been a continuing worry in the minds of planners and social scientists. To explain it, a number of psychological constructs have been advanced. The one which seems to quite revealing is the dependence proneness. Person who show dependence and satisfy the vanity of those who are in authority have less adjustment problems as compared to those who challenges the authority (Pandey and Sinha, 1968).

Dependence proneness is operationally defined as a motivational habit of over dependence on others in situations in which dependence is not necessarily called for. It is not a clever strategy to win over a situation nor a means to acheive some useful purpose rather it is a tendency or an inner inclination to run to others without exhausting one's own resources. It may express itself in one or more ways such as (a) to seek support, advice and/or order from others, (b) to confide with others uncritically (c) desires to be encouraged, helped and/or protected by others. Negatively, it may be recognized in behaviours and inclinations such as (a) lacking initiative (b) lacking independent judgement or weak judgement, (c) try to
avoid risk taking behaviour, (d) having an escape behaviour, (e) discouraged easily and (f) refusing or displacing responsibility for an unfavourable outcome.

Sinha (1968) observed that dependence proneness involves excessive amount of dependency which propels a person to seek advice, support and affection from others in situation where it may not be necessarily required. In subsequent study, Sinha and Pandey (1972) have reported that a high dependent - prone person hesitates, asks for all kinds of information and communications. He is further described as one who is anxious, fatalist, impractical and traditional. These characteristics of dependent prone persons suggest that they are cognitively less developed than their counterparts.

A person who happens to have developed such a disposition would run to others for support, suggestions, and help even if confronted with a relatively minor problem. He would be a person who needs frequent encouragements and emotional supports and feels reluctant to take initiative of independent judgements and actions. Rather, demanding situations make him uncomfortable so much so that he would avoid making decisions. If somehow a decision is made, he looks for a feedback and if a positive one would not seem coming, he would tend to displace responsibility for the outcome to someone else. It may also be believed, by stretching the experimental evidences regarding the correlates of dependency behaviour, that a dependence prone person is likely to be
suggestible (Jakubczak & Walters, 1959) conforming (Garai, 1960), Passive (League & Jackson, 1961), weak in judgement and self-concept (Elliot, 1960). Moreover, such a person leans on heavily for emotional support and advice, and would experience pleasure in being considered loyal to friends and to authority. He is a person who is discouraged easily, and hence has got greater need of being encouraged, helped and protected.

Another consideration that motivated the present researcher to undertake the present investigation is the growing importance of cognitive-flexibility. It seems cognitive rigidity-flexibility a personality variable, plays crucial role in the perceived satisfaction of needs.

The term rigidity is a personality trait. Persons suffering from such trait are engrossed in the interest and values primarily suited to their own thoughts, feelings and ideas. They think about the future and adhere to values of their own standard and plan for future but hesitate to reach a final decision. Such people suffer from lack of freedom in response and stop the process form starting. They will feel discomfort when faced with complex and uncertain situations, because they cannot understand them. In such situation, they show the tendency to 'retreat' rather than to attempt, to understand or cope with situations effectively.

According to Sheila (1959) the term rigidity has been used widely to refer to the ways of thinking and behaving which are not responsive enough to change in the demands. It has grown out of experimental studies on phenomena like preservation and mental inertia.
Rigidity has been defined by different investigators in different ways but resistance to change or the tendency to perserve in thinking and responses remains the basis features of all the definitions.

Rokeach (1948) defined it as "the inability to change one's set when the objective conditions demand it". Warner (1946) defined rigidity as lack of variability of response'. However Cattell (1949) has given one of the best definition. He described disposition rigidity as "the difficulty with which old established habits may be changed in the presence of new demand".

Rigidity has been classified by some investigators into different types. Cattell (1949) distinguished it into two types: Process rigidity and structural rigidity. Goldstein (1943) identified two kinds of rigidity called 'primary' and 'secondary'. Primary rigidity is independent of an impairment of higher mental processes. It is a basic lack of ability to change from one 'set' to another, i.e. primary rigidity refers to the inability of a person to change from one chain of thought to another. The secondary rigidity, on the other hand, refers to a preference of making incorrect response to making no response at all by a person who finds himself in a difficult situation. Rigidity here is a secondary phenomena, it is the means to escape from a frustrating situation but this rigidity appears only if the task is too difficult.

Piaget (1968) has explained rigidity in terms of his cognitive development theory of personality. The process of adaptation which is the
basic process in his theory, consists of assimilation and accommodation as its components. In assimilation an individual's cognitive structure does not change as a function of experience, whereas in accommodation his cognitive structure does not change as a function of experience; Piaget has also made a sharp distinction among rigid, labile and flexible cognitive functionings. The cognitive functioning in a rigid person is dominated by assimilatory tendency. Such a person finds it difficult to change himself and to benefit from new experiences. A labile person on the other hand, is so much changeable that it is difficult to predict any consistency in his behaviour. A flexible individual responses to new information and new experiences without losing his stability and identity.

