Chapter II

Review of Literature

1. Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction, the extent to which employees like their job and its components (Spector, 1997), is one of the most extensively researched topic in the industrial and organisational psychology literature (Highhouse & Becker, 1993). The number of articles and books investigating this construct has increased from over 3000 in 1976 (Locke, 1976), to over 5000 in 1992 (Harwood & Rice, 1992).

Today, a review of psychology and business databases demonstrates that over 10,000 publications on job satisfaction are available. Although this increasing interest in job satisfaction is no doubt beneficial to the field of industrial and organisational psychology, the amount of research has become overwhelming to both researchers and practitioners. Nowhere is this more clearly evident than in the theories of job satisfaction.

2. Theories of Job Satisfaction: Environmental and Dispositional Predictors

Theories of job satisfaction include dispositional and environmental predictors. The dispositional predictors of job satisfaction refer to characteristics of the employee, such as needs, values, and expectations. The environmental predictors refer to job characteristics, such as job control, workload, feedback, role ambiguity, and role conflict. Some theorists focus on the dispositional predictors, whilst others focus on the environmental predictors.
More recent theorists recognise the importance of both types of predictors. Dispositional and environmental theories of job satisfaction have been extensively researched, however researchers have still not reached consensus as to the major predictors of job satisfaction. As a result, researchers continue to rely on theories that have theoretical and empirical problems, or have limited applicability to the workplace.

In order to determine which theories are valid and useful, this review will examine the theories that have made the greatest contribution to a shift in focus of the determinants of job satisfaction. These include Maslow’s (1970) need hierarchy theory, Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman’s (1959) two-factor theory of job satisfaction, Vroom’s (1964) expectancy theory, discrepancy theories, Hackman and Oldham’s (1976) job characteristics model, and Karasek’s (1979) job demand-control model.


The need hierarchy theory was one of the first theories to focus on the dispositional predictors of job satisfaction. It proposed that employees’ needs determine their level of job satisfaction.

3.1 Need Hierarchy Theory

The need hierarchy theory (Maslow, 1954, 1970) posits that individuals are born with a set of needs. There are five needs: physiological, safety, belongingness, esteem, and self-actualisation. These are arranged in a hierarchy of relative prepotency, meaning that lower-order needs are satisfied before higher-order needs are activated.
The lowest need, physiological, refers to basic biological drives, such as hunger, thirst and sex. These physiological needs are the most prepotent of all, as an individual deprived of all needs would seek to gratify these needs first. They would not be concerned with safety, belongingness, esteem, or self-actualisation.

Once they have gratified the physiological needs however, the strength of that need decreases, and the next highest need, safety, becomes important.

The safety need refers to security, stability, dependency, protection, and need for structure, order, law and limits. To gratify the safety need, an individual requires a safe, orderly, predictable, lawful world. Once the safety need is gratified, its need strength is reduced, and the strength of the belongingness need increases.

The individual will begin to hunger for affectionate relationships with people, and for a place in their group or family. Once these belongingness needs are gratified, the strength of the esteem need increases, and the individual will desire a high evaluation of themselves, and others.

Once an individual has gratified these four needs, collectively known as deficiency needs (D-needs), they may begin to feel restless. This restlessness is indicative of the need for self-actualisation.

The need for self-actualisation refers to the need for the individual to become everything they are capable of becoming.
When the strength of this need increases, the individual strives for self-fulfilment. This fifth need is referred to as a being need (B-need) because it sustains an individual’s interest without being driven by feelings of deprivation. Unlike the previous four needs, when the need for self-actualisation is gratified, it increases in need strength (Maslow, 1962). Growth is a continued upward development, where the more that one gets, the more that one wants. This growth is “endless, and can never be attained or satisfied” (Maslow, 1962, p. 31).

4. Applying Maslow’s (1954, 1970) Theory to Organisations

In terms of applying this theory to organisations, the theory proposes that the lower-order needs must be gratified before the higher-order needs are activated. As such, employers must ensure that their employees’ physiological, safety, belongingness and esteem needs are satisfied. The employer can help the employee to gratify each need.

For example, to help them gratify their physiological and safety needs, employers can increase their employees’ pay. Once these needs are satisfied, the relationship between the employee and their supervisors and co-workers takes on increased strength.

The employer can help the employee to gratify this need through increasing the amount of social interaction among employees. This process needs to be continued until the employees have gratified all of the lower-order needs, and are reaching for self-actualisation, should the nature of the job permit this level to be attained.

Almost every aspect of Maslow’s (1954, 1970) work has been disputed on both theoretical and empirical grounds (Neher, 1991; Wahba & Bridwell, 1976). Five fundamental propositions of Maslow’s (1954, 1970) theory have been questioned, including: 1) the higher the deprivation of a need, the higher its need strength (i.e., deprivation/domination paradigm); 2) the higher the satisfaction with a need, the higher the need strength of the need at the next level (i.e., gratification/activation paradigm); 3) the measurement of self-actualisation; 4) the ability to achieve self-actualisation; and 5) the applicability of the theory to organisations. Each of these will now be considered.

5.1 Criticism One: Deprivation/Domination Paradigm

The deprivation/domination paradigm postulates that the higher the deprivation of a need, the higher its need strength. An early review concluded that the deprivation/domination paradigm was only partially supported for self-actualisation, and not supported for safety, belongingness and esteem needs (Wahba & Bridwell, 1976). On the basis of this review, many researchers have assumed that the proposition is not supported (Wicker, Brown, Wiehe, Hagen & Reed, 1993). This assumption may be inaccurate however, as many of the studies included in the review have methodological limitations. These limitations concern: a) the operationalisation of need strength; and b) establishing causality.
5.1.1 Operationalising Need Strength

One of the main limitations in studies examining the deprivation/domination paradigm concerns the operationalisation of need strength. Some researchers measure need strength through desire, others through important or intention\textsuperscript{14}.

Two studies have measured need strength through desire. In Alderfer’s (1969) study, subjects were asked to rate how much more of the following factors they would like to have in their jobs; pay, fringe benefits, love, status, and growth. Similarly, in Graham and Balloun’s (1973) study, subjects were asked how much improvement they wanted in their physiological, security, social and self-actualisation needs. These measures of need strength were then correlated with corresponding measures of satisfaction.

Both studies provided some support for Maslow’s (1954) theory suggesting that as satisfaction with a need increases, the strength of that need decreases. For example, in Graham and Balloun’s (1973) study, the correlations between need strength and satisfaction ranged from $r = -0.42$ to $r = -0.72$.

