

NEED-SATISFACTION DEFICIENCIES FOR DIFFERENT FACTORS RELATED TO MOTIVATION OF THE WORKERS IN THE PRIVATE SECTOR OF BANGLADESH[#]

M. Ekramul-Hoque
Department of Management
Islamic University
Kushtia, Bangladesh

The present study was designed to assess the extent of deficiencies in individual need satisfaction of the workers in the private sector. The relative importance of different aspects of workers' job as perceived by the workers was also investigated. Data were provided from a questionnaire. A sample of 100 workers from a private sector textile mill was selected randomly using random number table. Results showed: (i) a significant difference between the motivational importance of different job factors; (ii) a significant positive correlation between need-satisfaction deficiency and need importance of different job factors; and (iii) job security, recognition for better work and sympathetic supervision were found to be the most crucial factors for the motivation of the workers in the private sector because the workers considered to be of prime importance and because these were the areas where there were the greatest deficiencies in need satisfaction.

The role of private sector in the economy of Bangladesh is very great. Excepting about 220-230 large state owned enterprises in the manufacturing and services sectors the rest of the economic units are in the private sector. The share of gross domestic product (GDP) of the private sector is about 85%. The private sector also provides about 90% of the civilian employment. However, it faces manifold major problems, one of which is how to motivate its work force. Workers' motivation generally seems to have an important impact on workers' performance, worker-management relations, labour-turnover and such other factors which play an important part in determining the overall well-being of any industrial organization. Motivation refers to the internal force that induces workers to put forth efforts toward some particular behavior. According to Maslow (1954) motivation is a function of the satisfaction of human needs. Therefore, to investigate motivation thoroughly, management should know

[#] Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to. M. Ekramul-Hoque, Department of Management, Islamic University, Kushtia-7003, Bangladesh.

what aspects of job the workers consider important, and the extent of deficiencies in fulfillment of need for different factors related to workers' job. The purpose of the present study was to examine the extent of need satisfaction deficiencies for different factors related to motivation of the workers in the private sector. An investigation was also made of the relative importance which the workers attached to different factors used in this study.

Review of past studies on workers' motivation revealed that a number of studies conducted in Bangladesh (e.g., Ali, 1989; Begum, 1988; Habibullah, 1980; Khaleque & Hossain, 1992; Khan & Yunus, 1977), and elsewhere (e.g., Gluskinos & Kestelman, 1971; Jurgensen, 1978; Machungwa & Schmitt, 1983; Rice, Gentile, & McFarlin, 1991; Sheridan, Slocum, & Min, 1975) have been concerned with what workers want from their jobs. Except for a few studies on the management personnel concerning the need fulfillment deficiencies (Habibullah, 1974; Johnson & Marcum, 1968; Porter, 1961, 1962, 1963a, 1963b, 1964) no work is available on the need-satisfaction deficiencies of the workers particularly, in Bangladesh. Lack of substantive data demand a study in this area. The following hypotheses were framed for verification through empirical investigation.

- (a) There is significance difference between the motivational importance of different job factors.
- (b) There is a significant relationship between need-satisfaction deficiency and perceived importance of different job factors.

A study in this field is expected to be a valuable guide in designing and revising personnel policies and practice in the industries, ensuring better industrial harmony and productivity.

METHOD

Sample

The sample of the study comprised 100 production workers of a private sector textile mill located at Tongi near Dhaka city, Bangladesh. In selecting the sample a list of the production workers was prepared with the help of the Assistant Manager (Production). Serial numbers were assigned to the names of the workers and 100 workers were drawn out of the list using Random Number Table. The workers were sampled out from a total of 554 production workers. All the workers of the mill were men. Table 1 shows additional information pertaining to the sample.

