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

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

In short, job satisfaction is a general attitude which is the result of many specific attitudes in three areas, namely, specific job factors, individual characteristics, and group relationships outside the job.

There is the great confusion in the use of the term "job satisfaction" and in the factors that contribute to it. Reviewing the many studies in the area almost leads to the conclusion that job satisfaction is
anything that an author measures when he thinks that he is measuring “job satisfaction,” Too few experimenters in this field have been concerned with either the reliability or few validity of their measures.

Some studies have dealt only with attitudes on some specific job factors but have been called job satisfaction studies. Others have investigated other job factors and have also been called job satisfaction research. Still others have considered the individual factors and the job factors, and a few have attempted to measure parts of all three areas. It is no wonder that conflicting results are found in the literature on this subject. No one study is necessarily more in error than another, but most are incomplete. For example, an organization that has a good personnel program and offers steady work, good supervision, etc., may nevertheless find that a particular worker has little job satisfaction because of his capabilities in connection with his particular job family problems or unhappiness or unhappiness about his failure in union activities.

One additional point must be made about the confusion among the terms “employee attitude,” “job satisfaction,” and “industrial morale.” Although in many instances they are used interchangeably, they are not synonymous. An “attitude” is not “job satisfaction although it may contribute to job satisfaction since the latter is comprised of a number of attitudes. Similarly, job satisfaction is not the same as industrial morale, although it may contribute to morale.
An attitude of an employee can be considered as a readiness to act in one way rather than another in connection with specific factors related to a job.

Job satisfaction is the result of various attitudes the employee holds toward his job, toward related factors, and toward life in general. Industrial morale is a byproduct of a group and is generated by the group.

Surveys and studies have been carried out on a community-wide basis, in specific professional or occupational groups and, of course, in specific industrial establishments.

**HOPPOCK STUDY**

One of the early community-wide surveys was conducted by Hoppock in the town of New Hope, Pennsylvania (1935). Eighty-eight percent of the 351 employed adults answered the lengthy questionnaire.

These results indicate that 15 percent of the sample had negative attitudes, or job dissatisfaction. This early finding is quite similar to the preponderance of evidence that has since been reported. Robinson and Hoppock have collated the data on 191 assorted studies reporting percentages of job dissatisfaction (1952). The median figure is 18 percent dissatisfied.

These figures are quite different from the "common sense" view which workers are considered as robots doomed to dissatisfaction in
work because of industrial mechanization and other self-attributed causes.

Hoppock asked 36 nationally prominent personnel officers to estimate percentages of workers who were dissatisfied. The answer ranged from 0 to 80 percent, the average being 49 percent. As Hoppock points out, if numbers from 0 to 100 were put in a hat, the average of the numbers drawn would be 50. Hence it may well be that the 49 percent is as void of meaning as chance itself.

The view that is clearly taken is that the majority of the gainfully employed tend to have job satisfaction or are at least neutral. Only a small percentage have job dissatisfaction.

An index of job satisfaction was computed; the results are shown in Figure 12.1. A breakdown according to occupation classification indicates that the average index is lowest for the unskilled category and highest for the professional category; this is shown in Table 12.2.

This survey indicated that there is considerably more job satisfaction than dissatisfaction when all the persons who are gainfully employed are included in the survey.

Hoppock also conducted a survey on people in one occupation, namely, teaching. Five hundred teachers from 51 urban and rural communities in the northeastern United States estimated their job satisfaction on four attitude scales by combining these scales, a measure of job satisfaction was obtained. Of this group the 100 most satisfied
and 100 least satisfied were asked about 200 questions. A comparison of their answers differentiated the satisfied from the dissatisfied teachers in the following areas:

1. The satisfied showed fewer indications of emotional maladjustment.
2. The satisfied were more religious.
3. The satisfied enjoyed better human relationships with superiors and associates.
4. The satisfied were teaching in cities of over 10,000 population.
5. The satisfied felt more successful.
6. Family influence and social status were more favorable among the satisfied.
7. The satisfied “selected” their vocations.
8. Monotony and fatigue were reported more frequently by the dissatisfied.
9. The satisfied averaged 7.5 years older.