In view of the afore-mentioned exhaustive descriptions, it is quite clear that the present endeavour on the problem entitled, "Influence of organization culture, dependence proneness, and rigidity-flexibility on need satisfaction" was quite relevent as need satisfaction especially, of people at work in an organizaiton has always been a strong craving. The present work in its quest, had examined the influence of predictors (independent variables) viz. organizational culture, dependence proneness and rigidity-flexibility on the criterion variable viz. need-satisfaction. Thus, the aim was to explore whether or not these important variable have any impact on need satisfaction of the employees. The findings of the present study have definitely filled the void of knowledge in the organizational behaviour and in turn will help in giving suggestions to improve organizational strategy for improving organizational effectiveness.
for its growth and development. Moreover, this has also been very significant as employees need satisfaction has very important role in the maximum utilization of human resources as well as attaining overall organizational efficiency.

The purpose of the present study was to investigate the influence of organizational culture, dependence proneness and rigidity flexibility on need-satisfaction.

To be more specific the study was designed to answer the following questions.

(1) Does organizational culture influence need-satisfaction?
(2) Does dependence-proneness influence need-satisfaction?
(3) Does rigidity-flexibility influence need-satisfaction?
(4) Is there any interactional effect of organizational culture and dependence-proneness on need-satisfaction?
(5) Is there any interactional effect of organizational culture and rigidity flexibility on need-satisfaction?
(6) Is there any interactional effect of dependence proneness and rigidity flexibility on need satisfaction?
(7) Is there any interactional effect of organizational culture, dependence proneness and rigidity-flexibility on need-satisfaction?
Design of the Study:

In order to answer the above questions, a 2x2x2 factorial design, in which two personality variables (ie dependence proneness and rigidity flexibility) and one environmental variable (ie organizational culture) each varying in two ways was used in the present study. The two values of one personality variable i.e. rigidity flexibility were (a) rigid and (b) flexible and the two values of dependence proneness were (a) dependent prone and (b) independent. The organizational culture was varied in two ways by having (a) healthy culture and (b) poor culture. Thus there were eight groups of subjects. There were forty subjects in each group. The eight groups are given below.

(1) Rigid dependent prone under healthy organizational culture.
(2) Rigid dependent prone under poor organizational culture.
(3) Rigid independent under healthy organizational culture.
(4) Rigid independent under poor organizational culture.
(5) Flexible dependent prone under healthy organizational culture.
(6) Flexible dependent prone under poor organizational culture.
(7) Flexible independent under healthy organizational culture.
(8) Flexible independent under poor organizational culture.

Following tools were used in the present study.

Need satisfaction Scale:

To measure employee's need-satisfaction, Porter's (1961) need-satisfaction scale was used (see Appendix II). This scale consisted of
fifteen items based on five dimensions viz. security need, social need, esteem needs, need for autonomy and self-actualization need. The scale has a 5-point response category ranging from "strongly agree" (ie, 5) to "strongly disagree" (ie. 1). It is a widely accepted and commonly used scale, which is reported to be highly standardised as its reliability and validity are significantly quite high.

**Dependence Proneness Scale (D.P.S.):**

Dependence proneness was measured with the help of a scale developed by Sinha (1968). It is a 5 point self rating scale having 20 items, the scale ranging from quite true (ie. 5) to not at all true (ie. 1) with undecided (ie. 3) in the middle. The score range is possible from 20 to 100. In this system of scoring the larger the score, the greater is the degree of dependence proneness.

**The Rigidity Scale (G.S.R.)**

The Gaugh-Sanford Rigidity Scale (1952) which is a 22 items questionnaire was used in the study for measuring rigidity. The scale is widely used in psychological studies as a measure of rigidity and is included in the California Psychological Inventory, where it is labelled as Fx (flexibility) scale.

The scale was translated into simple Hindi (Appendix IV ) so that it could be understood easily by the subjects. Utmost care was taken to ensure that the translated version reflected truly the sense present in the
original version of the scale. Translation of each item was critically examined by three senior teachers of psychology. Besides, a senior teacher of Hindi, who was well proficient in Urdu and English as well, was also consulted during the process of translation of the scale where a difficult hindi word had to be used, its Urdu equivalent written in Devnagri script was provided within brackets. This was done to ensure that the sense implied in each question was correctly understood by these subjects also whose mother tongue was urdu.

