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1. Studies on Job Satisfaction

Over 3000 studies have been conducted on the topic of job satisfaction, or morale as it was more frequently termed in previous years. Their results tended to point out very much the same conclusions (Dryden Robert, p. 12). Management needs information on employee job satisfaction in order to make sound decisions, both in preventing and solving employee problems.

Benefits of the Studies on Job Satisfaction:

If the studies on job satisfaction are properly planned and administered, they will usually provide a number of important benefits, both general and specific.

Monitoring Attitudes: One benefit of studies on attitude is that they give management an indication of general levels of satisfaction in a company. Surveys also indicate the specific areas of satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

Additional Benefits: Surveys have many other benefits as well. The flow of communication in all directions is improved as people plan the survey, take it, and discuss its results. Surveys can serve as a safety valve, or emotional release, for people to get things off their chests and later feel better about them. Training needs can be identified, since employees can report how well they feel their supervisor performs certain parts of the job, such as delegating work and giving adequate instructions. Surveys can also help managers plan and monitor new programs, by getting feedback on proposed changes in advance and then conducting a follow-up survey to evaluate the actual response (Kith Davis, p. 218).

Ideal Survey Conditions:

Surveys are most likely to produce some of the benefits reviewed above when the following conditions are met:

- Top management actively supports the survey.
- Employees are fully involved in planning the survey.
- A clear objective exists for conducting the survey.
- The study is designed and administered in a manner consistent with standards for sound research.
• Management is capable of taking, and willing to take, follow-up action.
• Both the results and action plans are communicated to employees.

**Use of Existing Job Satisfaction Information:**

Before they conduct formal job satisfaction surveys, managers might examine two other methods for learning about current employee feelings – daily contacts and existing data. These approaches recognize that formal job satisfaction surveys are similar to an annual accounting audit in the sense that both are merely periodic activities; yet there is a day-to-day need to monitor job satisfaction just as there is a regular need to keep up with the financial accounts (Davis, p. 219).

Management stays in touch with the level of employee satisfaction primarily through face-to-face contact and communication. This is a practical and timely method of determining the job satisfaction level of individuals, but there are also a number of other satisfaction indicators already available in an organization. As shown in Figure, examples include absences, grievances, and exit interview. This information is usually collected separately for other purposes, but it can readily be assembled into a monthly report that gives management insights into the general level of satisfaction among employees.

![Figure No. 3.1. Examples of job satisfaction-related information frequently available in organization (Keith Davis, p. 219)](image)

Some of the items in Figure are behavioral indicators of job satisfaction (Keith Davis, p. 219).
Arnold, Hughy & Feldmand Daniel (1986) job satisfaction surveys can help employers manage their workers more effectively. Surveys are generally used to accomplish five goals:

1. To diagnose potential problems in organizations.
2. To discover the causes of absenteeism and turnover.
3. To assess the impact of organizational changes on employee attitudes.
4. To stimulate better communication between management and workers.
5. To provide accurate information about the degree to which employees may be willing to vote for a union if given the chance (Hughy & Daniel, p. 103-104).

2. Job Satisfaction as a Type of Attitude

A person can have thousands of attitudes, but OB focuses our attention on a very limited number of work-related attitudes. These work-related attitudes tap positive or negative evaluations that employees hold about aspects of their work environment. Most of the researches in OB have been concerned with three attitudes: job satisfaction, job involvement, and organizational commitment.

**Job satisfaction**: The term ‘job satisfaction’ refers to an individual’s general attitude toward his or her job. A person with a high level of job satisfaction holds positive attitudes about the job, while a person who is dissatisfied with his or her job holds negative attitudes about the job (Robbins, p. 74).

3. Definition of Job Satisfaction

Generally, job satisfaction is the result of the individual’s perception of what is expected and what is received from different facets of the work situation. The closer the expectation is to what is actually received, the greater the job satisfaction. Job satisfaction sometimes refers to an overall feeling of satisfaction or satisfaction with the situation-as-a-whole (global satisfaction). At other times, job satisfaction refers to a person’s feelings toward specific dimensions of the work environment (facet satisfaction). These dimensions or facets of the work environment refer to such things as pay, benefits, promotional opportunities, working conditions, supervision, the work itself, co-workers and the organizational structure (James, p. 74-5).
Job satisfaction is a popular concept in industrial and organizational psychology. The credit for bringing this term into currency goes to Happock (1935), according to whom job satisfaction is "any combination of psychological, physiological and environment circumstances that causes a person truthfully to say: I am satisfied with my job" (Singh, R.S., 1993, p.5).

The terms "job satisfaction" or "work satisfaction" have been given different connotations since their inception. Blum and Maylor (1968) are of the view that job satisfaction is the result of various attitudes possessed by an employee.

Sinha (1972) opines: Job satisfaction covers both the satisfaction derived from being engaged in a piece of work or in any pursuit of a higher order (Hingar Ashas, p.29).