One interesting finding is that the difference in average salaries between the two groups was not statistically significant.

One brief comment is necessary about this survey. No attempt was made to measure the proficiency of the teachers, and therefore it is not known whether those who were dissatisfied were less “good” than
the satisfied group. This survey also brings out the point that job satisfaction and vocational interest are not identical.

In the epilogue to his study on job satisfaction, Hoppock proposes the following six major components of job satisfaction:

1. The way the individual reacts to unpleasant satisfaction.
2. The facility with which he adjusts himself to other persons.
3. His relative status in the social and economic group with which he identifies himself.
4. The nature of the work in relation to the abilities, interests, and preparation of the worker.

Job satisfaction is an important generalized attitude in an individual, not a specific attitude about specific job factors. The idea that it is related to the individual’s emotional adjustment suggests that those who are unstable emotionally may have considerably more difficulty adjusting themselves to a job and may therefore be dissatisfied with it.

An excellent illustration of how job satisfaction is influenced by group variables is presented by Hulling and Smith (1964). They were interested in exploring whether men would differ significantly from woman (in the same plant) in terms of their job satisfaction. They obtained measures of five separate aspects of job satisfaction from 295
male workers and 163 female workers drawn from four different plants. The data were analyzed with respect to the mean job satisfaction for the male and female workers. Analyses indicated that in three plants the female workers were significantly less satisfied than their male counterparts (p<0.05) while in the fourth plant there was no significant difference. A test on the relative size of the differences indicated across the four samples.

**SUMMARY OF JOB SATISFACTION RELATIONSHIPS**

In summarizing the research relating job satisfaction to job behavior variables, Vroom (1964, p. 186) draws a number of conclusions which are worthy of repeating here.

1. There is a consistent negative relationship between job satisfaction and the probability of resignation. This relationship appears when scores on job satisfaction are obtained from individuals and used to predict subsequent voluntary dropouts and when mean scores on job satisfaction for organization units are correlated with turnover rates for these units.

2. There is a less consistent negative relationship between job satisfaction and absences. This relationship appears to emerge most consistently with measures of unexcused absences, and when frequency of absence rather than actual days lost are used.

3. There is some indication of a negative relationship between job satisfaction and accidents. However, the number of existing
studies of this relationship is too small to permit any firm conclusions.

4. There is no simple relationship between job satisfaction and job performance. Correlation's between these variables vary within an extremely large and the median correlation of 0.14 has little theoretical or practical importance. We do not yet know the conditions which affect the magnitude and direction of relationships between satisfaction and performance. Obtained correlation's are appreciable extent on the occupational level of the subjects or on the nature of the criterion (objective or ratings) employed.

SOME GENERAL COMMENTS ON JOB SATISFACTION

Anyone who has ever held a job knows that if he does not get along with his coworkers the job is unsatisfactory. The most rugged, aggressive, and independent individual will not be satisfied at work if he cannot get along with the working group. Furthermore adjustment to people on the outside affects a person's adjustment to his job. A secretary who is not getting along with her boyfriend or a husband who has had an argument with his wife is likely suddenly to find some dissatisfaction with the job which did not exist before; this usually disappears just as suddenly, after the "Kiss-and-make-up" stage.

In our culture, as in many others there, there is a strong desire to be approved and respected by others, especially one's friends. If an individual is to have job satisfaction, he must feel that he is on a par
with his friends. College graduates consciously or unconsciously sacrifice money when they enter the professional rather than the business field. They are reluctant to choose selling as an occupation because they feel they are “too good” for it. The fact that eventually sell professional services does not bother them, whereas selling insurance or hats usually does. The factory worker whose friends also work in a factory can feel he is as good as they are; he will have greater job satisfaction than the factory worker whose friends are mainly office workers.

