CHAPTER-V

DISCUSSION AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCHES

In the present chapter which is entitled as discussion and suggestions for further researches an attempt has been made to discuss and interpret the results of present research work in the light of theoretical frame work and in relation to findings of previous researcher in the field of job satisfaction. This chapter is divided into three section. (1) In the first section a broad review of theories of job satisfaction have been presented. (2) The second part deals with the interpretation of results related to (i) effect of level of stress on job satisfaction, (ii) effect of profession on job satisfaction and effect of gender on job satisfaction. (3) The third section deals with the suggestions for further researches.

(1) Over View of Theories of Job Satisfaction

Many theories have been offered to explain the behaviour of men at work, as well as to gauge the nature and causes of job satisfaction. Of the theories postulated, a few of them are alternative to each other and some of them are complimentary.
Antagonistic thinkers may support, deny or modify them with evidences availability with them. Wernimont, Toren and Kapell (1970) pointed out that it is difficult to consider motivation as separate and apart from personal or job satisfaction. Wanous and Lawler (1972) stated that negative feeling can arise from lack of variety, autonomy or challenge. They may be traced to the inability of one's work to offer a chance for promotion and recognition. Those aspects of jobs which deal with job content are called motivators by Frederick Herzberg (1968), an advocate of job enrichment as a way of redesigning jobs to add dissatisfaction. Some workers may be dissatisfied with environmental aspect of their job. Thus, any one aspect of one's job could lead to discontent, depending of curse, on each worker's own needs, experience and expectations. A brief account of few theories of job satisfaction are presented below-

(i) **Maslow's Need Hierarchy Theory**

This is the most widely discussed theory. Maslow (1964, 1970) proposes that people typically and continuously in a motivational state, but the nature of motivation is fluctuating and complex; further human beings rarely reach a state of complete satisfaction except for a short time. As one desire is satisfied,
another arises to take its place, and as this new desire is satisfied, another replaces it, so on and so forth. This never ending sequence gives rise to Maslow's theory of motivation, in which a hierarchy of needs is postulated. This theory emphasized that the human needs generally ordered in terms of their relative potency and act as human motivators.

Maslow’s need hierarchy theory has enjoyed widespread acceptance particularly in the writings of many prominent organisational theorists e.g., Argiris (1953), Haire (1965), McGregor (1969), Sachein (1965). It has been used to explain such issues as why pay can become unimportant and why self-actualisation seems to be very important to people today. More recently, several writers have offered modification and alternatives to Maslow’s theory (e.g. Alderrfer, 1969).

Maslow’s (1943, 1954, 1970) hierarchical model is composed of five level classification of human needs, and a set of hypotheses about how the satisfaction of these needs affect their importance. According to Maslow (1970) five need categories exists in a hierarchy of prepotency, such that the lower or more basic needs are inherently more important than the higher or less basic needs. Need No. 2 does not dominate unless need No. 1 is reasonably
satisfied. Need No. 3 does not dominate until need Nos. 1 and 2 are reasonably achieved, and so on. It means until physiological needs are met, social and psychological needs do not operate. The important features of Maslow’s theory are (i) The higher needs are evolutionary development. (ii) The higher the need and the less imperative it is for sheer survival, the longer gratification can be postponed. (iii) Living at the higher need level means greater biological efficiency, greater longevity, less disease, better sleep, appetite etc. (iv) Higher needs are less urgent. (v) Higher need gratifications produce more desirable subjective results i.e., more profound happiness and richness of inner life. (vi) Gratification of higher needs present a general healthward trend. (vi) Higher needs require better outside conditions (economic and educational, etc.) to make them possible. (vi) Satisfaction of higher needs is closer to self actualisation than is lower need satisfaction.

Maslow (1970) suggested that the various levels are interdependent and overlapping. In addition, he pointed out that individuals may jumble the order and importance around. It may be commented here though there is a reasonable support for the hypothesis that to some extent human needs do have some hierarchical order but questions have been raised regarding the
generality of Maslow's formulation. Herzberg, Mausner, Syndermann (1959) seriously questioned the theory that motivation in human work is primarily predicted on a hierarchy of needs.