Sinha (1974) defines job satisfaction as a "reintegration of effect produced by individual's perception of fulfillment of his needs in relation to his work and the situations surrounding it" (Saiyadain, p. 13).

Briefly it is definition of job satisfaction: on individual general attitude toward his or her job.

4. Importance of Job Satisfaction to the Organization

The importance of satisfaction to the firm is best studied through long-term research efforts.

Rensis Likert and his associates have been studying the importance of human behavior concerns such as satisfaction to organizational effectiveness since 1946. The coefficient of determination of .49 between managerial leadership and satisfaction means that 49 per cent of the variation in worker satisfaction is attributed to or explained by managerial leadership. Conversely, 51 per cent of work satisfaction can be attributed to factors other than managerial leadership. The coefficient of determination of .42 between satisfaction and productive efficiency means that 42 per cent of the variation of productive efficiency is accounted for, stems from or is explained by worker satisfaction (James, p. 71-2).

The managers and his subordinates are interested in satisfying their own needs – on and off the job, if such satisfaction is a goal they seek, then liking their jobs must somehow be tied to its achievement.
Research shows that lack of job satisfaction is usually tied to turnover and absenteeism. Because these two variables affect the organization’s cost, if for no other reason, management’s interest is stimulated in increasing job satisfaction (Dorotny, p. 67)

5. Theories of Job Satisfaction

1) The Needs of Shaffer’s Theory (1953):

Robert Schaffer conceptualized job satisfaction as a function of individual needs and need satisfaction. Schaffer hypothesized, “Overall job 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 was very specific as to requirements when selecting the needs to be included in his study. They were:

1. The need should be a relatively permanent and stable part of an individual’s personality.
2. It should be relatively important in determining adjustment (although differing in degree of importance among individuals).
3. It should be present in many people.
4. It should conceivably be satisfied in a work situation.
5. It should not overlap with other needs (should be unique).
6. It should be measurable by paper-and-pencil questionnaire.


The results of Schaffer’s study, on the whole, supported his hypothesis. The strongest needs did in fact correlate more closely with the overall measure of job satisfaction than did the weaker needs (Dorotny, p. 71).
2) The factors of the motivation to work theory:

Herzberg, Mausner, and Synderman take a position on job satisfaction that may be more controversial than any other theory of motivation. It was first reported in The Motivation to Work. Using a sample of 200 engineers and accountants from the Pittsburgh area, this group designed a study to test the concept that man has two sets of needs, “his needs as an animal to avoid pain and his needs as a human to grow psychologically. The respondents were asked to describe times in their work lives when they felt particularly good and when they felt particularly bad about their jobs (Dorothy, p. 72).

The results are reported in terms of frequency. Herzberg refers to as motivators and hygiene factors.

![Figure 3.2: Herzberg's Two Factor Theory](image-url)

**Motivators**
- Work itself
- Advancement
- Recognition
- Achievement
- Responsibility

**Hygiene factors**
- Supervision
- Salary
- Job security
- Relation with supervisors
- Company policies
- Working conditions
- Status
- Factors in personal life

Herzberg says that five factors lead to job satisfaction and the other factors lead to dissatisfaction the figure 3.2 show it. This division is a reflection of the Herzberg et al. position that job satisfaction is not a unidimensional concept. In the theory, factors leading to job satisfaction are achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, and advancement. These are what Herzberg calls the satisfiers. They have also been referred to as the motivators because, he says, “Other findings of the study suggest that they are effective in motivating the individual to superior performance and effort”. This, then, fits nicely with the name of the theory – Motivation to Work. These items refer to the content of the job, that is, what the worker is actually doing. The hygiene factors, so named because increases in these
factors prevent job dissatisfaction, are also called the dissatisfiers. These items are company policy and administration, supervision-technical, interpersonal relations, working conditions, salary, job security and status. (Dorotny, p. 72-3).

Herzberg contends: “the opposite job satisfaction would not be job dissatisfaction, but rather no job satisfaction; similarly the opposite of job dissatisfaction is no job dissatisfaction, not satisfaction with one’s job” (Dorothy, p. 75).

3) Need-fulfillment theory:

In some respects the most rational of the theories of job satisfaction and the one which is probably the clearest analogue to the incentive theory of performance is the notion that (1) a person is satisfied if he gets what he wants and (2) the more he wants something, or the more important it is to him, the more satisfied he is when he gets it and the more dissatisfied he is when he does not get it. There are two major theories that utilize this kind of framework, one a subtractive model and the other multiplicative (Vroom, 1964). Both conceptualize job satisfaction as a direct function of the extent to which an environment corresponds to one’s need structures.

The subtractive model proposes that job satisfaction is a direct negative function of the discrepancy between a person’s needs and the extent to which the environment provides satisfaction of those needs. The greater the total discrepancy counting all needs, the less the satisfaction; and the less the discrepancy, the greater the satisfaction.

According to the subtractive model, the individual’s rankings in terms of their satisfaction with their jobs would be predicted to be, starting from the most satisfied, C and D (tied), E, G, A, B and F. This is the order corresponding to the order in which the individuals’ needs are seen as being fulfilled on the job (i.e., their total discrepancy scores).