Job dissatisfaction may well be the result of a lack of vocational guidance. A person who is “too good” or “not good enough” for a job, in terms of his abilities and interests is not likely to be satisfied with his job. During the depression years college graduates were available at a “dime a dozen.” Department stores discovered this and proceeded to hire them at almost this rate. But they soon had to discontinue this policy, because the young men and women were “too good” for the job and left in droves, despite the fact that there were few positions open. People are not capable of working for any length of time at a job which they feel is below them. This is true also of people who do not possess the necessary abilities. A college professor who cannot keep up with his students is likely to be a “sad sack”. He may come to the conclusion that his students ask questions only to prove how smart they to the conclusion that his students ask questions only to prove how smart they are. Certain police departments face the peculiar problem of having
officers who are less capable than the patrolmen. Friction results. The same phenomenon appears in all types than of business organizations.

Security contribution to job satisfaction, but we must remember that security is social as well as economic. More important, security is relative not absolute. Resignations occur in the civil service even though the positions carry tenure, furthermore, some people holding these jobs report greater insecurity than some industrial employees who have to guarantee of continued employment. Of course, it may be that insecure people seek civil service jobs and that their basic insecurities prevent their feeling any great job security. Adventurous and dangerous jobs are sometimes considered “secure” even when life itself may be in the balance. A physician is secure in his position and cannot be prevented from continuing in it (baring a few legal exceptions), but he has no guarantee that people will call him. The point is that security is a relative, not an absolute, concept.

Knutson (1952) makes the interesting point that what some writers refer to as security or insecurity is defined by others as adjustment or maladjustment, high or low morale, and the like. He states:

Personal security is a “dynamic” concept. People seek security within their various areas of striving: by achieving it, they become secure in some areas; by failing to achieve it, they become insecure in other areas. The areas of personal striving are interrelated and overlapping, and some may be of greater importance than others to the
security of the individual. Feelings of security or insecurity may tend to become generalized throughout the personality structure or they may be projected from one area of striving into others. Furthermore, the biological structure or physical or social environment of an individual, by limiting or influencing the character and direction of his motivations, may have a direct bearing upon the nature of his securities. In view of these conditions or possibilities, there appears to be a general level or status of security, as well as levels of security within the individual areas of striving.

A person's feelings of security or insecurity within any area of striving involve his own subjective evaluation of his success, in past and present situations and group relationships, also, his expectations, hopes, fears, or uncertainties with respect to the carrying out of his purposes and aspirations in future situations and group relationships.

Feelings of security within any functional area vary on a continuum, so that security status within any area of striving or within any situation may considered a matter of degree rather than a matter of absolute.

Kuntson found that the patterns of security of very similar occupational groups are more alike than those of more distantly related occupational group. This finding would lead to the speculation that job satisfaction may not be a unitary trait but that it may exist in some people when they are employed in certain occupations and not in others.
Loyalty is not to be overlooked in job satisfaction. The feeling that he worker has for his firm or boss, or both contributes to job satisfaction. Although it is not likely to be as strong as the “school spirit” evidenced by loyal sons of Alma Mater, it is present in employees. It is the factor that prompts service beyond the line of duty in relation to job requirements.

To understand job satisfaction better, we must take in to consideration the opportunities for satisfaction that the job itself affords the individual as well as the broader opportunities it offers him. The job satisfaction index rises with occupational level. Kornhauser (1940) reports findings which have a bearing on this point. He asked four different economic groups seven questions dealing with personal satisfaction, and in each instance he found that the higher income groups indicated greater personal satisfaction.

Each of these questions is directly or indirectly related to job satisfaction. Questions 2 and 4 are the only ones to which the majority of the lowest income group gave favorable answers and yet the are of the essence of job satisfaction. This study is cited to show that if the economic range is great enough, salary may become a significant factor, but that with any one occupation group (for example, Hoppock’s teachers) or within a limited range, it is a minor factor.

Morse (1953) has published a book entitled Satisfactions in the white-collar job. It is based upon the interviewing of 742 clerical
workers in a large insurance company. In addition, 73 first- and second-line supervisor were also interviewed.