(ii) Vroom's Valence-Instrumentality Expectancy Theory (Vie-Theory)

This theory goes under several names, including expectancy theory, instrumentality theory, path goal theory and valence-instrumentality expectancy theory. Expectancy/valence theory is the second process theory that can be classified as a process-theory in contrast to a content theory- primarily because it attempts to identify relationships among variables in a dynamic state as they affect individual behaviour. This system orientation is in direct contrast to the content theories which have attempted largely to specify correlates of motivated behaviour. In expectancy/valence theory, like equity theory, it is the relationship among inputs that is the basic focal point rather than the inputs themselves.

The expectancy/valence model is also a cognitive theory of job satisfaction. Individuals are viewed as thinking, reasoning beings who have beliefs and anticipations concerning future
events in their lives. Drawing heavily on the earlier works of Lewin, Tolman and Peak and as discussed by Miner and Dachler (1973), these theories have their central theme the assumption that behaviour organisation is viewed as a function of the interaction of personality, e.g., ability, values, needs, expectations, instrumentalities and role demands; and general environment, e.g., organisational contingencies, environmental constraints, supervision, job or task requirements.

(iii) Equity Theory of Adam

Equity theory is essentially a social comparison theory in which an individual evaluates his input versus output derived from a given situation in relation to another person, a class of people, an organisation, or the individual himself to the extent that an individual perceives an imbalance in this relationship (i.e. inequity). It is postulated that he will experience dissatisfaction and be motivated to engage in some kind of activity which will restore equity. This relatively simple notion has its roots in the social exchange theories of Homons (19614) and Thimbaut and Kelley (1959).

The governing principle of equity theory would seem to be "to give equal value for received" (Adams. 1965). In an organisational
context, what one gives (i.e. the inputs includes) such factors are age, seniority, experience, education, demonstrated past experiences etc. While common outputs include pay, praise, promotion, increased responsibility and the like.

(iv) Performance Theory of Job Satisfaction

The animals worked like slaves, but they were happy in their work. They grudged no effort or sacrifice, well aware that everything that they did was for the benefit of themselves and those of their kind who would come after them (Donald and Harry, 1970). Unquestionably, it is the hypothesised connection between employee satisfaction and job performance which has generated the greatest research and theoretical interests. Brayield and Crockett (1955), Herzberg, Peterson and Capwell (1957), and Vroom (1964) have focused their reviews in this connection on the basis of their empirical research.

Sehawab and Cummings (1972) evaluated theoretical propositions concerning relationship between satisfaction and performance. Three major points of view are considered: (1) the view that satisfaction leads to performance, a position generally associated with human relations concepts; (2) the view that the
satisfaction performance relationship is moderated by a number of variables; and (3) the view that performance leads to satisfaction.

Management have at last discovered that there is great production and hence greater profit when workers are satisfied with their jobs. You improve the morale of the company and they improve your production.

(v) Performance-Satisfaction Theory

Good performance may lead to rewards, which in turn lead to satisfaction. This formulation would say that satisfaction rather than causing performance is caused by it. Porter-Lawler model (1968) emphasized on circularity relationship between performance and satisfaction. This implies that satisfaction causes performance and performance causes satisfaction. The most direct linkage has performance as the causal and satisfaction as the dependent variable.

March and Simon (1972) provided the most salient comparison with Porter-Lawler model because both explicitly postulate a circular performance-satisfaction relation.

(vi) Fulfilment Theory of Job Satisfaction:

Schaffer (1953) has argued that job satisfaction will vary directly with the extent to which these needs of an individual
which can be satisfied are actually satisfied. Vroom (1964) also sees job satisfaction in terms of the degree to which a job provides the person with positively valued outcomes. Vroom equates satisfaction with valence. The fulfillment approach views satisfaction as depending on how much of a given outcome or group of outcomes a person receives.

(vii) Discrepancy Theory of Job Satisfaction

Many psychologists have argued for a discrepancy approach about satisfaction. Katzell (1964) viewed satisfaction as the difference between an actual amount and some desired amount. He assumes that this difference should be divided by the desired amount. Katzell (1964) speaks of actual discrepancies while most discrepancy theorists talk of perceived discrepancies.

Locke (1969) has stated a discrepancy theory that differs from Katzell's in several ways. First, Locke emphasized that the perceived discrepancy, not the actual discrepancy, is determined by the simple difference between what the person wants and what he receives. Locke says, "job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are a function of the perceived relationship between what one wants from one's job and what one receives it as offering".
Porter (1961) in measuring satisfaction, asks people how much of a given outcome there should be for their job and how much of a given outcome there actually is; he considers the discrepancy between the two answers to be a measure of satisfaction.