This subtractive procedure has certain characteristics (Vroom, 1964). One of these is that all other things being equal, the greater a person’s needs, the more job satisfaction will decrease, regardless of what happens in the environment. Similarly, the greater the amount of environment return, the more job satisfaction will increase independent of the level of need of the individual involved. A second characteristic is
that a person who has a need level of 1 and a satisfaction of 1 is considered to have the same level of satisfaction as a person whose comparable figures are 10 in desire and 10 in fulfillment. Vroom thinks that this is a distorted conception of job satisfaction (Korman, p. 214).

4) Reference-group theory:

Reference-group theory is similar to need-fulfillment theory except that it takes as its point of departure not the desires, needs, and interests of the individual but, rather, the point of view and the opinions of the group to whom the individual looks for guidance. Such groups are defined as the reference group for the individual in that they define the way in which he should look at the world and evaluate various phenomena in the environment (including himself, to a great extent). It would be predicted, according to this theory, that if a job meets the interest, desires, and requirements of a person's reference group, he will like it, and if it does not, he will not like it (Korman, p. 215-6).

5) Equity theory of motivation:

Adam's (1963) equity theory explains that the perceptions of fairness of equity have a major influence on motivation of the person. It is greatly concerned with each person's feelings of fairness about the rewards-psychological, social and or economic received from an organization. The theory states that employees tend to determine fairness by considering their inputs and rewards on the job in comparison with those of other people. If the comparison is equal the employee feels treated fairly which leads to job satisfaction. If it is unequal, the employee feels inequality and is motivated to impress management to take corrective action, if not taken would lead to dissatisfaction.

6) The value theory:

The value theory proposed by Locke (1984). He proposed that job satisfaction occurs when the job outcomes or the reward that the employee receives matches with outcomes that are desired by him. The theory focuses on any outcome that people value regardless of their quality or quantity. Thus the value attached to outcome is more important. The better the outcome that they get the more satisfied they will be; and the less valuable outcome they receive, the less satisfied they will
be. Essential to Locke’s theory is, therefore, the discrepancy between the present aspects of the job and those that an employee desires such as pay, learning opportunity, promotion and so on (Saiyadain, p. 61-62).

7) The Met Expectations theory:

This approach is based on the expectations that new employees have about the job and how far these expectations are met. It suggests that the employees will work to achieve the outcomes they expect to follow after successful performance (Porter and Steers, 1973). Workers become dissatisfied if their expectations about their job are not met. Review of the theory suggests that the correlation between job satisfaction and met expectations are around 0.39 (Wanous et al., 1992). One of the implications of the Met expectations theory is that one way of reducing potential dissatisfaction among employees is to bring their expectations in line with the reality. The idea of met expectations suggests that the processes undergoing within the person influence job dissatisfaction. A critical viewpoint of this notion is that it ignores the social context of the individual and this is the basis of the equity theory (Saiyadain, p.62).

6. Elements and Resources of Job Satisfaction

**Elements:** Job satisfaction is a set of favorable or unfavorable feelings and emotions with which employees view their work. Job satisfaction is an affective attitude or a feeling of relative like or dislike toward something.

**Individual Focus** job satisfaction typically refers to the attitudes of a single employee.

**Overall or Multidimensional?** Job satisfaction can be viewed as an overall attitude, or it can apply to the various parts of an individual’s job. If it is viewed only as an overall attitude, however, managers may miss seeing some key hidden exceptions as they assess an employee’s overall satisfaction. Job satisfaction studies, therefore, often focus on the various parts that are believed to be important, since these job related attitudes predispose an employee to be in certain ways. Important aspects of job satisfaction include pay, one’s supervisor the nature of tasks performed, an employee’s coworkers or team, and the immediate working conditions (Kith Davis, p. 208).
Stability of Job Satisfaction: Attitudes are generally acquired over a long period of time. Similarly, job satisfaction or dissatisfaction emerges as an employee gains more and more information about the workplace. Nevertheless, job satisfaction is dynamic, for it can decline even more quickly than it develops. Managers cannot establish the conditions leading to high satisfaction now and later neglect it, for employee needs may fluctuate suddenly. Managers need to pay attention to employee attitudes week after week, month after month, year after year.

Environmental Impact: Job satisfaction is one part of life satisfaction. The nature of a worker’s environment off the job indirectly influences his or her feelings on the job. Similarly, since a job is an important part of life for many workers, job satisfaction influences general life satisfaction. The result is that there is a spillover effect that occurs in both directions between job and life satisfaction. Consequently, managers need to monitor not only the job and immediate work environment but also their employees’ attitudes toward other parts of life as shown in Figure 3.3 (Keith Davis, p. 209).