Furthermore, in Alderfer’s (1969) study, satisfaction and need strength were negatively correlated for the relatedness need, which was composed of a respect from co-workers’ need, and a respect from supervisors’ need.

For the respect from co-workers’ need, the correlations were all significant, ranging from $r = -0.21$ to $r = -0.38$. For the respect from supervisors’ need, the correlations ranged from $r = -0.06$ to $r = -0.49$. Although the correlations in Alderfer’s (1969) study were in the expected direction,
they were often small, and the correlations between satisfaction and need strength for the belongingness need were insignificant ($r = 0.02$ to $r = 0.07$).

These two studies appear to provide some support for Maslow's (1954) theory\textsuperscript{15}. Both of these studies assessed need strength ratings by desire, where participants were asked how much more they wanted of a need. It must be questioned however, if wanting or desiring more of a need is a measure of the strength of the need.

Wanting more of a need may actually be another way of demonstrating dissatisfaction with the area covered by that need. Other researchers have overcome this limitation by assessing need strength using importance ratings, which may be less likely to measure satisfaction.

For example, Hall and Nougaim (1968) conducted a longitudinal study on managers, interviewing them annually for five years. The participants rated the importance of, and satisfaction with a number of needs including safety, affiliation, achievement and esteem, and self-actualisation. Inconsistent with Maslow’s (1954) theory, the correlations between the satisfaction of needs and the importance of needs were positive. For safety, importance and satisfaction correlated $r = 0.26$, for affiliation $r = 0.16$, for achievement and esteem $r = 0.54$, and for self-actualisation $r = 0.29$.

In addition, Hall and Nougaim (1968) also examined the longitudinal changes in satisfaction and importance for each need. According to Maslow’s (1954) theory, it would be expected that if satisfaction of a need increased from one year to the next, importance of that need would
decrease. However, they found that the importance of a need in a given year was positively correlated with its own satisfaction in the previous year\textsuperscript{16}.

These correlations were moderate for safety ($r = 0.25$), affiliation ($r = 0.21$), achievement and esteem ($r = 0.53$) and self-actualisation ($r = 0.28$). Although Hall and Nougaim (1968) failed to discuss these correlations in detail, they clearly contradict Maslow’s (1954) theory. Importance was positively related to need satisfaction, suggesting that a satisfied need is an important need. This finding does not support Maslow’s (1970, p. 393) proposal that “a satisfied need is not a motivator.”

Although Hall and Nougaim’s (1968) findings are inconsistent with Maslow’s (1954) theory, their validity has been questioned.

Specifically, the study relied on a small sample, and the interview was not designed to produce data relevant to Maslow’s (1954) theory (Lawler & Suttle, 1972). Furthermore, the inter-rater reliability of the coding of interviews was low (0.55 to 0.59).

A study designed to overcome the limitations identified in Hall and Nougaim’s (1968) study was conducted by Lawler and Suttle (1972). They employed a reasonably large sample of employees from government agencies and retail stores. Their questionnaire, developed by Porter (1963), was designed to measure Maslow’s (1954) needs.

According to Maslow’s (1954) theory, the importance of a need should be negatively correlated with satisfaction of that need. Hence, as satisfaction with a need increases, the importance of
that need decreases. Lawler and Suttle’s (1972) results did not support this proposal for either the government or retail organisations respectively, for social ($r = -0.09$, $r = 0.07$), esteem ($r = 0.06$, $r = -0.04$), autonomy ($r = 0.07$, $r = 0.01$), and self-actualisation needs ($r = 0.01$, $r = -0.10$). There was however, some support for the security needs ($r = -0.34$, $r = -0.12$).

As their study was longitudinal they also conducted change analyses. They correlated the change in need importance with the change in need satisfaction.

It was expected that these correlations would be negative, indicating that increases in the satisfaction of a need were associated with decreases in its importance. However, these correlations were also positive ranging from $r = 0.07$ to $r = 0.24$. Hence, the direction of the correlations was inconsistent with Maslow’s (1954) theory.

In summary, Hall and Nougaim’s (1968) and Lawler and Suttle’s (1972) findings are inconsistent with those of Alderfer (1969) and Graham and Balloun (1972).

The major difference between these studies is that the latter two measured need strength with desire or improvement, while the former two relied on measures of importance. Although the desire and improvement measures were criticised earlier for being too similar to measures of satisfaction, the use of importance as an indicator of need strength has also been criticised (Wicker et al., 1993)\textsuperscript{17}.
Although Maslow (1970) postulates that a need is important because of deprivation, it has been suggested that a person may report that a need is important because they have attained it and value it (Wicker et al., 1993). Indeed, Maslow (1954, p. 148) proposed that “greater value is usually placed on higher-order needs by persons who have gratified both kinds (i.e., lower and higher-order needs).”

Hence, people who are self-actualising may report that all the higher needs are important because they value them. A person may thus report that a higher-order need is important because they are deprived of it, or because they have attained it and value it. If individuals report that a higher-order need is important because they have attained it, it would be positively related to satisfaction (Wicker et al., 1993).

Although importance may be an ambiguous construct, the early studies conducted by Hall and Nougaim (1968) and Lawler and Suttle (1972) should still be valid. The majority of participants in these studies would not have gratified both lower-order and higher-order needs.

As such, they would only be expected to report that a need was important if they were deprived of the need. Hence, although the early studies tested the deprivation/domination paradigm using importance ratings, this is not expected to reduce the validity of the findings, which are inconsistent with Maslow’s (1954) theory.
More recent researchers have found some support for Maslow’s (1954) theory using a different measure of need strength, namely intention. Wicker et al., (1993) examined how need strength relates to satisfaction when need strength is operationalised in a number of different ways.

They used, among others, ratings of importance (i.e., “To what extent is it an important goal”) and ratings of intention (i.e., “How much do you want to pursue it”). They correlated these variables with attainment as a measure of deprivation (i.e., “To what extent do you already have it”). According to Maslow’s (1970) theory, it would be expected that as attainment of a need decreased, the intention of that need would increase. However, they found the correlations of past attainment (deprivation) and intention were positive, ranging from $r = 0.39$ to $r = 0.96$. This suggests that as attainment of need increases, the intention to pursue the need also increases.

Although Wicker et al’s., (1993) findings are inconsistent with Maslow’s (1970) theory; they suggest that the correlations may have been inflated by halo-effects or carryover rating bias. They postulate that the ratings may be affected by a general motivation factor, and by earlier ratings. To control for such effects, deviation scores were computed and correlated. Deviation scores are calculated by subtracting the grand mean over all scales for a need from the mean of that need on each particular scale.