As a result of this study, the hypothesis was advanced that satisfaction depends basically upon what an individual wants from the world and what he gets. Morse developed four indices of job satisfaction. The first is related to content of the job; the second is related to identification with the company; the third is related to financial and job status satisfaction; and the fourth is related to pride and group performance. While it must be stated that an author is as an author does, the point of view expressed in the text is to refer to job satisfaction as the resultant of the sum total of individual attitudes, and to refer to job satisfaction as the resultant of the sum total of individual attitudes, and to refer to morale as a group factor. Morse apparently considers job satisfaction and morale as interchangeable concepts. To be more correct, she considers morale to be a combination of three of her indices of job satisfaction: job content, company involvement, and job status. However, at another point, she describes the degree of group sprit as equal to morale. While it is not important for present purposes to become involved in the problem of semantics, it nevertheless is important for an author to be consistent in definition as well as in application.

One of underlying generalizations offered by Morse is that level of satisfaction is a combination of both level of aspiration or need-tension level and amount of return from environment. Satisfaction exists when these two are in line, and job dissatisfaction exists when the
return from the environment is much less than the need level of the individual. Morse found that productivity and employee satisfaction did not necessarily go hand in hand. This is similar to other findings of the Michigan group on section gangs on a railroad and factory workers in a tractor plant. All three studies find that high producers do not differ significantly from low producers in overall satisfaction with their employment.

Only one who is naive or who makes unguarded and unwarranted assumptions would expect to find job satisfaction and production related in a cause-and-effect relationship. This view is what might be called "unseasonable sweetness" — that is, all good things should be expected to go together. Since job satisfaction is a good thing and so is high production, the two ought to go together. High production, however, may be an employer's goal and job satisfaction may be an intrinsic quality in an employee. Many instances can be cited from everyday experience where people who are very job-satisfied are not necessarily high producers. It may be best to regard job satisfaction as an entity in itself, which may or may not be related to production just as one might hope to find that beauty and intelligence go together one finds that sometimes they do not, although sometimes they do.

Schaffer (1953) has proposed the hypothesis that "Overall satisfaction will vary directly with the extent to which those needs of an individual which can be satisfied in a job are actually satisfied; the stronger the need, the more closely will job satisfaction depend on its fulfillment."
Schaffer investigated 12 need, using as his sample 72 employed men, most of whom were in the professional and semiprofessional occupational groups. He found that two clusters appeared. One contained need which were passive or hostility-restraining in nature; the other contained the assertive, aggressive needs. A high correlation existed between the person’s two strongest needs and overall satisfaction. Among the strongest need reported in this sample were creativity and challenge, mastery and achievement, and helping others.

Morse’s work and Schaffer’s work seem to point to the view that job satisfaction depends upon the fulfillment of personal need. Such fulfillment may not at all depend upon productivity as measured by the number of units turned out, and therefore the expectation that increasing job satisfaction increases productivity may be a ‘Pollyanna’ approach to the reality that does exist.

Weitz (1952) raises an interesting point that a measure of general satisfaction of an individual should be taken in relation to that individual’s job satisfaction. He scores and a large number of job dissatisfactions are less likely to quit than those who have low general dissatisfaction scores and a large number of job dissatisfactions; other combinations are obvious, such as high general dissatisfaction-low job dissatisfaction (less likely to quit), etc.”

Granted that we should know with what job satisfaction correlates. However, which we may hypothesize, we should not glibly expect job satisfaction to correlate with arbitrary and assumed external
criteria. We may expect job satisfaction to correlate with length of employment and production, but under certain conditions this expectation may be false. Both production, and length of employment may be employers' goals and cited as measures of success. However these two criteria are not correlated to any perfect extent with each other. Blum's finding (1940) that production and length of employment correlated +0.44 would indicate that each is measuring a somewhat different aspect of success on the job.