![Figure No. 3.3 (Keith Davis, p. 209)](#)

Sources of Job Satisfaction:

There are a variety of factors that lead people to feel positively or negatively about their jobs. Below, we look at the six most frequently studied causes of job satisfaction: (1) pay, (2) the work itself, (3) promotions, (4) supervision, (5) the work group; and (6) working conditions. We will see that, in general, pay and the work itself are the most important sources of job satisfaction, that promotional opportunities and supervision are moderately important sources of job satisfaction, and that the work group and working conditions are relatively minor sources of job satisfaction.
Pay:

Wages do play a significant role in determining job satisfaction. Money facilitates the obtaining of food, shelter, and clothing and provides the means to enjoy valued leisure interests outside of work. Moreover, pay can serve as a symbol of achievement and a source of recognition. Employees often see pay as a reflection of management’s esteem for their contribution to the organization (Hughy, p. 86).

The work itself: Along with pay, the content of the work itself plays a very major role in determining how satisfied employees are with their jobs. By and large, workers want jobs that are challenging. They do not want to be doing mindless jobs day after day. The two most important aspects of the work itself that influence job satisfaction are variety and control over work methods and work pace.

In general, jobs with a moderate amount of variety produce the most job satisfaction. Jobs with too little variety cause workers to feel bored and fatigued. Jobs with too much variety and stimulation cause workers to feel psychologically stressed and “burned out”.

Jobs that give workers some autonomy in how they do their work also provide the greatest job satisfaction. In contrast, management control over work methods and work pace consistently leads to high levels of job dissatisfaction. It is dehumanizing for employees to have their every action determined by their supervisors, down to when they can have a rest break. Moreover, many workers report that their own productivity varies widely over the course of a day. Often, employees are least efficient the first and last half hours of the day and must before and after lunch. They are most efficient in the middle of the morning and the middle of the afternoon. Mechanical pacing does not allow employees to pace their work according to their energy levels (Hughy, p.88).

Promotions: Promotional opportunities have a moderate impact on job satisfaction. A promotion to a higher level in an organization typically involves positive changes in supervision, job content, and pay. Jobs that are at the higher levels of an organization usually provide workers with more freedom, more challenging work assignments, and higher salary.
However, the rewards associated with a particular promotion differ greatly from one situation to another. One person may be promoted to a company presidency with a salary increase of $100,000 a year, whereas another person who is promoted from senior secretary to administrative assistant may receive only a $1,000 salary increase. For this reason, promotions are a much greater source of job satisfaction to business executives than to blue-collar and white-collar clerical workers. Executives gain comparatively greater rewards from their promotions (Hugy, p. 88).

**Supervision:** Like promotion, supervision is a moderately important source of job satisfaction. Two dimensions of supervisor style, in particular, seem to have some impact on employee job satisfaction. The first dimension is employee-centeredness or consideration. Supervisors who establish a supportive personal relationship with subordinates and take a personal interest in them contribute to their employees’ satisfaction. The other dimension of supervisory style that seems to contribute to employees’ satisfaction is influence, or participation, in decision making. Employees who participate in decisions that affect their jobs display a much higher level of satisfaction with their supervisors and with their overall work situation.

While employee-centeredness and influence in decision making are positively correlated with employee satisfaction, the participative leadership style does not always improve workers’ attitudes toward their jobs. For instance, while employees in small, close-knit work groups prefer democratic leaders, employees in large, impersonal work groups actually prefer autocratic leaders. Thus, while there is generally a positive relationship between an employee-centered supervisory style and employee satisfaction, there are several circumstances in which the relationship does not hold up.

**Work Group (coworkers):**

Having friendly and cooperative coworkers is a modest source of job satisfaction to individual employees. People like the opportunity to have conversation with each other as they work, and especially dislike jobs in which they are physically separated from each other. The work group also serves as a social support system for employees. People often use their coworkers as a sounding board for their problems or as a source of comfort.
Ironically, however, while most people are very satisfied with their relationships with coworkers, having good relationships with coworkers are not as important to employees as most other factors are (Hughy, p. 90).

**Working conditions:**

Working conditions, too, contribute in a modest way to job satisfaction. Features such as temperature, humidity, ventilation, lighting and noise, work schedules, cleanliness of the workplace, and adequate tools and equipment can all affect job satisfaction.

The reasons for this are fairly straightforward. First, employees desire good working conditions because they lead to greater physical comfort. For instance, too much heat or too little light can cause physical discomfort, unclean air or poor ventilation can be physically dangerous. Second, working conditions are important to employees because they can influence life outside of work. If people are required to work long hours and/or overtime, they will have very little time left for their families, friends, and recreation outside of work. On the other hand, if workers have relatively short work weeks and/or some flexibility in the hours they have to work, it will be much easier for them to improve the quality of their lives outside of their jobs.

A number of factors have been associated with job satisfaction. Among the more important ones are these: 1. Pay, 2. Work itself, 3. Promotion opportunities, 4. Supervision, 5. Coworkers, 6. Working conditions, 7. Job security (Ivanchovic, p. 122).