A few researchers have argued that satisfaction is determined by what a person expects to receive rather than by what he wants or feel he should receive. Thus the literature on job satisfaction contains three different discrepancy approaches: (i) The first look at what people want. (ii) The second at what people feel they should receive. (iii) The third at what people expect to receive.

(viii) Mcgregor’s X and Y Theory:

The basic assumption of this theory as propounded by McGregor (1957) is that human behaviour may differ because of complexity of factors affecting the behaviour. These assumptions are characterised as theory X and theory Y.

THEORY X: It implies that management fulfils its economic ends by money, material (equipment) and man i.e. with 3 Ms. Man by nature is self-centered, avoids responsibility and is gullible. It is the duty of management to guide, direct and control
the behaviour of people at work by persuasion, reward and punishment.

**THEORY Y:** This theory implies that average man does not dislike work, because work is as natural as play and rest; work may be source of satisfaction and source of punishment. A few more constituents of theory X are that man is indifferent to organisational needs, dislikes responsibilities, lacks ambition, is gullible and is by nature resistant to change. It also suggests cooperative endeavour of management and employees. There is no conflict between the two. Maximum output with minimum input may be obtained to management by keeping in view the needs of men and there by ensuring their maximum satisfaction. Many of the problems in industry come to focus in frustration and aggression stemming from the relationship between labour and management. Stagner (1965) says, aggression sets off counter-aggression and it leads to a straining of labour management relationships.

(ix) **Achievement Motivation Theory**

In their separate studies of one aspect of motivation, McClelland (1961) and Atkinson (1957) have addressed themselves to achievement oriented activity. McClelland
formulated the concepts of the need to achieve (an achievement or n Ach) postulating that this seemed to be a relatively stable personality trait rooted in experiences in middle childhood.

McClelland and Winter (1969) make the point that a score on n Ach is of a operant, not a respondent nature, in that it records how often a person spontaneously thinks about improving things, not how interested he is in doing so.

The behaviour patterns stem from arousal of the need for achievement, the need for power, and the need for affiliation. It is postulated that those who have high n Ach tend to approach those tasks for which there is reasonable probability of success and to avoid those tasks which are either too easy (because they are not challenging) or too difficult (because of fear of failure). Further, it is presumed that any situation which presents a challenge to achieve (by arousing an expectation that action will lead to success) also must pose the threat of failure (by arousing an expectancy that action may lead to failure). This achievement oriented activity is influenced by the resultant of a conflict by two opposing tendencies, the tendency to achieve success and the tendency to avoid failure. Atkinson and Feather (1966) proposed that the tendency to approach or to continue a task is
a simple multiplicative product of initial level of n Ach (or motives to achieve success).

Thus the generalised model of this theory indicates those with high N Ach are having the strongest tendency to approach tasks of intermediate difficulty, those with low n Ach also tend to approach tasks of intermediate difficulty. However, those with high fears of failure (the negative aspect n Ach) tend to avoid such tasks, preferring the easier tasks in which they are almost certain to succeed or the harder tasks (because the failure at such tasks is clearly not their fault). This basic premise of this theory is supported by a number of studies presented by Atkinson and Feather (1966). McClelland and Winters (1969) pointed out that achievement motivation apparently can be learnt and is not exclusively predetermined by childhood experiences.

(ix) Employee Centred Theory By Likert

According to Likert (1967) supervisory staff has a great impact on motivation. There is a marked relationship between the kind of supervision an employee receives and his productivity. When an employee thinks that his boss perceives him as a cog in the machine (instrument of production) he will be a poor producer;
if he thinks that his boss is interested in him, his problems, his future, he will be a high producer.

Likert (1967) suggests that supervision should be employee centred i.e., friendly and supportive, and not job centred i.e., punitive and threatening.

(x) Behaviouristic Theory by Skinner

Skinner (1954) has provide on the basis of his experiments on operant conditioning that the cause of behaviour is outside the person and in the environment. Behaviour of an individual is modified through operant conditioning. It is encouraged through positive reinforcement. At the same time, it is discouraged through negative conditioning. Skinner (1954), Guthrie (1968), Watson (1939) and other behavioural scientists are the champion of this viewpoint and they advocated the incentives and rewards for the employees.