Severin (1952) points out that care should be used in substituting one criterion for another since the median correlation of job performance criteria with various other criteria is about +0.30. It is clear that criteria correlate with various one another variously, and some are more equivalent to each other than are others.

In a market of many jobs, the more productive workers may take better jobs and the poorer ones will stay on. Job satisfaction may be that the more productive workers, regardless of job satisfaction, take advantage of better job opportunities.

Whether job satisfaction is related to termination may depend to a large extent on employment conditions and the availability of other jobs. Therefore, the correlation between job satisfaction and termination may exist in one type of employment market and not in another.

Studies comparing job satisfaction with such criteria as termination and production may result in erroneous conclusions. It is necessary to be aware that many hypotheses can concerning the relation
between job satisfaction and production and/or termination or any other stated criterion. The hypothesis offered here is that job satisfaction can bear various relations to production depending upon a host of factors not usually even considered by some psychologists in their studies. For example, a correlation is computed as a result of taking a measure of production at a particular time. It is clear from studies investigating production that it varies from one period to another. In other works, production in the long run may differ from production in the short run and which should be regarded as the "truer" measure? If they differ, then each bears a different relationship to job satisfaction.

It is most important to establish what is meant by job satisfaction or dissatisfaction and then to measure it. If what is meant by job dissatisfaction is the number of gripes that a person has about a job, it may not be correct to assume that the person who gripes will necessarily leave the job. It may happen that gripper is competent and feels free to gripe, whereas the person who is unsure and is afraid to complain may leave the job because he is really dissatisfied. This again may be cited as an example or does not mean that this correlation would continue if any variable in addition to the two being measured were to change.

Research findings often lead to meaningful hypotheses, but they must also be mixed with reality. Many times the research will be stumped by the meaning of his results. All he has to do is ask the secretary or the factory worker involved to explain the phenomenon, and the answer will be forthcoming immediately.
Kates (1950) found that there was a positive correlation between scores on the Strong interest blank and job satisfaction in clerical workers, but he did not find that the expression of job satisfaction bore any relation to Rorschach signs of adjustment or maladjustment in these same clerical workers. He also found that the higher the score on the clerical scale of the Strong blank, the more numerous were the signs of personality maladjustment as determined by Rorschach respondents. This would mean that routine clerks may be satisfied with their jobs despite Rorschach’s signs of maladjustment. This finding does not allow the generalization that routine clerks who are satisfied on their jobs are emotionally maladjusted. It merely means that the possibility exists that individuals may have satisfaction in one area in relation to their personality structures, and if these people were working in different areas they might have dissatisfactions. Thus, it is unsafe to assume that all “good” things ought to go together, and if they do not then there is something wrong.

Watson (1939) has conducted a few studies in job satisfaction, the results of which are summarized here to shed additional light on the role of salary as a factor in job satisfaction. He states:

Without in any way denying the need of many workers for higher wages, it may be recognized that sometimes workers, vaguely dissatisfied with the way things are going, know no other way of meeting the satisfaction. They ask for more pay or shorter hours, and perhaps they should have these, but if these demands were attained, the
relief would be only temporary. The underlying cause of dissatisfaction may be not in the pay envelope or the time clock, but in the work itself.

Job dissatisfaction occurs when conditions of work and life are such that they block the gratification of strongly desired human needs. It appears that the phenomenon is more likely to occur at higher levels. The nature of the job and the reward (both physical and psychological) it offers are hardly adequate to gratify these needs (psychological) it offers are hardly adequate to gratify these needs (Physical, security, social and egoistic) to a desired extent at lower occupational levels. This may lead to a feeling of deprivation. Since a job is very much instrumental in the satisfaction of these needs, an individual may displace these feelings to the job.\(^1\)

Sinha conducted a comparative study of job satisfaction in office and manual workers by taking 100 offices and the same number of manual workers as sample. He drew the conclusion that “office workers a group were more dissatisfied than manual workers. The causes of dissatisfaction were inadequate salary and not enough leave with pay whereas for manual workers they included lack of security, no advancement and the job not being congenial to their health.