Table 1

Demographic variables of the sample of workers (N= 100)

| Age (Years) | Experience (Years) | Education | Wage Per Month | Workers Married | Workers Trained |
|----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| <i>Range</i> | <i>Range</i> | <i>Per cent</i> | <i>Range</i> | <i>Per cent</i> | <i>Per cent</i> |
| 22-45 | 3-26 | Illiterate 06 | 2000-3300 | 87% | 3% |
| | | Primary 46 | | | |
| <i>Mean</i> | <i>Mean</i> | Secondary 47 | <i>Mean</i> | | |
| 30.11 | 9.15 | Higher | 2779.58 | | |
| | | Secondary 1 | | | |

Instruments

The questionnaire used in the present study consisted of three parts: Part-I contains personal information schedule, Part-II contains the Need-Satisfaction Deficiency Scale, and Part-III contains the Relative Importance Measurement Scale.

Need-Satisfaction Deficiency Scale contains twelve items related to twelve aspects of workers' jobs. To assess the deficiencies in need satisfaction of the workers two questions were asked about each aspect of the job. The first ask how much of the desired aspect of the job is now in the work situation. The second asks how much of the desired aspect of the job there should be. A sample item (related to Job Security) as it appeared in the scale was as follows: (a) How much secure is your job?, and (b) How much secure it should be?

For each of the twelve items the respondents were asked to answer the above two questions by giving tick (✓) marks on a number on a rating scale ranging from 1 to 5, where 'low numbers' represent minimum magnitude and 'high numbers' represent maximum magnitude. Deficiencies in satisfaction of the desired aspects of the job were assessed by subtracting the responses to the question—a from the responses to the question—b of each item. With this method, the larger the difference between responses b and a, the greater the deficiency.

The questionnaire was developed partially on the basis of review of literature (Habibullah, 1974; Porter, 1961; Porter & Lawler, 1968), and partly on the basis of a pilot survey of opinion of the workers. Experts' opinion was also sought in this regard. Test-retest (over a period of two

weeks on 30 workers) reliability coefficient of the scale was $r = .75$ which was highly significant ($p < .001$).

To measure the relative importance of job factors 13 items were selected from related literature (Hossain, 1991; Khaleque & Rahman, 1987; Nadler & Lawler, 1977). The respondents could indicate the importance of job factors to their motivation on a 5-point rating scale ranging from not at all important (1) to extremely important (5). Test-retest (over a period of two weeks on 30 workers) reliability coefficient of the scale was $r = .70$ which was highly significant ($p < .001$).

Procedure

Data for the present study were collected from the sample on a person to person interview basis. The field investigation was conducted during the month of January, 1996. All the respondents were contacted in the factory during working hours and they were explained the purpose of the study. Every effort was made to build proper rapport with them. They were told that the study was an academic exercise and had nothing to do with their company management or any other external agency. They were also taken to confidence and were convinced that whatever they would respond, it would be kept secret. The sitting was arranged in suitable room provided by the authority of the mill. The researcher himself interviewed the respondents with the help of the questionnaire. Because of the illiteracy or poor literacy of the workers, who could hardly read or write, the questionnaire was treated as interview schedule. Items of the scales were elaborately explained to them in their vernacular. In case any respondent felt difficulty in understanding a particular item or point, it was clarified by the researcher at the time of personal interview.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results in Table 2 reveal that job security was rated by the workers as the most important factor and next in order of importance to their motivation were wage, recognition for better work, sympathetic supervision, open communication, chances for promotion, coworkers' friendship, knowledge of results, opportunity for development of skills and abilities, opportunity for participation in decision making, chances for learning new things, chances for doing worthwhile work, and freedom of work.

Table 2

Mean ratings, standard deviations, rank orders, and mean differences of importance for different job factors (N = 100)