W.W. Ronan (1970) has reviewed the empirical literature and determined job satisfaction has, at a minimum, seven important facets. The seven important dimensions were found to be:


Smith Kendal has found that workers have feeling toward five job facets:

Happock (1935) has suggested the following six factors as major constituents of job satisfaction:

(i) The way an individual reacts to unpleasant situation, (ii) The facility to which he adjusts himself with other persons, (iii) His relative status in the social and economical group with which he identifies himself, (iv) The nature of work in relation to his abilities, interests and preparation, (v) Security, and (vi) Loyalty (R.S. Singh, 1993, p. 5-6)

Herbert Mausher, Peterson and Campwell (1957) compiled data from 15 studies in which workers were asked about the causes of satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Supervision was maintained next only to co-workers as source of satisfaction. But it was placed at fourteen places in the same list of job factors when they were asked what made them dissatisfied with their jobs (Singh, 1993, p. 7). There are also some data suggesting that worker’s satisfaction with their job is related to their opportunities for interaction with others on job (Walker and Guest (1952), Kerr, Koppelmeir and Sullivan, (1951), Smastky (1951) and Richards and Dobryns (1957) income level is generally found to be positively associated with job satisfaction (Thompton (1939), Miller (1941), Caners and Cantril (1946), Lawler and Porter (1967), Pestsongee (1969, 1971) and Dwivedi (1971) (Singh, 1993, p. 7).


The typical factors of job satisfaction would be included are – 1. The nature of the work, 2. Supervision, 3. Present pay, 4. Promotion, opportunity and 5. Relations with co-workers (Robbins S, p. 184).

**Intrinsic versus Extrinsic Sources of Satisfaction:**

All sources of job satisfaction fall into two categories: intrinsic and extrinsic. Intrinsic sources originate from within the individual and have psychological value such satisfactions are essentially self-administered. Autonomy (that is, independence, such as the ability to choose one’s own work pace) is one source of intrinsic satisfaction. Other intrinsic sources include a sense of challenge and feelings of recognition.
Extrinsic sources of satisfaction originate from outside the individual; they come from his or her environment. Working conditions and opportunities to interact with coworkers are sources of extrinsic satisfaction, as are job security and fringe benefits.

In addition, some sources of satisfaction serve a dual purpose in that they can be extrinsic, or tangible, in nature while having intrinsic or psychological, value because of what they symbolize. Both a high salary and rapid career progress would offer dual sources of satisfaction.

**Expectations:** Satisfaction is a very personal experience that depends heavily on an individual’s expectations. For example imagine that you have just been offered an executive position that pays $150,000 a year. It sounds attractive, of course. In the abstract, it’s difficult to conceive of how some one could be dissatisfied with such a salary. Suppose, however, that you discover that other people who have much the same job are receiving $500,000 + $900,000 per year. What formerly seemed to be an attractive salary would suddenly become unsatisfactory.

Expectations can have a powerful influence on a person’s level of satisfaction. For example, new employees often have on unrealistically high expectations. In the time between being offered a job and the first day of work, new employees may be fantastic about how rapidly they will rise in the new organization, what immediate working conditions will be like, and so on. Once on the job, however they may experience a shock when confronted with a number of harsh realities. They may discover that no promotion ladder extends from their current position, that their coworkers are not very pleasant, or that the lunch room and rest rooms are dilapidated. The unrealistic expectations of new employees may be partly generated by personal fantasy and partly by the media. The effects of realistic job previews on individuals’ reaction to their work have been extensively studied. With minor exceptions, the results have generally shown that individuals who are told both the bad and the good features of their new jobs before they begin working have higher levels of job satisfaction (Dryden, Robert P. Vecchio, 1988, pp. 120-121).
A Model of Job Satisfaction:

What determines whether employees feel generally satisfied or dissatisfied with their jobs? How do the specific satisfactions with pay, promotions, and the other job factors combine to produce an overall attitude of liking or disliking of the job? The model of job satisfaction presented in Figure No. 3.4 summarizes what we know about what determines whether employees will be generally satisfied.

Basically, job dissatisfaction is determined by the discrepancy between what individuals expect to get out of their jobs and what the job actually offers. A person will be dissatisfied if there is less than the desire amount of job characteristic in the job. For instance, if a person expects to be promoted in six months and then is not, the person will be dissatisfied. A person will be satisfied if there is no discrepancy between desired and actual conditions (Hughy, p. 91).

Now let’s examine cases of both job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction, using the model in figure no. 3.4.

**Figure 3.4. A model of Job satisfaction**

Source: Adapted from Lawler, E.E. III (1973) Motivation in work organizations Monterey, p. 75 (Hughy, 91-92).

7. Measuring Job Satisfaction

An employee’s assessment of how satisfied or dissatisfied he or she is with his or her job is a complex summation of a number of discrete job elements. How, then, do we measure the concept?
The two widely used approaches are a single global rating and a summation score made up of a number of job facets. The single global rating method is nothing more than asking individuals to respond to one question, such as “All things considered, how satisfied are you with your job?” Respondents then reply by circling a number between one and five that corresponds to answers from “highly satisfied” to “highly dissatisfied”. The other approach – a summation of job facets – is more sophisticated. It identifies key elements in a job and asks for the employee’s feelings about each. Typical factors that would be included are the nature of the work, supervision, present pay, promotion opportunities, and relations with co-workers. These factors are rated on a standardized scale and then added up to create an overall job satisfaction score (Robbins, p. 78).