This removed a need-means factor from the data, “reducing any biasing effect on correlations resulting from mean differences among needs” (Wicker et al., 1993, p. 126). Using these deviation scores, the directions of the correlations were reversed. For importance, two of the four correlations were in the expected negative direction, however they were very small ($r = -$
0.13 and $r = -0.07$). For intention however, all four of the correlations were strong and negative, ranging from $r = -0.62$ to $r = -0.74$.

This suggests that if need strength is measured through intention, and deviation scores are used, then it is negatively related to attainment. On this basis, Wicker et al., (1993) postulate that it is too early to discard the deprivation/domination paradigm. They propose that participants in earlier studies (e.g., Hall & Nougaim, 1968; Lawler & Suttle, 1972) may have reported that a lower order need was important because they had attained it and they valued it (high satisfaction), or because they were deprived of it (low satisfaction). As a result, the correlations between importance and satisfaction could be positive or negative, depending on how need strength was operationalised. Despite this, it remains concerning that the deprivation/domination paradigm is only supported when need strength is operationalised as intention.

5.1.2 Establishing Causality

A second methodological problem, which may reduce the validity of the studies examining the deprivation/domination paradigm is that although the deprivation/domination paradigm is causal, the relationship is assessed through correlational analyses (e.g., Alderfer, 1969; Graham & Balloun, 1972; Hall & Nougaim, 1968; Lawler & Suttle, 1972).

Only one study has attempted to establish causality through experimentally manipulating deprivation and measuring subsequent need strength. Wicker and Wiehe (1999) divided forty students into two groups, where one group wrote about a past event where they felt especially close to another person and the other group wrote about a time when they tried to get close to someone, but felt unsuccessful\(^{18}\).
Both groups then rated their needs on each level of the hierarchy on prior attainment (i.e., “To what extent do you already have it”), intention (i.e., “How much do you intend to pursue it”), and importance (i.e., “To what extent is it an important goal”).

The interpersonal scenario was expected to affect their belongingness responses, where the unsuccessful group would report lower attainment, and higher need strength for the belongingness need. Inconsistently however, the two groups did not report different levels of attainment on the belongingness need. The two groups did report different levels of esteem attainment where the unsuccessful group reported less past attainment of esteem needs than the successful group. The unsuccessful group also reported higher intention on all levels of the hierarchy than the successful group. The two groups did not however differ on importance ratings.

These data were interpreted as supporting Maslow’s (1970) theory, as when the past attainment of esteem needs were low, intentions were higher. The results must be interpreted with caution however as there were methodological limitations in the study.

Aside from each group having a small sample size ($N = 20$), need strength was not assessed prior to the intervention. Hence, the differences in their intentions may have been a pre-existing difference. Furthermore, although the groups were asked to report a story relating to belongingness needs, the two groups did not report different level of past attainment on belongingness needs. Hence, the belongingness manipulation was not successful$^{19}$. In summary,
although Wicker and Wiehe (1999) present their study as supporting Maslow’s (1970) theory, the findings should be viewed with caution.

5.1.3 Summary: Deprivation/Domination Paradigm

The deprivation/domination paradigm was rejected after several early studies failed to find supportive correlations. Wicker et al., (1993) re-introduced the proposition into the literature, attributing the inconsistent findings to the operationalisation of need strength. They demonstrated that positive correlations between attainment and need strength could be reversed if deviation scores were used, and need strength was measured by intentions rather than importance.

The validity of these findings continues to be questioned however, as the relationship between need strength and satisfaction, although causal has been assessed through correlational analyses. In summary, the majority of research demonstrates that as deprivation increases, need strength does not necessarily increase.

5.2 Criticism Two: Gratification/Activation Paradigm

The gratification/activation paradigm postulates that the higher the satisfaction with a need, the higher the need strength of the need at the next level of the hierarchy.

The gratification/activation paradigm is different from the deprivation/domination paradigm as the former examines the correlation between the satisfactions of a need at one level with the importance of the need at the next level, whereas the latter examines the correlation between satisfaction and need strength of a need on the same level.
Two longitudinal studies have been conducted to evaluate the gratification/activation paradigm. As previously mentioned, Hall and Nougaim (1968) interviewed managers annually throughout a five-year period, coding their responses on need strength and satisfaction.

For each year, they correlated the changes in need satisfaction from one year to the next with changes in need strength at the next highest level during the same period of time. According to Maslow’s (1954) theory, it was expected that high correlations would exist between the change in satisfaction of a given need level and the change in strength of the next highest level. The pooled correlations were low however, ranging from $r = 0.05$ to $r = 0.22$. Hence, there was little evidence to suggest that the increasing satisfaction of a need results in the increasing need strength of the next highest need. It must be noted however that this study relied on a small sample size, and the interview used in the study was not designed to produce data relevant to Maslow’s (1954) theory. These limitations were addressed in Lawler and Suttle’s (1972) study.

As previously mentioned, Lawler and Suttle (1972) relied on Porter’s (1963) questionnaire, which was specifically designed to measure Maslow’s (1954) needs. According to Maslow’s (1954) theory, it was expected that the satisfaction of a need would be positively correlated with the need strength of the need in the next highest level.

Lawler and Suttle’s (1972) results demonstrated that one correlation between security satisfaction, and social importance was significant for the retail group ($r = 0.21$), however the rest were all low ranging from $r = -0.01$ to $r = 0.10$. 
These findings, as with Hall and Nougaim’s (1968) findings clearly raise questions concerning the validity of the gratification/activation paradigm. In summary, the gratification/activation paradigm proposes that as satisfaction with a need increases, the need strength of the next highest need increases. Studies investigating this paradigm generally demonstrate that the correlations between need satisfaction and need strength of the next highest need are low.

5.3 Criticism Three: Measurement of Self-Actualisation

There is a poor level of concordance between the definition of the need for self-actualisation, and the measurement of the need for self-actualisation. Self-actualisation is defined as “the full use of one’s talents, capacities, potentialities” (Maslow, 1970, p. 150). It is the need for the individual to become everything they are capable of becoming.

Self-actualisers have a more efficient perception of reality, accept others, are autonomous, do not need others, are less concerned with themselves, and have deeper interpersonal relationships (Maslow, 1970).

These characteristics must be regarded with caution however as they were based on a social discussion with a sample of 22 people whom Maslow (1954) believed to be self-actualisers. These people were selected as they seemed to be fulfilling themselves, and doing the best they were capable of. Perhaps as a consequence of this vague definition, operational definitions of the need for self-actualisation vary extensively.
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Several early studies measured self-actualisation using Porter’s (1963) need scale (i.e., Lawler & Suttle, 1972; Roberts, Walter & Miles, 1971).