(xi) Herzberg's Dual Factor Theory of Job Satisfaction

The research findings of Herzberg, Mausner and Synderman (1959) suggested that man has two sets of needs: (1) his need as an animal to avoid pain, (2) his need as a human to grow psychologically. These findings led to advance a dual factor theory. This theory was hypothesised by studying two hundred
engineers and accountants. During the structural interview they were asked to describe a few previous job experiences in which they felt exceptionally good or exceptionally bad about their jobs. They were also asked to rate the degree to which their feelings had been influenced for better or for worse by each experience which they described. The distinction between two kinds of factors were noted for analysis of results.

Job satisfaction consisted of two separate independent dimensions: the first related to job satisfaction and the second dimensions to job dissatisfaction. These dimensions are not opposite ends of the same continuum, but instead represent two distinct continua. Those job characteristics that are important for and lead to job satisfaction but not to job dissatisfaction are classified as 'satisfiers' or 'motivators', while those that are important for, and lead to job dissatisfaction but not to job satisfaction are classified as 'dissatisfies' or 'hygienes' or 'maintenance'. Motivators contribute to satisfied feelings. Hygienes contribute to dissatisfied feelings. The first set of factors i.e. intrinsic, include job content: job itself, achievement, recognition, promotion, responsibility, advancement, psychological growth. Another set of factors i.e., extrinsic, include job context, working
conditions, salary, supervision, job security, status, company policy.

Herzberg (1959) observed that satisfaction and dissatisfaction were two separate distinct and independent feelings. They are unipolar dimensions. The opposite of satisfaction is no satisfaction, and the opposite of dissatisfaction is no dissatisfaction. The traditional view conceives satisfaction and dissatisfaction as bipolar dimension, according to which absence of one indicates the presence of other.

**Traditional View (Bipolar dimension)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissatisfaction</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Two-factor theory (Unipolar Dimension)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfiers</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissatisfies</th>
<th>Dissatisfaction</th>
<th>No dissatisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Second two-factor theory states that satisfaction and dissatisfaction do not exit on a continuum running from satisfaction through neutral to dissatisfaction. Two independent continuum
exist; one running from satisfied to neutral and another running from dissatisfied to neutral as given below:

Satisfied________________Neutral

Dissatisfied______________Neutral

According to Herberg (1966), a person can be very satisfied and very dissatisfied at the same time. The theory implies that factors such as working conditions cannot increase or cause satisfaction they can only affect the amount of dissatisfaction that is experienced. Thus, the theory argues that job satisfaction and dissatisfaction result form different causes. Satisfaction depends on motivations while dissatisfaction is the result of hygiene factors.

(xii) Critical Evaluation of Theories

The sum of all these theories is expressed here singly none of the theories of job satisfaction is able to explain the management philosophies and practices. All of these theories go a long way to explain the different aspects and motives of employee’s behaviour and the concept of job satisfaction. All the theories are complimentary to one another. Majority of industrial psychologists are of the opinion that there is no generality of assumptions between job satisfaction and job productivity, turn over, etc. The commonly held hypothesis is that employees who
experience positive job satisfaction in their work are more productive as a result. However, one can also contemplate the reverse explanation namely, that those employees who are more productive, have higher level of satisfaction, because of their superior work performance. In regard to this chicken and egg (conundrum), Porte and Lawler (1968) made a plea to stop putting the satisfaction cart before the performance horse, rather they expressed the conviction that job satisfaction should be viewed as something that results from performance behaviour rather than as a cause of good or bad performance.

Morse (1953) suggesting additive view of the interplay of among job values, job rewards and job satisfaction argued, "the greater the amount the individual gets, the greater his satisfaction, and at the same time, the more the individual still desires, the less his satisfaction."

A McCormick and Tiffin (1979) pointed out that the total welfare of individuals, and of society as whole depends in part on the satisfaction that the people experience in the various aspects of their lives, including their employment relationships. In recent years, there has been an increasing acceptance on the part of industry of social obligations to the community and to the nation as
a whole, thereby creating adequate justification for the action taken by managements and organisations to create work situations that are conducive to the increase of human satisfaction.