| Job Factors | Mean Rating | SD | Rank Order | t | p |
|-----------------------------|-------------|-----|------------|------|------|
| Job security | 4.82 | .41 | 1 | 1.76 | ns |
| Wage | 4.66 | .73 | | | |
| Job security | 4.82 | .41 | 2 | 4.77 | .001 |
| Recognition for better work | 4.54 | .54 | | | |
| Wage | 4.66 | .73 | 3 | 1.18 | ns |
| Recognition for better work | 4.54 | .54 | | | |
| Wage | 4.66 | .73 | 4 | 3.92 | .001 |
| Sympathetic supervision | 4.31 | .68 | | | |
| Recognition for better work | 4.54 | .54 | 5 | 2.78 | .01 |
| Sympathetic supervision | 4.31 | .68 | | | |
| Sympathetic supervision | 4.31 | .68 | 6 | 1.49 | ns |
| Open communication | 4.19 | .60 | | | |
| Sympathetic supervision | 4.31 | .68 | 7 | 1.52 | ns |
| Chances for promotion | 4.15 | .87 | | | |
| Sympathetic supervision | 4.31 | .68 | 8 | 3.32 | .001 |
| Coworkers' friendship | 3.99 | .87 | | | |
| Open communication | 4.19 | .60 | 9 | .43 | ns |
| Chances for promotion | 4.15 | .87 | | | |
| Open communication | 4.19 | .60 | 10 | 2.17 | .03 |
| Coworkers' friendship | 3.99 | .87 | | | |
| Chances for promotion | 4.15 | .87 | 11 | 1.38 | ns |
| Coworkers' friendship | 3.99 | .87 | | | |
| Chances for promotion | 4.15 | .87 | 12 | 1.46 | ns |
| Knowledge of results | 3.97 | .88 | | | |

(Table 2 continued...)

| Job Factors | Mean Rating | SD | Rank Order | t | p |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|------|------------|------|------|
| Chances for promotion | 4.15 | .87 | | 2.92 | .01 |
| Development of skills & abilities | 3.75 | .97 | | | |
| Coworkers' friendship | 3.99 | .87 | 7 | 21 | ns |
| Knowledge of results | 3.97 | .88 | | | |
| Coworkers' friendship | 3.99 | .87 | | 2.11 | .04 |
| Development of skills & abilities | 3.75 | .97 | | | |
| Knowledge of results | 3.97 | .88 | 8 | 1.88 | ns |
| Development of skills & abilities | 3.75 | .97 | | | |
| Knowledge of results | 3.97 | .88 | | 6.52 | .001 |
| Participation in decision making | 3.39 | .93 | | | |
| Development of skills & abilities | 3.75 | .97 | | | |
| Participation in decision making | 3.39 | .93 | 9 | 2.95 | .01 |
| Participation in decision making | 3.39 | .93 | | | |
| Participation in decision making | 3.39 | .93 | 10 | 1.42 | ns |
| Chances for learning new things | 3.23 | 1.05 | | | |
| Participation in decision making | 3.39 | .93 | | 2.17 | .03 |
| Chances for doing worthwhile work | 3.18 | 1.04 | | | |
| Chances for learning new things | 3.23 | 1.05 | | | |
| Chances for doing worthwhile work | 3.18 | 1.04 | 11 | .51 | ns |
| Chances for learning new things | 3.23 | 1.05 | | | |
| Freedom of work | 3.00 | 1.30 | | 1.57 | ns |
| Chances for doing worthwhile work | 3.18 | 1.04 | 12 | 1.38 | ns |
| Freedom of work | 3.00 | 1.30 | 13 | | |

Note: ns = not significant

Job security was perceived by the subjects as the most important factor for their motivation. Many studies (e.g., Gluskinos & Kestelman,

1971; Hossain, 1991; Jurgensen, 1947, 1978; Khaleque & Hossain, 1992; Sheridan et al., 1975; Stagner, 1950) provided similar results indicating that job security was ranked top in order of importance by the workers. Job security has been found to be a common important job factor in a number of studies in India (e.g., Ganguli, 1961; Lahiri, 1965; Mukherjee, 1968; Prasad, 1979). It is quite natural for the Bangladeshi workers to attach high importance to job security since mass unemployment is common in Bangladesh and is becoming greater and greater with the rapid increase in population. In addition to that, a steady job may mean not only security but also more money in the long run (Mukherjee, 1968).