This scale includes three items which assess the opportunity for personal growth and development in the job, the feelings of self-fulfilment a person gets from being in the job, and the feelings of worthwhile accomplishment in the job. One problem with these items however, is that they appear to assess how the person feels about their work rather than whether they feel they have reached their potential.

Although more recent scales tend to be more comprehensive, their validity is still questioned. For example, Shoura and Singh (1999) assessed self-actualisation through items measuring meaningfulness, self-sufficiency, effortlessness, creativity, professional creativeness, self-understanding, independence, and harmony with the universe.

Examples of these items are “do you think you have enough talents and capabilities to perform the job”, “does your work come as second nature to you” and “do you feel your job is in harmony with the universe.”

These items are criticised for being vague, and it is questioned whether they measure if a person has become all that they are capable of. Furthermore, these items only refer to self-actualisation on the job, and in some cases, self-actualisation may occur off the job. In summary, there seems to be a great deal of discrepancy between the definition and measurement of self-actualisation.
5.4 Criticism Four: Ability to Achieve Self-Actualisation

The need for self-actualisation is the need for the individual to become everything that they are capable of becoming. This suggests that anyone performing their job to the best of their abilities is self-actualising. However, Maslow (1970) screened 3000 college students and concluded that only one student was self-actualising.

Following this study, Maslow (1970) proposed that self-actualisation of the sort he had found in older adults was not possible for younger developing people. He proposed that young people lack many of the experiences needed for self-actualisation such as identity, autonomy, and romantic relationships.

The proposal that younger people do not self-actualise has not received empirical support. A study conducted on engineers demonstrated that the junior engineers reported higher scores on self-actualisation than the senior engineers (Shoura & Singh, 1999). Furthermore, in a study of academics, ranging in age from 30 to 68 years, age and self-actualisation were not related (Hawkins, Hawkins & Ryan, 1989). It must be noted however that, as previously mentioned, these studies relied on questionable measures of self-actualisation.

5.5 Criticism Five: Applicability of Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs to Organisations

Although some of the propositions in the need hierarchy theory have not received empirical support, the theory has been extensively accepted in the management literature (Roberts, 1982). Moreover, the general idea that the concepts of love, safety, self-esteem, and growth contribute
to motivation and satisfaction are acceptable to both psychologists and management scientists (Shoura & Singh, 1999).

The fundamental problem in applying Maslow’s (1970) theory to work organisations is that little is known about how to reach the ultimate goal of self-actualisation. Maslow’s (1970, p.46) definition of self-actualisation as “what a man can be, he must be” is extremely vague, and there is no agreed upon way of operationalising the construct, or facilitating it in employees.

6. Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman’s (1959, 1993) Two-Factor Theory of Job Satisfaction; How the Two-Factor Theory has contributed to our Understanding of Job Satisfaction: The two-factor theory (Herzberg et al., 1959) questioned the assumption that job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction lie on a single continuum. Rather, the theory proposed that job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction are separate continua, and that the factors which affect job satisfaction are different from the factors which affect job dissatisfaction.

6.1 Development of the Two-Factor Theory

The two-factor theory is based on a study of accountants and engineers. Through an interview, employees recalled experiences about times when they felt especially good or bad about their jobs, and then rated how seriously their feelings (good/bad) about their jobs had been affected by what happened. Using content analysis, their responses were coded into 14 categories.

As demonstrated in Table 1, employees reporting the sources of good times tended to recall events related to achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, and advancement. These sources of satisfaction were termed motivator factors. Employees reporting the sources of bad
times tended to recall events related to company policy and administration, supervision-technical, salary, recognition, and interpersonal relations with supervisor. These sources of dissatisfaction were termed hygiene factors\(^2\).

An obvious exception to this classification is for the factor salary. Salary was reported a similar number of times for employees reporting the source of good events and for those reporting the source of bad events.

On the basis of these findings, Herzberg et al., (1959) proposed that paying attention to motivator factors will increase job satisfaction, but will not affect job dissatisfaction. Alternatively, paying attention to hygiene factors will decrease job dissatisfaction but will not increase job satisfaction. For example, increasing status is expected to reduce job dissatisfaction, but not increase job satisfaction.

**6.2 Criticisms of Herzberg et., al’s., (1959) Theory**

The two-factor theory is criticised for deducing conclusions from a study that: a) failed to test the main propositions; and b) was methodologically flawed. In regards to the first criticism, there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate how motivator and hygiene factors relate to job satisfaction. Although the study demonstrated that employees recalling good times tended to recall motivator factors, and employees recalling bad times tended to recall hygiene factors, there is no empirical evidence for the proposal that motivator factors can only contribute to job satisfaction and that hygiene factors can only contribute to job dissatisfaction.
The study did not measure job satisfaction, and as such, there is no basis for assuming that the factors described in the incidents caused, or were even related to job satisfaction (Ewen, 1964).

In regards to the second criticism of Herzberg et al.’s., (1959) theory, concerning the methodology of the study, several problems have been identified. These include: 1) some of the findings contradict the theory; 2) the findings differ depending on the method of data collection; and 3) the hypotheses and criterion measures are ambiguous. These limitations will now be discussed more extensively.

6.2.1 Criticism One: Evaluation of Results

The results from Herzberg et al.’s., (1959) study did not completely support the theory. As can be seen in Table 1, employees often report motivator factors, such as recognition when they are recalling a time when they felt bad. Although they reported recognition significantly less for bad times than good times, recognition was still the third highest source of a bad time. Furthermore, some of the hygiene factors were reported only slightly more for bad events than good events (i.e., salary, status and job security). Hence, some of the findings are not supportive of the two-factor theory.

6.2.2 Criticism Two: The Interview Method

Replications of Herzberg et al.’s., (1959) study have produced mixed results. Some researchers have found support for the theory (i.e., Schmidt, 1976), whilst others have contradicted the theory (e.g., Armstrong, 1971; Brenner, Carmack & Weinstein, 1971; Hill, 1986; King 1970; Waters & Waters, 1969). A commonality among the studies that have contradicted the theory is
that they have departed from the traditional interview method (Gardner, 1977; Salancik & Pfeiffer, 1977).

The interview method is criticised for being retrospective, and selective (Gardner, 1977). The employees are expected to more readily recall positive events which reflect upon themselves, and negative events which can be attributed to external conditions (Vroom, 1964). As a result, many researchers have tested Herzberg et al’s., (1959) theory with rating scales.