(2) Interpretation of Results

In this section we have made an attempt to interpret the main findings of the present research work in the light of previous theories and findings of the previous researches conduct by earlier investigators.

The difference in the mean job satisfaction score between low and moderate stress group is 23.5 while the difference between moderate and high stress group is 24.84. A comparison of this mean difference clearly demonstrate than there is consistent decrease in the job satisfaction with the increase in the level of stress. The effect of stress on job satisfaction has also been studied by previous psychologists. Mishra and Singh (1987) conducted a study to find out the effect of stress on job satisfaction and reported significantly adverse effect of stress on job satisfaction. Several studies related to level of stress and job satisfaction have established negative relationship between the two indicating higher job satisfaction with lower level of stress (Norg et al., 1991; Burke and Greenglass, 1994; Davis and Wilson,
(i). Effect of stress on Job Satisfaction

The main finding related to the effect of level of stress on job satisfaction clearly revealed that the three group of stress, i.e., low, moderate and high do differ significantly in their scores of job satisfaction. The subjects with low stress were found more satisfied in their job (M=156.42) in comparison to other group of subjects belonging to moderate (M=131.58) and high level of stress (M=108.08).

Now question arises why do these groups differ significantly in job satisfaction. More specifically, why are the subjects of low stress are more satisfied in their job as compared to the subjects belonging to moderate and high stress group. To answer this question, an explanation can be advanced to account for these differences in the light of Vroom's valence instrumentality expectancy (V.I.E.) theory. This theory is also known by another names such as Expectancy theory. The expectancy valence theory or model is also a cognitive theory of job satisfaction. Individuals are viewed as thinking and reasoning beings who have beliefs and expectations or anticipations concerning future events in their lives. The assumption of this theory is that behaviour is viewed as
function of interaction between personality i.e. ability, value, needs, expectancy, instrumentality and role demands and general environment around the person. Vroom (1964) also sees job satisfaction in terms of the degree to which a job provides the person with positively values outcomes. Vroom equates satisfaction with valence.

Since, the subjects with low stress have shown more satisfaction in jobs, these subjects are supposed to have healthy personality interaction with the environment around them. The needs and expectations of these individuals are fulfilled by their effort and abilities and in turn of this they take more interest in their job which might be producing a positive feeling towards their job. In other words it may be hypothesized that individual with low stress feel more comfortable and enjoy their work. The positive feeling towards the work also brings positive feeling in them.

The positively in the feeling and behaviour of individual brings more satisfaction in job due to more valued outcomes provided by the environment. Thus, due to the difference in the degree of the valued outcomes, these three groups of high, moderate and low stress have shown different job satisfaction.

Another explanation can be presented in the light of
fulfillment theory of job satisfaction proposed by Scaffer (1953). The basic assumption of this theory is that job satisfaction is related to the extent of fulfillment of needs. The subjects of high level of stress were found to experience less job satisfaction. It may be noted that the outcome in the job depends upon the efforts one makes to complete the work successfully. A highly stress person have feeling of helplessness and does not take interest in his work leading to low job satisfaction.

(ii) Effect of Profession on Job Satisfaction

Our findings regarding the effect of profession on job satisfaction have revealed that the professional groups i.e., doctors, teachers and advocates differ significantly on job satisfaction. Teachers were found having high degree of job satisfaction followed by doctors (M=132.33) and advocates (M=122.13) In a study Elzbeta (1996) studied the job satisfaction and dissatisfaction and occupational commitment among four types of professional groups, i.e., doctors, engineering, lawyers and teachers. The study also examined elements of job satisfaction and individual social background among four professional groups. Findings of the study revealed the fact although there were some difference between professional groups in terms of job satisfaction
the reason for this difference was assigned to prestige ascribed with the each profession. Tharkan (1992) also reported differences in the job satisfaction of different professional groups.