The split half reliability of the translated version of the scale was .74 (corrected, N=50), and the scale correlated significantly with California F-scale (r = 58, N = 50) with which it was conceptually related.

Organizational Culture Scale:

An organizational culture scale was developed by Nasheed Imteyaz (2000) in order to measure the effects of organizational culture. The scale was based on twelve dimensions namely: fairness, mutual trust, openness, organizational climate, team spirit, organizational environment autonomy, work values, organisational belongingness, confrontation proaction and organizational loyalty. The organizational culture scale is a 5-point response category. To confirm the reliability/dependability of device, split-half reliability was calculated and reliability coefficient was r = .89 which confirms high reliability. Further, congruent validity was calculated to check the validity of the scale and validity coefficient was r = .76 which also indicate that the test is highly valid. Therefore organizational culture scale was confirmed as standardised scale.
Need-satisfaction scale developed by Porter (1961) was administered on all the eight groups namely - Rigid dependent prone under healthy organizational culture, Rigid dependent prone under poor organizational culture, rigid independent under healthy organizational culture, rigid independent under poor organizational culture, flexible dependent prone under healthy organizational culture, flexible dependent prone under poor organizational culture, flexible independent under healthy organizational culture, and flexible independent under poor organizational culture. Each groups consisted of 40 subjects.

The test was administered group wise with the following instructions.

This scale consists of few statements each statement is followed by five alternative responses namely (i) strong disagreement, (ii) disagreement, (iii) neutral response, (iv) agreement, (v) strong agreement. You are requested to read each statement carefully and indicate the extent to which each aspect IS PRESENT in your job. Assign "5" to the job aspect which is present in the maximum degree and "1" to the aspect which is present in minimum degree in your job. So please rate each item on 5-point scale from maximum "5" to minimum "1". It is important to note that you have to answer each statement. I assure you that your answer would be kept secret. Please read the instruction carefully given on the cover page of the scale. Do you understand?

As soon as the subjects finished their task, the test was collected from them and scoring was done. The data, thus, obtained were tabulated
Keeping in view the objective of the present research, appropriate statistical technique i.e. analysis of variance was used to draw necessary inferences. Thus F-ratios were calculated for the variation of each independent variable and also for any possible interaction between two or more than two independent variables.

The main findings of the present research are: (1) subjects working under healthy organizational culture and poor organizational culture differ with respect to their need satisfaction; (2) dependent prone and independent prone subjects do not differ with respect to their need satisfaction; (3) rigid and flexible subjects do not differ with respect to their need satisfaction; (4) There is no interactional effect of organizational culture and dependence proneness on degree of need satisfaction; (5) there is an interactional effect of organizational culture and rigidity flexibility on the degree of need satisfaction; (6) there is an interactional effect of dependence proneness and rigidity flexibility on the degree of need-satisfaction and (7) there is no interactional effect among organizational culture, dependence proneness and rigidity flexibility on the degree of need-satisfaction.

The first finding of the present study, i.e. subject working under healthy and poor organizational cultures differ with respect to their need-satisfaction, is too obvious to explain. This finding of the present research is what the researcher expect it. Numerous studies have shown that
organizational culture influences need satisfaction or job satisfaction. It has been observed that employees differ with respect to their job satisfaction depending on whether organizational climate of any organization is democratic or is autocratic. Kumar and Bohra (1979), for instance, have demonstrated that employees who perceived the organizational climate as democratic, they reported higher job satisfaction than those employees who perceived organizational climate as autocratic.

Instead of using the terms healthy and poor culture, Wiener (1988) has used the terms strong culture and weak culture. The first finding of our research provides empirical support to the viewpoint expressed by Wiener. Moreover, the author of the present research firmly believes that healthy organizational culture is one in which (1) employees interact with each other, use common language; (2) standards of behaviour exist; (3) employees share major values advocated by the organization; (4) there are clearcut policies to deal with employees and customers; (5) rules of the organization are strictly adhered to and (6) there is a democratic atmosphere in the organization. A poor organizational culture, on the other hand, is one which has opposite characteristics of a healthy organizational culture as mentioned above. In view of these contrasting characteristics of healthy and poor organizational cultures, it is reasonable and logical to assume that employees working under healthy organisational culture are likely to be more satisfied than those who are working under poor organizational culture. The first finding of our research provides empirical evidence to this assumption. The first finding of the present research i.e.
organizational culture has significant effect on need-satisfaction, received indirect support from numerous researchers. It has been demonstrated by large number of investigators that there is negative co-relation between organizational climate and need-satisfaction. In other words it has been shown that when needs are diprived of, the perception of organizational climate becomes negative (Subha & Anantharaman, 1981; Sen, 1981; Rajendran, 1987; Srivastava, 1994; Petty et al, 1995).