Wage was ranked second in order of importance to motivation of the workers. Many other studies (e.g., Begum, 1988; Habibullah, 1969; Hossain & Farouk, 1964; Kapoor, 1967; Khan & Yunus, 1977; Lahiri, 1965; Mukherjee, 1968; Prasad, 1979; Rice et al., 1991) also indicated high importance to wage as a motivating factor. The reason for giving high importance to wage by the workers might be that their need for money to satisfy the basic needs such as food, shelter, and clothing for the family is not fairly well satisfied. Workers are almost unanimous that their wages are not enough for their maintenance. In view of the decreasing trend of purchasing value of what a worker earns on the average per month, much emphasis is being placed by the workers on adequate earnings and opportunities for increased income.

Recognition for better work was considered by the workers as the third factor in order of importance to their motivation. Some other studies, in line with the findings of the present study, showed that appreciation or recognition for work done was a powerful incentive to the motivation of the workers (e.g., Fosdick, 1939; Khaleque & Rahman, 1987; Machungwa & Schmitt, 1983; Prasad, 1979). The reasons for attaching high importance to recognition for better work by the workers may be that it implies not only recognition of their abilities and sincerity but also more money.

Sympathetic supervision has been assigned fourth rank by the workers in order of importance to their motivation. The results support the findings of many studies (e.g., Blum & Russ, 1942; Hossain, 1991; Jurgensen, 1947) where sympathetic supervision was ranked fourth. A number of studies (e.g., Ganguli, 1961; Jurgensen, 1978; Prasad, 1978; Sheridan et al., 1975) also indicated high importance to sympathetic supervision. Habibullah (1980) in a study on the jute industries of Bangladesh found top preferences for good boss who would sympathetically hear workers' complaints and who would treat them more as human beings rather than mere tools of production.

The results in Table 2 further show that there was significant difference between the mean scores of importance for job security and recognition for better work; wage and sympathetic supervision; recognition for better work and sympathetic supervision; sympathetic supervision and coworkers' friendship; open communication and coworkers' friendship; chances for promotion and development of skills and abilities; coworkers' friendship and development of skills and abilities; knowledge of results and participation in decision making; development of skills and abilities and participation in decision making; participation in decision making and chances for doing worthwhile work. However, no significant difference was found between the mean score of importance for other factors. Thus, the first hypothesis that there is significance difference between the motivational importance of different job factors is partially confirmed.

Table 3

Mean need-satisfaction deficiencies, standard deviations, rank orders, and mean differences of need-satisfaction deficiencies for different job factors (N= 100)

| Job Factors | Mean Deficiency | SD | Rank Order | t | p |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|------|------------|------|------|
| Job security | 2.55 | 1.27 | 1 | 1.10 | ns |
| Recognition for better work | 2.44 | 1.16 | | | |
| Job security | 2.55 | 1.27 | | 1.88 | ns |
| Sympathetic supervision | 2.36 | 1.03 | | | |
| Job security | 2.55 | 1.27 | | 1.56 | ns |
| Chances for promotion | 2.35 | .70 | | | |
| Job security | 2.55 | 1.27 | | 1.86 | ns |
| Development of skills & abilities | 2.32 | .71 | | | |
| Job security | 2.55 | 1.27 | | 5.86 | .001 |
| Open communication | 1.86 | 1.08 | | | |
| Recognition for better work | 2.44 | 1.16 | 2 | .84 | ns |
| Sympathetic supervision | 2.36 | 1.03 | | | |

(Table 3 continued...)