Is one of the foregoing approaches superior to the other? Intuitively, it would seem that summing up responses to a number of job factors would achieve a more accurate evaluation of job satisfaction. The research, however, doesn’t support this intuition. This is one of those rare instances in which simplicity seems to work as well as complexity. Comparisons of one-question global ratings with the more lengthy summation-of-job-factors method indicate that the former is essentially as valid as the latter. The best explanation for this outcome is that the concept of job satisfaction is inherently so broad that the single question captures its essence (Robbins, p. 79).

**Job Satisfaction as a Dependent Variable:**

We now turn to considering job satisfaction as a dependent variable. That is, we seek an answer to the question: What work-related variables determine job satisfaction? An extensive review of the literature indicates that the more important factors conducive to job satisfaction are mentally work itself, supervisor, co-worker, promotion, pay (Robbins, p. 184).

**Job Satisfaction as an Independent Variable:**

We find a large number of studies that have been designed to assess the impact of job satisfaction on employee performance, productivity, absenteeism, and turnover… (Robbins, p.187).
8. Trends in Job Satisfaction Levels

We looked at job satisfaction from the individual’s point of view. In this section, we consider some of the larger aspects of job satisfaction. Just how satisfied are workers in general today? What have been the trends in the levels of job satisfaction and why? (Hughy, p. 95).

Long-term nationwide studies indicate that general job satisfaction has been relatively high and stable in the United States. Although worker expectations have both increased and changed in their focus overtime, the quality of management practices also has improved. As a result, more than 80 per cent of those in the workforce usually report that they are reasonably satisfied with their jobs. Managers should not be complacent, however, for this statistic also suggests that millions of workers (the other 20 per cent) are unhappy, and many other millions are probably dissatisfied with some specific aspect of their jobs. In addition, many of the “satisfied” workers may have simply resigned themselves to their work situations, with the result that they are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. Moreover, many workers live under a cloud of job insecurity as a result of attempts to improve organizational effectiveness by laying off thousands of workers.

The level of job satisfaction across groups is not constant, but it is related to a number of variables. The key variables revolve around age, occupational level, and organizational size.

As workers grow older, they initially tend to be slightly more satisfied with their jobs. Apparently, they lower their expectations to more realistic levels and adjust themselves better to their work situations. Later, their satisfaction may suffer as promotions are less frequent and they face the realities of retirement. Predictably, too, people with higher level occupations tend to be more satisfied with their jobs. As we might expect, they are usually better paid, have better working conditions, and hold jobs that make fuller use of their abilities. Finally, there is some evidence to suggest that levels of job satisfaction are higher in smaller organizational units, such as a branch plant or a small Silicon Valley enterprise. Larger organizations tend to overwhelm people, disrupt supportive processes, and limit the amounts of personal closeness, friendship and small-group teamwork that are important aspects of job satisfaction for many people (Keith Divis, p. 210).
There has probably been a very slight trend downward in the overall level of job satisfaction over the past 15 years – probably no more than 5 per cent. While more than 80 per cent of the work force still report that they are either somewhat or very satisfied with their jobs, which percentage seems to have been inching downward since the early 1970s. Why is the case? Let’s look at the changes in attitudes among three large groups of workers: the young (under 30); middle managers; and blue-collar workers. (Hughy, p. 96)

**Figure No. 3.5: Three dissatisfied work groups**

- **Young workers**
  1. Unrealistic job expectations
  2. Over qualification for jobs
  3. Unresponsiveness to authoritarian management

- **Middle managers**
  1. Lack of influence in decision making
  2. Frequent layoffs during recessions
  3. Declining earning power

- **Blue collar workers**
  1. Lack of mobility out of blue color jobs
  2. Lack of respect given by media
  3. Low pays uninteresting work (Hughy, 96).

**Young workers:**

Demographic changes in the work force are contributing to the downward trend in job satisfaction. Probably the most significant of these changes is the growing number of young employees. In the United States, out of a work force of more than 85 million, 22.5 million are now under age 30. The baby-boom generation of the 1950s is entering the labor market in full force, and younger employees are consistently more dissatisfied than other employees.

Part of the reason young employees are dissatisfied with their jobs is the nature of their job expectations. Many young employees begin their jobs with unrealistic expectations about how fulfilling and challenging their jobs will be. Finding that reality falls short of expectations, they are very disillusioned in their first decade of work. After age 30, expectations are modified and the job is seen in a more positive light.
Another reason young employees are dissatisfied is that many of them are overqualified for their jobs. Thus, college graduates are moving down to lower-income and lower-status jobs, generating even further frustration (Hughy, p. 97).