Srivastava & Pratap (1984) reported a significant positive relationship between the overall organizational climate and job satisfaction. Job satisfaction was also found related to various individual dimensions of organizational climate such as leadership, communication, interaction influence in decision making goal-setting and control.

Spector (1982), (1986), observed that autonomy and participation are positively related to general satisfaction and satisfaction with work, pay, supervision, co-workers, promotion, and growth. In one of their studies Weatherly, & Beach (1998) found that the greater the difference between S's assessments of an organization's culture as they perceived it to be now and as they thought it actually ought to be, the less satisfied they reported themselves to be with their jobs. Most recently Patel (1999) reported that employees of nationalized bank exhibited higher job satisfaction than employees of co-operative bank. These findings, obtained by numerous researchers, are in agreement either directly or indirectly with the first finding of the present study.
A survey of literature has revealed that three models have been developed to explain the relationship between job perception and job satisfaction. First model, based on job characteristics theory and developed by Hackman and Lawler (1971), asserts that job perception leads to job satisfaction. Second model based on social information theory and developed by Salanick and Pfeffer (1978), on the other hand, advocates that job satisfaction leads to job perception. Third model specifies a reciprocal relationship between perception and satisfaction was developed by Mathien, Hofman and Farr (1993). The first finding of the present research fits in the third model. Our finding under discussion provides empirical support to this model of job satisfaction.

The second finding of the present study i.e. independent and dependent prone subjects do not differ with respect to their need satisfaction, is not in expected direction. Keeping in view of the personality characteristics of dependent prone individuals it was assumed that dependent prone subjects would show greater need satisfaction than independent subjects. As mentioned elsewhere dependence proneness is a motivational habit of over dependence on others in situations in which dependence is not necessarily called for. It is a tendency or an inner inclination to run to others without exhausting one's own resources. It may express itself in one or more ways such as (a) to seek support, advice, and/or order from others, (b) to confide with others uncritically, (c) desires to be encouraged, helped and/or protected by others. Negatively, it may be recognised in behaviours and inclination such as (a) lacking initiative(b)
lacking independent judgement or weak judgement, (c) try to avoid risk
taking behaviour (d) having an escape behaviour, (e) discouraged easily and
(f) refusing or displacing responsibility for an unfavourable outcome.
Moreover it has been found that a dependence prone person is likely to be
suggestible (Jakubezak & Walters, 1959) conforming (Garai, 1960),
passive (League & Jackson, 1961), weak in judgement and self-concept
(Elliot, 1960). Individuals having these characteristics are likely to
perceive greater need satisfaction as compared to those who do not have
these characteristics. The second finding of the present research does not
confirm this assumption.

Though dependent prone and Independent subjects do not differ
significantly, there is however a trend showing greater need satisfaction
among dependent prone subjects than among independent subjects. This
trend is not statistically significant but provides confirmation, though a
weak one, to our assumption. Looking at the data of our research it may be
extracted that if the study is carried out on much larger sample the existing
trend may become statistically significant. However at present no
convincing explanation maybe provided except that the present finding is
in consonance with the findings obtained by Singh & Sengupta (1997).
These researchers administered Sinha's (1968) dependence proneness scale
on Indian students studying at Indian Institute of Management of Calcutta
with the objective to examine the dependence proneness of these subjects.
They found that their subjects have initiativeness and independent decision
making behavioural patterns. Thus the second finding of the present
research leaves no option except to assume that the sample of the present study might not be fairly categorized into dependent prone and independent subjects.

The third finding of the present research i.e. Rigid and flexible subjects do not differ with respect to need satisfaction, is not consistent with the existing findings (Pritichard and Karasick, 1973; Deepa, 1996). Pritichard and Karasick (1973) reported a positive correlation between flexibility and job-satisfaction. Whereas Deepa (1996) found lower satisfaction among rigid group. Turning our attention to Table II C, it may be observed that rigid group of subject obtained slightly higher mean score on need-satisfaction scale than their counterpart flexible group of subjects. Though the difference is not statistically significant, there is, however, a trend to the effect that rigid subjects are more satisfied than flexible subject. This trend of the present research is contrary to what other researchers have found. However this trend throws a light on new personality dimension of rigid subjects. We believe rigid subjects are insecure individuals (Ramamurti and Gnanakannan, 1972) and therefore they are more likely to be satisfied easily with smallest amount of incentive. This assumption is fully endorsed by existing trend of the present research. This trend motivates the authors of the present research to undertake a more comprehensive study in this area of knowledge using a much larger sample of subjects so that a new theoretical framework may be worked out.
Turning our attention to other findings of the present research, to find that two interactional effects i.e. interaction between organizational culture and dependence proneness, and among organizational culture, dependence proneness and rigidity flexibility are insignificant, whereas interaction between organizational culture and rigidity-flexibility, and interaction between dependence proneness and rigidity flexibility are significant.