| Job Factors | Mean Deficiency | SD | Rank Order | t | p |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------|------|---------------|------|------|
| Recognition for better work | 2.44 | 1.16 | | | |
| | | | | .73 | ns |
| Chances for promotion | 2.35 | .70 | | | |
| Recognition for better work | 2.44 | 1.16 | | 1.01 | ns |
| Development of skills & abilities | 2.32 | .71 | | | |
| Recognition for better work | 2.44 | 1.16 | | 4.68 | .001 |
| Open communication | 1.86 | 1.08 | | | |
| Sympathetic supervision | 2.36 | 1.03 | 3 | .09 | ns |
| Chances for promotion | 2.35 | .70 | | | |
| Sympathetic supervision | 2.36 | 1.03 | | .36 | ns |
| Development of skills & abilities | 2.32 | .71 | | | |
| Sympathetic supervision | 2.36 | 1.03 | | 4.22 | .001 |
| Open communication | 1.86 | 1.08 | | | |
| Chances for promotion | 2.35 | .70 | 4 | .33 | ns |
| Development of skills & abilities | 2.32 | .71 | | | |
| Chances for promotion | 2.35 | .70 | | 4.40 | .001 |
| Open communication | 1.86 | 1.08 | | | |
| Development of skills & abilities | 2.32 | .71 | 5 | 4.13 | .001 |
| Open communication | 1.86 | 1.08 | | | |
| Open communication | 1.86 | 1.08 | 6 | 1.25 | ns |
| Knowledge of results | 1.71 | .87 | | | |
| Open communication | 1.86 | 1.08 | | 3.29 | .001 |
| Participation in decision making | 1.49 | .63 | | | |
| Knowledge of results | 1.71 | .87 | 7 | 2.34 | .021 |
| Participation in decision making | 1.49 | .63 | | | |
| Participation in decision making | 1.49 | .63 | 8 | .42 | ns |
| Chances for doing worthwhile work | 1.45 | .82 | | | |

(Table 3 continued...)

| Job Factors | Mean Deficiency | SD | Rank Order | t | p |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------|-----|---------------|------|------|
| Participation in decision making | 1.49 | .63 | | 2.57 | .01 |
| Chances for learning new things | 1.25 | .78 | | | |
| Chances for doing worthwhile work | 1.45 | .82 | 9 | 1.88 | ns |
| Chances for learning new things | 1.25 | .78 | | | |
| Chances for doing worthwhile work | 1.45 | .82 | | 1.94 | ns |
| Coworkers' friendship | 1.23 | .80 | | | |
| Chances for doing worthwhile work | 1.45 | .82 | | 3.86 | .001 |
| Freedom of work | 1.01 | .81 | | | |
| Chances for learning new things | 1.25 | .78 | 10 | .19 | ns |
| Coworkers' friendship | 1.23 | .80 | | | |
| Chances for learning new things | 1.25 | .78 | | 2.09 | .039 |
| Freedom of work | 1.01 | .81 | | | |
| Coworkers' friendship | 1.23 | .80 | 11 | 2.06 | .042 |
| Freedom of work | 1.01 | .81 | 12 | | |

Note: ns = not significant

The results in Table 3 reveal that out of the twelve specific factors the largest deficiency in need-satisfaction of the subjects was in the area of job security. The areas of recognition for better work and sympathetic supervision produced the next larger deficiencies in need satisfaction. The areas of learning new things, coworkers' friendship and freedom of work produced smaller deficiencies in need satisfaction.

Result in Table 3 further show that there is significant difference between the mean score of need-satisfaction deficiencies for job security and open communication; recognition for better work and open communication; sympathetic supervision and open communication; chances for promotion and open communication; development of skills and abilities and open communication; open communication and participation in decision making; knowledge of results and participation in decision making;

participation in decision making and chances for learning new things; chances for doing worthwhile work and freedom of work; chances for learning new things and freedom of work; coworkers' friendship and freedom of work. However, no significant difference was found between the mean scores of deficiencies for other job factors.

To assess the impact of need satisfaction deficiencies, not only the size or amount of the deficiency must be taken into account, but also the importance of the particular need area to the individual involved (Porter, 1961) should be taken into consideration. Spearman's rank order correlation coefficient between the ratings of relative importance and need-satisfaction deficiencies for different job factors was calculated, which shows that there is significant positive rank order correlation ($\rho = .79$; $p < .001$) between the ratings of relative importance and need-satisfaction deficiencies for different job factors. The result confirms the second hypothesis that there is a significant relationship between need-satisfaction deficiency and perceived importance of different job factors which indicates that the factor with the highest motivational importance is whatever one that is most lacking at the same time. Combining the results for deficiency with those for importance presents a picture which is summarized in Table 4 (The terms used in the body of Table 4 represent the approximate relative degree of deficiency and importance for different factors related to workers' job).