Now the question arises that why teachers are having higher degree of job satisfaction, followed by doctors and advocates occupied higher social status and prestige in the society but even they have low job satisfaction in comparison of teachers. The main reason for this difference in job satisfaction of doctors, teachers and advocates may be attributed to the nature of job income and employment level. In the present study we selected teachers of degree colleges who were employed as regular teacher and comparatively in high pay package and less risk to their job in comparison of doctors and advocates. Doctors no doubt are equally respected class in the high income group but they also have to demonstrative high professional commitment which leads to pressure on them. Doctors have to deal with the patients and their relatives that is like public dealing. Doctors also faces the probability of success and failure in their treatment. But in case of teachers there is no uncertainty with them and public pressure is minimum on them. Due to above reasons our finding regarding the highest job satisfaction among teachers in quite explainable.
Reasons for the low level of job satisfaction among advocates may be advanced in terms uncertainty linked with the profession. A large percentage of advocates are in private practice where income is not regular and fixed. Only a few advocates who are very senior get sufficient income. The income of advocates is on daily basis and uncertainty is there. A large number of advocates work as junior assistant with senior advocates and they are paid by their senior advocate depending on their daily income. In view of the above reasons i.e., uncertainty with the income, advocate have low job satisfaction. Though doctors have high income but due to public pressure and risk involved with the job they have moderate level of occupational stress. Teachers have high level of job satisfaction because they have regular income and low occupational pressure on them.

(iii) Effect of Gender on Job Satisfaction

In regard to this variable i.e. sex of the subjects the finding is clear that male subjects have shown more job satisfaction (M=141.54) as compared to the female (M=122.52). Our finding gets confirmation by the results obtained by earlier researcher also. Gender difference in job satisfaction has been studied by Titles Coshagbemi (2000) McNeilly et al. (1992) found that men
expressed greater job satisfaction in comparison of women with pay and opportunity for promotion and less satisfaction with their superior staffs.

In this context, question arises why do male subjects differ significantly in job satisfaction in comparison to the female subjects. To answer this question, the explanation can be presented in the light of Fulfillment theory of job satisfaction proposed by Schaffer (1953). Schaffer argued that job satisfaction will vary directly to the extent to which the needs of an individuals can be satisfied are actually satisfied. It may be noted that male employees are able to fulfill and satisfy their needs in the organisation better than women. Thus, due to difference in fulfillment of needs in these two groups i.e. male and female subjects have expressed different job satisfaction.

Another reason for this gender difference i.e., higher job satisfaction in male in comparison of female can be advanced in terms of high job commitment and occupational pressure. Female by and large have more job commitment and try to give their best to the organisation which as a result brings high pressure on them. This high perceived pressure by the female towards the job is main cause of low job satisfaction among female workers. Male
members have different temperament. They are easy going by nature due to socialization factors. Male members when at work also enjoy the company of their friends and exchange verbal communication very frequently while on job. This reduces the work pressure on them.

Another reason might be the dual responsibility attached with the female. Female apart from doing their duty at work place also work at home for their children and husband. Thus, female face divided attention between home and work place. But this is not the case with the male members. Therefore the low job satisfaction among female in companies of male members are quite explainable.
(3) Suggestions for Further Researchers

In the following section researcher has made an attempt to highlight and suggest those problems which are still unresolved and need further investigation by the follow researchers.

i. In the present study we investigated the effect of three professional groups, i.e., doctors, teachers and advocates ignoring their seniority and work experience. With the length of experience several type of changes are automatically associated, i.e., adjustment with the work environment, income and professional skills etc. A study be planned to find out the effect of work experience i.e., length of service on job satisfaction.

ii. In our study, we studied the effect of profession on job satisfaction ignoring the job profile. We studied job satisfaction of doctors without considering whether they are private practioners or in employment in government or semi government organisation. Similarly teachers working in Govt Colleges and self finance colleges, advocates in employment or private practioners be also compare in term of their job satisfaction. A study including this dimension will bring interesting results.
iii. Now a days people are more inclined and prefer Govt. job rather than job the private organisation due to job uncertainty in private organization. A study comparing the job satisfaction of workers in private and govt organisation along with the length of service may be planned to bring comparative position of job satisfaction.

iv. A comparative study of job satisfaction in small, medium and large industrial organisation be also investigated. Workers in large industry might be feeling more secure in their job and promotion is almost automatic due to strong labour union. While in small organization workers performance of the worker is always in the knowledge of the manager or owner. This might be a contributing factor to job satisfaction of the workers.

v. In garment and leather industry most of the workers are employed with the condition that they will get payment based on their output i.e., production basis. It is called service hired on commission basics. Many government many garment factories have come up in Gurgaon and Shahdara near Delhi NCR. A study of job satisfaction of these workers may also be investigated.