The first insignificant interactional effect of organizational culture and dependence proneness suggests that the need-satisfaction scores under healthy and poor organizational culture are independent of dependence proneness - independent proneness of the subjects. The findings reveals that though organizational culture influences the degree of need-satisfaction in a significant way when considered separately but when it is combined with dependence proneness, its interaction becomes insignificant.

Similarly the second insignificant interactional effect of organizational culture, dependence proneness and rigidity-flexibility makes it crystal clear that need-satisfaction score under healthy and poor culture are independent of dependence proneness and rigidity-flexibility of the subjects. The finding leads us to conclude that though organizational culture influences degree of need satisfaction in a significant way when considered separately, but when it is combined with dependence-proneness and rigidity flexibility, its interaction becomes insignificant.
So far as significant interactional effect of organizational culture and rigidity-flexibility is concerned, it suggests that the need satisfaction scores under healthy and poor culture are not independent of the personality dimensions i.e. rigid flexible, of the subjects rather than need-satisfaction scores of the subjects are the product of the organizational culture and rigidity flexibility.

Similarly second significant interactional effect of dependence-proneness and rigidity flexibility suggests that the need satisfaction scores of dependent prone and independent prone subjects are not independent of their rigidity flexibility type rather the need satisfaction score of the subjects are the product of dependence proneness and rigidity flexibility.

The overall findings of the present research revealed that among three independent variables namely organizational culture, dependence-proneness, and rigidity flexibility, only organizational culture was found to have an influence on need satisfaction of employees.

So far as impact of organizational culture is concerned it is well documented that organization culture has a strong influence on employee's behaviour. It has been shown that employees develop subjective perception of the organization based on such factors as degree of group emphasis support of people, risk tolerance and management's willingness to tolerate conflict. This overall perception in fact constitute what we called organization's culture. Thus employee's satisfaction or dissatisfaction depends to a larger extent whether they have formed favourable or
unfavourable perceptions of the organization. According to Hellriegel and Slocum (1974) there is strong relationship between culture and satisfaction but this relationship is moderated by individual differences. It has been demonstrated that there will be highest satisfaction if there is congruence between employee's needs and culture. For instance if employees have a high need for achievement and autonomy, they will derive maximum satisfaction in those organisations which emphasise individual tasks, have loose supervision and reward people for high achievement.

The subjects of the present study who were having favourable perception of the organization were found satisfied where as those having unfavourable perception of their organizational culture were found dissatisfied. However the influence of organizational culture on need satisfaction was moderated by individual differences in the dimension of dependence proneness and rigidity flexibility. Our conclusion, therefore, is that job satisfaction often varies as a result of employee's perception of the organization culture.

The findings of the present research do not show any differential effect of dependence proneness and rigidity-flexibility on need satisfaction. However these personality variables may play crucial role in cultivating a ground for a change in a organization's culture.

As a matter of fact once an organization is well established its dominant culture too becomes stable and permanent. In other words strong
cultures are particularly resistant to change because employees of that organization become so committed to them. However if a given culture, overtime, becomes appropriate to an organization and a handicap to management, there may be little that management can do to change it.

In such situations the management is confronted with the critical question what would those favourable conditions be that might facilitate changing a culture? Kilmann, Saxton, Serpa (1985) have cited evidence to the effect that cultural change is most likely to occur when four conditions namely dramatic crises, turnover in leadership, young and small organization, and weak culture exist. However in the light of the findings of the present research it is suggested that fifth condition namely personality variables (i.e. dependence proneness and rigidity-flexibility) may also be included. We firmly believe that dependence proneness and rigidity-flexibility may also facilitate a change in culture whenever such a change is required in any organization. This contention is based on the personality characteristics of dependent-independent prone individuals as well as personality characteristics of rigid and flexible individuals. The personality characteristics of dependent-independent and rigid flexible individuals as mentioned in chapter I, lead us to suggest that management of the organization should take care of personality traits of the employees at the time of personal selection. More specifically it is suggested that only those employees should be selected who are independent-prone and flexible. This task may easily be accomplished by administering certain
personality test at the time of selection. By selecting independent prone and flexible employees, we believe, it would become easier for the management to bring out a change in culture whenever it is required for the welfare of the organization.