**Middle Managers:**

Many middle managers feel that their company would not act to do something about their individual problems; loyalty to the employer, once high among this group of workers, is now much lower.

Middle managers today feel they lack influence in organization decision making. They often have to implement company policies that they don’t understand and don’t agree with. Moreover, because middle managers’ productivity is often hard to measure and their functions often seem nonessential, middle management is the easiest place to cut during recessions. Even the relative earning power of the middle manager has declined substantially. Very few middle managers can afford to support their families on their own salaries (Hughy, p. 98).

**Blue collar workers:**

Many blue-collar workers do not believe that there is a great deal of opportunity for them or their children to move up the ladder of success.

Second, many blue-collar workers are frustrated by the lack of respect with which they are portrayed by the media such as the plumbers who work only twenty-hour weeks and earn $500. The portrait of blue-collar workers that emerges from the mass media implies that they are the problem, not that they have problems.

Third, there is an increasing feeling among blue-collar workers that there are not enough of the good things in life to go around – and that they have received the short end of the stick. Most blue-collar workers are barely keeping up with inflation; many of their jobs are being automated or eliminated; many of their jobs are still characterized by low skill variety and little real autonomy (Hughy, p. 98).

**9. How satisfied are People in Their Jobs**

Are most people satisfied with their jobs? Independent studies, conducted among U.S. workers over the past 30 years, generally indicate that the majority of workers are satisfied with their jobs. Moreover, these results are generally applicable
to other developed countries. For instance, comparable studies among workers in Canada, Mexico, and Europe indicate more positive than negative results.

In spite of the generally positive results, recent trends are not encouraging. The evidence indicates a marked decline in job satisfaction since the early 1990s. A conference Board study found that 58.6 per cent of Americans were satisfied with their jobs in 1995. By the year 2000, that percentage was down to 50.7. This intuitively seems surprising since those five years were ones of economic expansion, increased incomes, and a strong labor market. Apparently, economic prosperity doesn’t necessarily translate into higher job satisfaction. And even though all income groups in the Conference board study indicated lower job satisfaction in 2000 than in 1995, money did seem to buy some happiness. Job satisfaction increased directly with pay for every income category in both 1995 and 2000.

What factors might explain this recent drop in job satisfaction? Experts suggest it might be due to employers’ efforts at trying to increase productivity through heavier employee workloads and tighter deadlines. Another contributing factor may be a feeling, increasingly reported by workers, that they have less control over their work. But does the fact that job satisfaction increases with pay mean that money can buy happiness? Not necessarily, while it’s possible that higher pay alone translates into higher job satisfaction, an alternative explanation is that higher pay is reflecting different types of jobs. Higher-paying jobs generally require higher skills, give incumbents greater responsibilities are more stimulating and provide more challenges, and allow workers more control. So it may be that the reports of higher satisfaction among better-paid workers reflect the greater challenge and freedom they have in their jobs rather than the pay itself (Robbins, p. 79).

10. Job Satisfaction/job Dissatisfaction Outcomes

Job satisfaction outcomes:

We see that job performance includes many potential outcomes. Some are of primary value to the organization – the objective outcomes, for example. Other outcomes (such as job satisfaction) are of primary importance to the individual. Job performance is without doubt a complex variable that depends upon the interplay of numerous factors. Managers can make some sense of the issue by understanding the motivational implications of jobs through the application of job analysis (Ivankovich, 2002, p. 234).
Job Satisfaction and Performance:

First, the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance is weak. Empirical research studies suggest that these two variables are not closely related to each other in any simple fashion. Other factors besides job satisfaction – for instance, the condition of the work equipment or the worker’s own abilities, skills, problem-solving approaches have a much greater impact on how much a person can produce than his or her job satisfaction does.

Second, there is substantial evidence to suggest that job performance leads to job satisfaction, rather than vice versa. As the model in Figure 3.6 indicates, performance leads to satisfaction, and rewards play a major role in the relationship.

Employees who perform well should receive both more intrinsic rewards and more extrinsic rewards. Workers who have successfully completed their jobs will receive more intrinsic rewards as a result of their efforts. Moreover, employees who perform well should also receive more extrinsic rewards (e.g., pay and promotions) in recognition of their superior work. As a result of all these rewards, the best performers will also be the most satisfied workers.

In contrast, employees who perform poorly will probably feel worse about their competence and will probably also receive less pay and fewer promotions. Consequently, the model would predict that these poor performers will be less satisfied with their job (Hughy, p. 92-93).

Figure No. 3.6: The relationship between satisfaction and performance

Managers’ interest in job satisfaction tends to center on its effect on employee performance (Robbins, p. 79). One of the most widely debated and controversial issues in the study of job satisfaction are its relationship to job performance or effectiveness. The general views on this relationship have been advanced: (1) job satisfaction causes job performance; (2) job performance causes job satisfaction; and (3) the job satisfaction-job performance relationship is moderated by other variables such as rewards. Exhibit 3.7 shows each of these viewpoints (Ivankovich, p. 122).