Table 4

Summary of relative need-satisfaction deficiencies and need importance of the workers (N= 100)

| Factors | Relative Deficiency | Relative Importance |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Job security | Large | Large |
| Recognition for better work | Large | Large |
| Sympathetic supervision | Large | Large |
| Chances for promotion | Moderate | Moderate |
| Development of skills and abilities | Moderate | Moderate |
| Open communication | Moderate | Moderate |
| Knowledge of results | Moderate | Moderate |
| Participation in decision making | Moderate | Moderate |
| Chances for doing worthwhile work | Moderate | Small |
| Chances for learning new things | Small | Small |
| Coworkers' friendship | Small | Moderate |
| Freedom of work | Small | small |

Table 4 shows that the most crucial of the factors related to workers' job for their motivation are the factors of job security, recognition for better work and sympathetic supervision because the workers considered them to be of prime importance and because these were the areas where there were the greatest deficiencies in need-satisfaction. Moderate crucial factors were chances for promotion, opportunity for development of skills and abilities, open communication, knowledge of results, opportunity for participation in decision making, coworkers' friendship and chances for doing worthwhile work. The least crucial factors were chances for learning new things and freedom of work, because the workers considered these two factors as of little importance and because these were the areas where there were very little deficiencies in need-satisfaction. This means that the higher order needs are the least crucial factors for the motivation of the workers.

Perceived need satisfaction deficiency with respect to pay of the workers was not assessed. Because the perception of need satisfaction deficiencies of pay seems to overlap with the need satisfaction deficiencies of other needs. The amount of pay one receives in one's work would seem to satisfy both security and esteem needs and is a means of satisfaction of primary physiological needs. The sample of workers regarded pay as the second most important factor for their motivation (Table 2). Thus, pay, seems to be a crucial factor for the workers' motivation.

CONCLUSION

In summary, job security, recognition for better work, and sympathetic supervision were found to be the most crucial factors for motivation of the workers in the private sector. In an effort to enhance motivation of the workers management should:

- a) Create a feeling among the workers that they will not lose their jobs because of no fault on their parts and will be able to remain in their jobs as long as they like. Workers lack motivation if their jobs are temporary in nature or depend upon the whim of the management. When workers feel uncertainty and fear of losing jobs they get dishearten and lose encouragement and inspiration in their works.
- b) Examine the policies toward recognition for good performance as a means of increasing motivation of the workers. Recognition for good work leads to high motivation among the employees and makes them more committed to their works.
- c) Develop within the supervisors, the approach of concern for people, that is, supervisors will hear workers' grievances sympathetically and

will treat them in a supportive manner. If this approach renders more production without any increase cost to the enterprise, there is every reason for management to take the advantage.

Although adequate precautionary measures have been taken in selecting samples and collecting data for the present study yet the study suffers from some limitations, such as the sample was confined to the production workers only and was Tongi based. It would have been better if non-production workers could have been included and the sample could have been taken from different parts of the country. In spite of the limitations, the findings of the present study may be a useful guide for the management, particularly in the private sector, in enhancing workers' motivation, which is extremely important for performance, labour-management relations and overall well-being of any organization.

REFERENCES

- Ali, M. O. (1989). Employee motivation in Bangladesh with special reference to Nationalized Industrial Units located in Rajshahi and Khulna Zones. In M. Ahmad, M. & G. Mclean (Eds.), *Bangladesh Business Research Reports I* (pp.88-93). Dhaka: University Grants Commission of Bangladesh.
- Begum, J. A. (1988). Job satisfaction of industrial workers: A study in Rajshahi Jute Mills (in Bengali). *Management Development*, 17(1), 16-25.
- Blum, M. & Russ, J. (1942). A study of employee attitudes toward various incentives. *Personnel*, 19, 438-444.
- Fosdick, S. J. (1939). Work satisfaction. In G. W. Hartmann & T. Newcom, (Eds.), *Industrial Conflict*. (pp.114-124) New York: Gordon.
- Ganguli, H. C. (1961). *Industrial productivity and motivation*. Bombay: Asia Publishing House.
- Gluskinos, U. M., & Kestelman, B. J. (1971). Management and labor leaders perception of workers needs as compared with self-reported needs. *Personnel Psychology*, 24, 239-246.
- Habibullah, M. (1969). *Some aspects of productivity in the jute industry of Pakistan*. Dhaka: Bureau of Economic Research, Dhaka University.
- Habibullah, M. (1974). *Motivation mix*. Dhaka: Bureau of Economic Research, University of Dhaka.