Raka Sharan conducted a study on working conditions and job satisfaction. Six aspects of working conditions were- wages, benefits, job security, promotional prospects, Physical atmosphere at work place and social relationship with immediate bosses. He observed that the respondents got very low wages. They seldom got the benefits like casual leave, earned leave, medical or maternity leave to which they

were theoretically entitled. They were dissatisfied with physical atmosphere. Their work duration almost exceeded eight hours a day. Workers mentioned that sometimes they had work without any break. Absence of proper lighting arrangements and electric fan at the assembly rooms had made the conditions still worse. The Researcher Found that if the working condition show any market improvement particularly in wages, the respondents satisfaction with their present job too is likely to improve considerably.\(^1\)

In another study effort was made to find out the relationship between life satisfaction and job satisfaction and to study the role of objective factors such as pay, housing and other economic benefits in general satisfaction with life. Salary was found to be the most important. Salary was found to be the most important factor accounting for 15% of the variance in the employee’s perceived life satisfaction. Amenities satisfaction emerged as the second important factor accounting for 1.6% of the variance. The other factors which made significant addition to cumulative contribution of life satisfaction were active acceptance of norms, education and age. The rest of the independent variables including supervisor satisfaction, intensive job satisfaction with nature of job did not make any contribution to the employee’s life satisfaction.

In India, Ganguli compiled results from three studies on Indian worker’s ranking of various job factors that could contribute to the satisfaction of dissatisfaction of employees in their work.\(^2\)

---

The ranking is as follows:

(a) Adequate earnings.
(b) Comfortable working conditions.
(c) Suitable type of work.
(d) Good and sympathetic supervisor.
(e) Opportunity to learn a job.
(f) Job Security.
(g) Adequate Personal benefits like Canteen, Medical aid, Provident Fund.
(h) Opportunity for promotion.
(i) Job Status and Prestige.
(j) Good personal relations.
(k) Prestige of company.
(l) Free medical aid.
(m) More leave with pay.
(n) Clear instructions about the job.
(o) Cheap ration.
(p) Regular working hours.
(q) Share of responsibility.

It would be a mistake to take a merely humanitarian view to regard workers as a submerged group waging a commendable uphill fight for better conditions of life. The modern approach to the study of labour must accept certain things as a fact with no feelings of exuberance or regret. Secondly, correct answer to labour problems would require some understanding of the underlying social and
psychological forces as well. While the economist can explain the probable economic effects of various measures and laws and can indicate how a certain programme may effect employment, production, profit and wages. The Sociologists and psychologists must analyse the causes of human behaviour and also decide what results they desire in a given context.\(^1\) It is because of this reason that the need to undertake the present study was felt.

From the study of literature we find job satisfaction is one of the important factors which affect not only the efficiency of the workers but also such job behaviour as absenteeism and accidents etc. Work is important to men and job satisfaction plays a major role in general satisfaction. High job satisfaction is the hall mark of a well managed organisation. Job dissatisfaction on the part of the employees may lead to industrial unrest.

The main view of an organisation is to get maximum output of highest quality in shortest time period, with minimum expenditure of human energy and maximum job satisfaction. Satisfied workers are more productive than the dissatisfied ones.

S.K. Srivastava is of the view that there are a few studies on the measurement of job satisfaction with reference to different sectors in the Indian context. There are various intrinsic and extrinsic factors which affect job satisfaction. The relationship of these variables in job satisfaction should be studied.

---

1. Das, N.: Industrial Labour in India, Eastern Economy Pamphlets, Delhi, p. 83
Though the factors affecting job satisfaction can not be isolated from one another yet, for analysis, the researchers can, by the use of statistical techniques separate them to give an indication of their relative importance to job satisfaction.

These days various organisations are spending on labour welfare and government has enacted many labour welfare laws so that the industrial worker is able to taste occasionally the better things of life, and so that worker is happy in the organisation. But whether these labour welfare activities have made any impact on job satisfaction among workers is difficult to answer.