6.2.3 Rating Scales

One example of such a study is Waters and Waters (1969) study of office employees. Rather than using Herzberg et al’s., (1959) critical incidents interview, employees completed a job satisfaction scale, a job dissatisfaction scale (as these are proposed to be two separate dimensions), and a scale examining satisfaction with specific facets of work. They correlated facet satisfaction with overall satisfaction and overall dissatisfaction.

According to Herzberg et al’s., (1959) theory, it was expected that the motivator factors (i.e., responsibility, work, sense of achievement etc.) would correlate with overall satisfaction more than overall dissatisfaction. This finding was not supported as the pattern of relationships with satisfaction and dissatisfaction were similar (i.e., responsibility of job correlated with satisfaction \( r = 0.41 \) and with dissatisfaction, \( r = -0.37 \)).

Similar results were obtained for the hygiene factor, where for example, competent supervision correlated \( r = 0.44 \) with satisfaction and \( r = -0.40 \) with dissatisfaction, and salary correlated \( r = \)
0.43 with satisfaction and $r = -0.28$ with dissatisfaction. As motivator and hygiene factors acted as both satisfiers and dissatisfiers, this study did not provide support for the two-factor theory. Other researchers who have relied on rating scales have also found that their results fail to support the theory. For example, Brenner et al., (1971) conducted a study on accountants, assessing “how much is there now” for each motivator and hygiene factor.

They correlated each of the items with a measure of overall job satisfaction. Consistent with the two-factor theory, the motivator factors were positively related to measures of job satisfaction, with the correlations ranging from $r = 0.39$ to $r = 0.62$. Inconsistently however, the hygiene factors were also positively related to job satisfaction, with the correlations ranging from $r = 0.41$ to $r = 0.59$. These findings, fail to conform with Herzberg et al.’s., (1959) theory, and suggest that as motivator and hygiene factors increase, job satisfaction increases.

Although Waters and Waters (1969) and Brenner et al.’s., (1971) studies failed to support the two-factor theory using a rating scale, Hill’s (1986) study claims to offer more support. Hill (1986) developed a 45-item questionnaire to measure intrinsic and extrinsic factors of work in academia. The intrinsic factors (i.e., teaching, convenience, recognition-support) were similar to motivator factors, whilst the extrinsic factors (i.e., economic, administration, and collegial) were similar to the hygiene factors.

It was expected that the intrinsic factors would lead to job satisfaction and that the extrinsic factors would lead to job dissatisfaction. To test this proposal, Hill (1986) compared the mean
level of satisfaction with each dimension. The employees were more satisfied with the intrinsic dimension ($M = 4.43$) than the extrinsic dimension ($M = 4.18$).

Specifically, the following means were observed where one is very dissatisfied and six is very satisfied: teaching ($M = 4.82$), convenience ($M = 4.52$), recognition-support ($M = 3.96$), economic ($M = 4.24$), administration ($M = 4.00$), and collegial ($M = 4.23$). From these results, Hill (1986) concluded that the academics’ dissatisfaction with their work came from extrinsic factors (i.e., hygiene factors), whilst their satisfaction came from intrinsic factors (i.e., motivator factors). The validity of this conclusion is questioned however, as the mean level of satisfaction for the intrinsic and extrinsic factors were very similar. The difference was significant, however this may be due, in part, to the large sample size ($N = 1000$). More importantly however, it must be questioned whether Hill’s (1986) study is even testing Herzberg et al’s., (1959) theory.

The two-factor theory did not propose that employees are more satisfied with the motivator factors than the hygiene factors, but rather that the motivators serve to bring about job satisfaction, and hygiene factors prevent job dissatisfaction. As such, although Hill’s (1986) study claims to support the two-factor theories using a rating scale, the validity of the findings are questioned.

In summary, it appears that studies testing the two-factor theory using rating scales tend to be inconsistent with those using the interview method. The rating scale may be superior to the interview method, however it is still problematic (Herzberg, 1966; Silver, 1987; Whitsett & Winslow, 1967).
Researchers propose that the rating scales may induce respondents to indicate an attitude towards every item, even on items that they have never thought about before (Herzberg, 1966). Furthermore, there is pressure for the respondents to appear rational when they report their satisfaction with the job facets and overall satisfaction, where they may attempt to keep their responses consistent. As a result of these limitations, some researchers have opted for free response scales (e.g., Silver, 1987).

6.2.4 Free Response Scales

Studies attempting to overcome the limits of both interview and ratings scales have relied on free response scales. These scales are not retrospective, and allow the employee to develop their own answers. For example, Friesen, Holdaway and Rice’s (1983) study of school Principals relied on two questions including “which two factors contribute most to your overall satisfaction with the principalship” and “which two factors contribute most to your overall dissatisfaction with the principalship.”

They then calculated how often the Principals mentioned motivator factors and hygiene factors when they referred to sources of their satisfaction and dissatisfaction. These were converted into ratios, which included the number of times each factor was mentioned as a satisfier, and the number of times each factor was mentioned as a dissatisfier (satisfier: dissatisfier). For example, sense of achievement was reported as a source of satisfaction 85 times, and a source of dissatisfaction 5 times (i.e., 85: 5).
Other factors that were reported as satisfiers more than dissatisfiers included interpersonal relationship (77: 0), importance of the work (24: 0), and relationship with central office (11: 0). These findings were generally consistent with the two-factor theory, the exception being factors involving relationships (i.e., interpersonal relationships and relationships with central office). Relationship factors are hygiene factors, and as such, are expected to be reported as dissatisfiers more than satisfiers.

The factors that were mentioned more as dissatisfiers than satisfiers include amount of work (0: 68), overall constraints (0: 56), attitudes of society (0: 49), stress (0: 21) and impact on home life (0: 14).

These were also generally consistent with the two-factor theory. It must be noted however that many other factors were identified as sources of both satisfaction and dissatisfaction, such as relationship with teachers (94: 42), responsibility (81: 20), autonomy (70: 19), student attitudes (51: 25), challenge of work (41: 36), relationships with parents (22: 51) and salary (6: 7).

In fact, only eight of the 20 factors occurred uniquely as either satisfiers or dissatisfiers and two of these were in the wrong direction (i.e., interpersonal relationships, relationships with central office). Hence, although researchers have proposed that this study “represents a major step in resolving the controversy in favour of Herzberg’s assertion” (Silver, 1987, p. 5), it provides at best, only partial support.
A similar study was conducted on educators by Silver (1987). The participants were required to think of a time when they felt especially good/bad about their jobs, and write a paragraph describing what happened.