- Habibullah, M. (1980). *Employee-centered supervision and productivity in the jute industry*. Dhaka: Bureau of Economic Research, University of Dhaka.
- Hossain, M. M. (1991). Industrial employees' attitudes towards various incentives related to motivation: A case study in Bangladesh private sector. *Management Development*, 20(3-4), 33-44.
- Hossain, A. F. A., & Farouk. A. (1964). *Social integration of industrial workers in Khulana*, Dhaka: Bureau of Economic Research, Dhaka University.
- Johnson, P. V., & Marcum, R. H. (1968). Perceived deficiencies in individual need fulfillment of career army officers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 52, 457-461.
- Jurgensen, C. E. (1947). Selected factors which influence job preference. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 31, 553-564.
- Jurgensen, C. E. (1978). Job preferences (What makes a job good or bad?). *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63, 267-276.
- Kapoor, S. D. (1967). The prepotency of specific motives among industrial workers. *Journal of Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, 4, 45-47.
- Khaleque, A., & Hossain, M. M. (1992). Perceived importance of different factors related to motivation. *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research*, 7(1-2) 21-30.
- Khaleque, A., & Rahman, A. (1987). Perceived importance of job facets and overall job satisfaction of the industrial workers. *Human Relations*, 40, 401-416.
- Khan, A. A., & Yunus, M. (1977). Workers motivation: A case study of manufacturing concerns in Chittagong. *Chittagong University Studies: Part 1, 1*, 129-142.
- Lahiri, D. K. (1965). Perceived importance of job factors by government and non-government employees. *Indian Journal of Psychology*, 60, 37-48.
- Machungwa, P. W., & Schmitt, N. (1983). Work motivation in a developing country. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 31-42.
- Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper.
- Mukherjee, B. B. N. (1968). Importance ranking of job-related needs by Indian Textile Mill workers. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 4, 162-188.

- Nadler, D. A., & Lawler, E. E. III. (1977). Motivation: A diagnostic approach. In Hackman, J. R., Lawler, E. E. III., & Porter, L. W. (Eds.), *Perspective on behaviour in organizations* (pp.36-38). New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Porter, L. W. (1961). A study of perceived need satisfactions in bottom and middle management jobs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 45, 1-11.
- Porter, L. W. (1962). Job attitudes in management: I. Perceived deficiencies in need fulfillment as a function of job level. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 46, 375-384.
- Porter, L. W. (1963a). Job attitudes in management: II. Perceived deficiencies in need as a function of job level. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 47, 141-148.
- Porter, L. W. (1963b). Job attitudes in management: III. Perceived deficiencies in need fulfillment as a function of line versus staff type of job. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 47, 267-275.
- Porter, L. W. (1964). Job attitudes in management: IV. Perceptions of the importance of certain personality traits as a function of job level. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 48, 31-36.
- Porter, L. W., & Lawler, E. E., III, (1968). *Managerial attitudes and performance*. Homewood, III: Irwin.
- Prasad, L. (1979). What workers want from their jobs. *Integrated management*, 14(9), 30-37.
- Rice, R. W., Gentile, D. A., & McFarlin, D. B. (1991). Facet importance and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 31-39.
- Sheridan, J. E., Slocum, J. W. Jr., & Min, B. (1975). Motivational determinants of job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60, 119-121.
- Stagner, R. (1950). Psychological aspects of industrial conflicts-II. Motivation. *Personnel Psychology*, 3, 1-16.

Received: August 24, 1998.