It was hypothesised that the employees would cite motivator factors more often than hygiene factors when describing positive events, and cite hygiene factors more often than motivator factors when describing negative events.

As hypothesised, the employees mentioned more motivator factors (85) than hygiene factors (6), when recalling a positive event. Inconsistently however, the employees reported more motivator factors (48) than hygiene factors (40), when recalling a negative event. As such, Silver’s (1987) study provides only partial support for the two-factor theory.

Silver (1987) conducted a second study using a questionnaire developed by Wernimont (1966). The questionnaire contained two lists of statements, one positive and one negative, each referring to one of Herzberg et al.’s, (1959) 16 categories.

The participants were required to indicate whether an event had occurred, and then to indicate whether it was a positive or negative event. For example, for the pay facet, on the negative list was “the pay increase I got was insufficient for putting some aside for the future” and on the positive list was “I received a substantial increase in pay.” It was hypothesised that on the positive-feelings list, respondents would check more motivator than hygiene items, and on the negative-feelings list, respondents would check more hygiene than motivator items. On the
positive list, the employees checked 322 motivator factors and 259 hygiene factors, whilst on the negative list, they checked 255 hygiene and 178 motivator factors. These results are assumed to be supportive of the two-factor theory as respondents checked more motivator than hygiene factors on the positive list and more hygiene than motivator factors on the negative list. However, it is concerning that motivator and hygiene factors were reported for both positive and negative events.

6.2.5 Summary

Studies that contradict the two-factor theory tend to depart from the traditional interview method. These studies, relying on rating scales or free response scales, claim to provide some support for the theory. Closer examination of the results however, demonstrates that these studies provide at best, partial support of the theory.

7. Criticism Three: Ambiguous Hypotheses and Criterion Measures

Researchers testing the two-factor theory have been criticised for employing several different hypotheses and criterion measures (King, 1970). First, in regard to the hypotheses, King (1970) cites several different ways that researchers test the main propositions of the theory. Some researchers propose that all motivator factors combined together should contribute more to job satisfaction than job dissatisfaction, and that all hygiene factors combined should contribute more to job dissatisfaction than job satisfaction.

Other researchers examine each factor separately, proposing that each motivator factor should contribute more to job satisfaction than job dissatisfaction, and each hygiene factor should contribute more to job dissatisfaction than job satisfaction. A more precise version of the theory...
proposes that only motivators determine job satisfaction, and that only hygienes determine job dissatisfaction. These examples serve to demonstrate that one researcher using a broad hypothesis may report that their findings support the theory, whilst another researcher using a specific hypothesis may report that their results are inconsistent with the two-factor theory.

In regard to the criterion measures, researchers tend to evaluate their findings differently (King, 1970). For example Sergiovanni (1967) conducted a study on teachers using the critical incident technique. The results indicated that teachers reported achievement as a source of a positive event (30) more than a source of a negative event (9).

Some researchers, including Sergiovanni (1967) propose that this ratio is supportive of the two-factor theory as it is reported more in positive experiences than negative experiences. However, other researchers (e.g., Friesen et al., 1983) propose that it is not supportive as achievement was reported for some negative experiences. Most researchers opt for the former, proposing that if one part of the ratio is greater than the other part, the results are supportive of the two-factor theory (i.e., Silver, 1987). Even so, these different criterion measures certainly create confusion.

It must also be questioned whether a study can provide support for the two-factor theory when some of the ratios are in the wrong direction (i.e., salary 20: 12). Herzberg et al., (1993) did not comment on the issue; however they accepted results that were not in the proposed direction in their study. King (1970) attempted to specify some guidelines, proposing that failure to conform one item would not contradict the whole theory unless that one item had a significant negative difference.
However, it still remains unclear how many items would need to be inconsistent for the theory to be refuted\textsuperscript{30}.

8. Vroom’s (1964) Expectancy Theory of Job Satisfaction\textsuperscript{31}; How Expectancy Theory has contributed to our Knowledge of Job Satisfaction

Expectancy theory (Vroom, 1964) was one of the first theories to focus on the cognitive processes that underlie job satisfaction. It has received considerable theoretical and empirical attention for over 30 years (Van Eerde & Thierry, 1996). The number of studies examining expectancy theory has decreased recently however, with only ten studies being conducted since the 1990’s (Ambrose & Kulik, 1999). As such, this review will mainly be based on the earlier studies.

8.1 Description of Expectancy Theory

Expectancy theory describes its major constructs and propositions using its own jargon. It refers to three major constructs, namely expectancy, valence, and instrumentality. Expectancy refers to how much a person perceives that an action will result in a certain outcome. For example, how much a person believes that if they work harder, they will get a pay rise; Valence refers to the degree of anticipated satisfaction or desirability of an outcome.

Hence, in the previous example, the valence would be a measure of how much the person desires a pay rise. Instrumentality refers to the degree to which the person sees the outcome in question as leading to the attainment of other outcomes. Hence, in our example, instrumentality would be how much a person believes that a pay rise will result in other outcomes, such as buying a house.
The way these constructs are combined depends on the variable that is being predicted. Three
dependent variables have been examined, namely job effort, job performance and job
satisfaction. This review will only examine the model predicting job satisfaction, referred to as
the valence model. This incorporates two of the above-mentioned constructs, namely valence
and instrumentality. It proposes that job satisfaction can be predicted by multiplying the valence
of an outcome by its instrumentality. Hence, to predict job satisfaction, we would need to
determine how much a person likes or values an outcome of their job (i.e., being promoted) and
multiply this measure by how much they believe that this outcome will lead to other outcomes
(i.e., being offered a partnership in a business).

There is a great deal of ambiguity surrounding the measurement of the major constructs in the
expectancy theory (Van Eerde & Thierry, 1996). The instrumentality construct has proved to be
the most troublesome for researchers (Wahba & House, 1978). Vroom (1964) referred to
instrumentality as the probability that an outcome will result in other outcomes (i.e., outcome-
outcome relationship), and expectancy as the probability that an action will result in an outcome
(i.e., action-outcome relationship)\(^{32}\).

Researchers have confused these variables however, and have measured instrumentality through
examining the probability that an action will result in an outcome (eg., Constantinople, 1967;
Pulakos & Schmitt, 1983; Reinharth & Wahba, 1976). These different conceptualisations of
instrumentality influence the application of the valence model to the workplace.
8.2 Applications of the Valence Model

According to the valence model as defined by Vroom (1964), an employer can increase their employees’ levels of job satisfaction through ensuring that employees value the outcomes of their job (i.e., gaining admiration from other workers, being promoted, feeling a sense of accomplishment, pay rise), and believe that these outcomes will lead to other outcomes. According to researchers who operationalise instrumentality as expectancy, employers should ensure that their employees value the outcomes of their jobs, and believe that their work will help them achieve those outcomes.

8.3 Studies of the Valence Model

Several early studies examined the relationship between job satisfaction and the valence model (e.g., Constantinople, 1967; Ferris, 1977; Pulakos & Schmitt, 1983; Reinharth & Wahba, 1976; Sobel, 1971, Teas, 1981). A review of such studies demonstrates that correlations between the valence model (valence x instrumentality) and job satisfaction are generally positive, ranging from $r = 0.03$ to $r = 0.57$ (Mitchell, 1974). This demonstrates that together, valence and instrumentality predict job satisfaction.

An example of a typical study conducted to assess how the valence model influences satisfaction, is that conducted by Constantinople (1967). This study examined how valence and instrumentality contributed to satisfaction in university students.

The students were given a list of 14 outcomes of university (e.g., learning how to learn from books and teachers). Each outcome was rated in terms of its importance (i.e., valence) and on
the degree to which the university was helping the students to achieve the outcome (i.e., instrumentality). The product of these two ratings (i.e., instrumentality and valence) was obtained for each outcome, and the products were summed across all 14 outcomes.

This measure was then correlated with a measure of satisfaction with college. According to the valence model, it was expected that the valence times instrumentality interaction would be positively related to satisfaction. The results were generally supportive of the model with the correlations ranging from $r = 0.34$ to $r = 0.49$. It must be noted however that Constantinople (1967) did not examine how much each component of the model contributed to satisfaction.

8.4 Methodological Limitations

Although many studies testing Vroom’s (1964) valence model claim to provide moderate support for Vroom’s (1964) expectancy theory (e.g., Ferris, 1977; Pulakos & Schmitt, 1983; Reinhart & Wahba, 1976; Sobel, 1971, Teas, 1981), these studies have some methodological limitations. Three such limitations have been identified and will be discussed below as: 1) the finding that the components of the valence model account for more of the variance in satisfaction on their own than when combined; 2) violations of the assumptions of the multiplicative composite; and 3) inflated correlations due to common method variance.

The Finding that the Components of the Valence Model Account for more of the Variance in Satisfaction on their own than when Combined; The valence model proposes that job satisfaction can be predicted by the product of valence and instrumentality.
However, many studies have demonstrated that the components of expectancy theory account for more of the variance in satisfaction on their own than when included in the expectancy model (e.g., Pulakos & Schmitt, 1983; Reinhart & Wahba, 1976; Teas, 1981; Van Eerde & Thierry, 1996). In these studies, one of the components, either valence or instrumentality, has predicted job satisfaction as well, or better than, the valence times instrumentality interaction.

An example of such a study is that conducted by Reinhart and Wahba (1976). They measured valence and expectancy in a sample of sales force employees. Although instrumentality should have been included in the model, their measure of expectancy was similar to a measure of instrumentality.

They measured expectancy by assessing the extent of agreement with the following items; “The harder I work, the more I produce”, “there are no rewards for working hard in this company” and “poor job performance may get me fired.” Their results demonstrated that expectancy was as strongly correlated to job satisfaction ($r = 0.43$) as the expectancy times valence interaction ($r = 0.40$).

Similar findings were reported in Pulakos and Schmitt’s (1983) study of graduating students. Valence of work outcomes was assessed through rating the importance of job facets (e.g., good pay, cooperative workers, opportunities for personal growth), and instrumentality was assessed through rating the likelihood of each facet.
They correlated these measures with internal job satisfaction and external job satisfaction. The results demonstrated that valence and instrumentality considered separately correlated with job satisfaction as well or better than the valence times instrumentality interaction. For example, in regard to the co-workers facet, the correlations between the valence times instrumentality interaction \( (r = 0.04, \text{internal}, \ r = 0.11, \text{external}) \) were lower than the correlation for instrumentality considered on its own, \( (r = 0.11, \text{internal}, \ r = 0.12, \text{external}) \). Hence, in this example, the valence model was not more strongly related to job satisfaction than the components considered separately.

A recent meta-analysis of studies using the valence model to predict occupational choice reached similar conclusions (Van Eerde & Thierry, 1996). The results demonstrated that valence \( (r = 0.27) \) and instrumentality \( (r = 0.27) \) considered separately correlated as well with choice as the valence times instrumentality model \( (r = 0.28) \).

In conclusion, these studies suggest that the components of the valence model often account for more of the variance in job satisfaction when considered separately rather than when combined into the valence model. These results not only question the usefulness of the two components of the valence model, but also how these components are combined.

8.5 Violations of the Assumptions of the Multiplicative Composite

Although the valence model proposes that valence should be multiplied by instrumentality, many assumptions underlying the multiplicative process may not be met. First, although it is assumed that for a multiplication to be valid, the two constructs are independent (Campbell & Pritchard, 1970), instrumentality and valence are related to each other (e.g., \( r = 0.47 \); Pritchard & Sanders,
Second, although it is assumed that multiplicative composites are based on a ratio scales with a true zero point (Evans, 1991), most researchers rely on interval scales (Mitchell, 1974). Some researchers have attempted to establish a zero-point on a likert scale by having a scale that ranges from 0 to 10 (i.e., Pritchard & Sanders, 1973). This scale does not have a true zero point, and rather, to establish a true zero point, a complex and time-consuming process needs to be undertaken, that requires the scaling of pairs, as well as individual outcomes or objects (Thurstone & Jones, 1957). In summary, although the valence model proposes that the components of the model should be multiplied; two major assumptions underlying multiplicative composites may not be met.

8.6 Inflated Correlations due to Common Method Variance

Although the assumptions of the multiplicative composites are often ignored, the correlations between the components considered either on their own or in the valence model, with job satisfaction, are still moderate. Critics suggest that these moderate correlations occur as the measures of instrumentality, valence, and satisfaction are all based on self-report (Schwab, Olian-Gottlieb & Heneman, 1979).

It has been proposed that when both the independent variables and dependent variables are measured through self-report, they correlate higher than if one of the variables is observed (Mitchell, 1974; Schwab et al., 1979).

The problem with this reasoning however is that self-report measures are expected to differ from objective measures. Objective life satisfaction, for example, is poorly correlated with subjective life satisfaction (r = 0.12; Cummins, 2000).
Thus, the subjective measures cannot be verified through objective measures. Furthermore, it is the subjective measures, which are important to the individuals’ levels of satisfaction\textsuperscript{38}.

As long as the employee perceives that by working hard, they will receive a pay rise (instrumentality), and value a pay rise (valence), their satisfaction will be influenced. As such, there is no evidence for the proposal that the correlations among variables in the valence model are inappropriately inflated through common method variance. Rather, the correlations used to make such claims are based on invalid comparisons between objective and subjective variables.

Although common method variance is not deemed to be a problem in this regard, researchers have tested the valence model using measures other than self-report. Sobel (1971) conducted a study with students, experimentally manipulating instrumentality.

Two groups were formed; one with high instrumentality and one with low instrumentality. Both groups were told that they were required to complete a task of mental agility. Before completing this task, they rated the valence of this task to themselves. They then completed the task, and their score was calculated.

They were given a table of norm probabilities which indicated how likely it was that they would perform well on the next task. One group was given a table of norms, which contained high probabilities (i.e., high instrumentality group), whilst the other group was given a table of norms which contained low probabilities (i.e., low instrumentality group).
Both groups were then asked to rate their satisfaction whilst considering the importance of the task, and the probability that they would do well in the next task.

According to the valence model, it was expected that people with higher instrumentality and higher valence would report higher satisfaction. In regard to instrumentality, the high instrumentality group consistently reported higher satisfaction ($M = 19.5$) than the low instrumentality group ($M = 13.5$), thus supporting the model. In regard to the proposed interaction effect, it was expected that for the high or low instrumentality group, people who reported high valence would also report higher satisfaction than people who reported low valence.

Inconsistently however, the results demonstrated that for the high instrumentality group, there was no difference in the level of satisfaction reported by the high valence group ($M = 20.3$) and the low valence group ($M = 18.7$). Furthermore, for the low instrumentality group, the low valence group reported significantly higher satisfaction ($M = 15.0$) than the high valence group ($M = 12.1$).

Although these results are generally inconsistent with the valence model, there was a major limitation in the study. The researchers failed to measure instrumentality after the subjects had completed the intervention. As such, they failed to demonstrate that their intervention altered levels of instrumentality.
In summary, researchers have suggested that instrumentality and valence correlate well with job satisfaction because they are measured by self-report. Although there is no evidence for this proposition, Sobel’s (1971) study suggests that when the variables are experimentally manipulated, the results are inconsistent with the valence model.

9. Discrepancy Theories

9.1 How Discrepancy Theories have Contributed to our Knowledge of Job Satisfaction

Discrepancy theories of job satisfaction focus on the cognitive processes that underlie job satisfaction. These theories are particularly notable for proposing that employees’ levels of job satisfaction are dependent on this source of comparison.

9.2 Description of Discrepancy Theories

Discrepancy theories propose that job satisfaction is a result of a comparison between the perception of the current situation and some standard of comparison (Lawler & Suttle, 1973; Locke, 1969; Michalos, 1985; Porter, 1961).

Researchers have defined this standard of comparison in various ways, including what they want, what they feel they are entitled to, what they see others as getting, what they had in the past, or what they expected to have (Harwood & Rice, 1992; Michalos, 1985). In all of these theories however, the larger the difference between the perceptions of the current situation and the standard of comparison, the lower the level of job satisfaction.
9.3 Empirical Studies Investigating Discrepancy Theories

Although only a few empirical studies have examined the relationship between discrepancy and job satisfaction, they have generally been supportive. For example, Rice, McFarlin and Bennett (1989) measured how much employees have, and want, thirteen job facets. They then calculated the amount of discrepancy between what the employee has and what they want. They found that the perceived have-want discrepancies were moderately negatively correlated with facet satisfaction, where $r = -0.48$. Hence, as the have-want discrepancy increases, satisfaction decreases.

Although Rice et al.’s., (1989) study only examined have-want discrepancies, similar results have also been found for other discrepancies. For example, Harwood and Rice (1992) examined comparisons with: a) co-workers; b) what the person believed that they should have; c) what they expected; and d) what they currently expect.

The correlations between these discrepancies and satisfaction, although all in the predicted direction, varied depending on the comparison. The have-want discrepancy was most highly correlated with satisfaction, where the average correlation was $r = -0.51$. For the have-should have, $r = -0.42$, have-expected, $r = -0.33$, have-expect, $r = -0.25$, and have-co-workers discrepancy, $r = -0.22$. In summary, studies examining the discrepancies theories are generally supportive.
9.4 Theoretical Problems with Discrepancy Theories

Although the discrepancy between what a person has and some standard of comparison correlates well with job satisfaction, there are difficulties in using discrepancies to explain satisfaction (Cummins & Nistico, in press).

When the discrepancy theory is used to explain job satisfaction in the workplace, the explanation becomes tautological. For example, the theory would propose that the employee has a low level of job satisfaction because; they want more from their job. As such, these discrepancies may define job satisfaction rather than explain it.

10 In Conclusion

a) The need hierarchy theory proposes that individuals strive to gratify five needs, namely physiological, safety, belongingness, esteem and self-actualisation needs. The theory proposes that the higher the deprivation of a need, the higher its need strength, and the higher the satisfaction with a need, the higher the need strength of the next highest need. Although early studies tended to reject these propositions, more supportive results were found when need strength was operationalised as intentions rather than importance or desire. Even with some supportive findings, the validity of the theory is still questioned as very little is known about the ultimate goal for humans, the need for self-actualisation.
b) The two-factor theory was notable for proposing that job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction are separate continua, and that the factors which affect job satisfaction are different to the factors which affect job dissatisfaction. The original study from which the theory developed was methodologically flawed, and as such, it is not surprising that empirical studies evaluating the two-factor theory often demonstrate that motivator and hygiene factors affect both job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. Researchers that report supportive findings often rely on less stringent hypotheses and criterion measures. In conclusion, the two-factor theory of job satisfaction has received little empirical or theoretical support.

c) Expectancy theory proposes that job satisfaction can be predicted by multiplying the valence of an outcome by its instrumentality. Reviews conducted on the valence model have demonstrated that the two major components of the model correlate well with job satisfaction. However, the individual components of the model often account for more of the variance in job satisfaction than the multiplicative composite. This has led researchers to not only question the validity of the individual components of the model, but also the validity of the multiplicative composite. In conclusion, while the valence model appears to be simple, it combines a set of complex variables in a problematic manner.

d) Discrepancy theories propose that job satisfaction can be determined by cognitive comparative processes. Empirical studies have demonstrated that the discrepancy between what an employee has and some standard of comparison is moderately
correlated with job satisfaction. However, when discrepancies are used as an explanation of job satisfaction, the explanation becomes tautological.
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