**Figure No. 3.7**

1. Job satisfaction \(\rightarrow\) Job performance
   
   “The satisfied worker is more productive”

2. Job performance \(\rightarrow\) Job satisfaction
   
   “The more productive worker is satisfied”

Perceived equity

3. Job performance \(\rightarrow\) Reward \(\rightarrow\) Job satisfaction

Source: Ivankovich, p. 123.

The first two views have mixed, but generally weak, research support. Most studies dealing with the performance-satisfaction relationship have found low association between performance and satisfaction. The evidence is rather convincing that a satisfied employee is not necessarily a high performer. Managerial attempts to make everyone satisfied will not necessarily yield high levels of productivity. Likewise, the assumption that a high performing employee is likely to be satisfied is not well supported.

The third view suggests that satisfaction and performance are related only under certain conditions. A number of other factors, such as employee participation, have been posited as affecting the relationship (J.A. Wagner, p. 312-30). Most attention, however, has focused on rewards as moderating the relationship. Generally, this view suggests that the rewards one receives as a consequence of good
performance, and the degree to which these rewards are perceived as reasonable or equitable, affect both the extent to which satisfaction results from performance and the extent performance is affected by satisfaction. This means that if an employee is rewarded for good performance and if the reward is deemed fair by the employee, job satisfaction will increase (or remain high). This in turn will have a positive effect on performance, leading to additional rewards and continued higher levels of job satisfaction (Ivankovich, p. 123).

A more accurate statement of the relationship is that high performance contributes to high job satisfaction. The sequence shown in Figure 3-8 is that better performance typically leads to higher economic, sociological, and psychological rewards. If these rewards are seen as fair and equitable, then improved satisfaction develops because employees feel that they are receiving rewards in proportion to their performance. On the other hand, if rewards are seen as inadequate for the level of performance, dissatisfaction tends to arise.

Alternatively, a different scenario emerges if performance is low. Employees might not receive the rewards they were hoping for and dissatisfaction can result. Under these circumstances, the employee might exhibit one or more negative behaviors, such as turnover, absenteeism, tardiness, theft, violence, or poor organizational citizenship. Each of these on undesirable by product of dissatisfaction (seen in the lower portion of Figure 3.8) will now be explored. (Keith Davis – P. 213).

**Figure No. 3.8: The performance satisfaction-effort loop**

Source: Keith Davis, p. 213.
Satisfaction and Productivity: As the “Myth or Science?” box concludes, happy workers aren’t necessarily productive workers. At the individual level, the evidence suggests the reverse to be more accurate – that productivity is likely to lead to satisfaction.

Interestingly, if we move from the individual level to that of the organization, there is renewed support for the original satisfaction – performance relationship. When satisfaction and productivity data are gathered for the organization as a whole, rather than at the individual level, we find that organization with more satisfied employees tend to be more effective than organizations with fewer satisfied employees. It may well be the reason that we haven’t gotten strong support for the satisfaction-causes-productivity thesis and that the studies have focused on individuals rather than on the organization and that individual-level measures of productivity don’t take into consideration all the interactions and complexities in the work process. So while we might not be able to say that a happy worker is more productive, it might be true that happy organizations are more productive (Robbins, p. 80). In the following figure No. 3.9 the relationship between satisfaction and productivity has been shown (Aryyie, M. p. 239).

![Figure No. 39. The relationship between productivity and satisfaction](image)


The Influence of Job Satisfaction on Life Satisfaction:

Is there a relationship between job satisfaction and life satisfaction? It seems reasonable to assume that individuals who are happy with their jobs would tend to be happy with life in general. (Or are individuals who are happy with life in general
happy with their job situation?) Alternatively, do people who dislike their jobs also tend to dislike important things in their life, for example, family and leisure activities?

One study did find that unhappy workers were also unhappy with life in general. More importantly, the study concluded that job satisfaction influences life satisfaction more than life satisfaction influences job satisfaction. This relationship is especially significant when unhappy workers attach high importance to their jobs. When a worker attaches high importance to the job while, at the same time, being dissatisfied with it, general life discontent could very well develop. In the 1960s, it was thought that a dissatisfied worker would compensate for job discontent through rewarding activities outside of the organization, such as becoming more family oriented and getting more involved with fraternal and voluntary organizations or community projects. The above-mentioned study argues against that idea. Dissatisfied workers on the job were dissatisfied in life as well. Satisfied workers on the job were also satisfied with life (James, p. 83-84).

**Job Satisfaction and OCB:**

It seems logical to assume that job satisfaction should be a major determinant of an employee’s organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). Satisfied employees would more likely seem to talk positively about the organization, help others and go beyond the normal expectations in their job. Moreover, satisfied employees might be more prone to go beyond the call of duty because they want to reciprocate their positive experiences. Consistent with these thinking, early discussions of OCB assumed that it was closely linked with satisfaction. More recent evidence, however, suggests that satisfaction influences OCB, but through perceptions of fairness.

There is a modest overall relationship between job satisfaction and OCB. But satisfaction is unrelated to OCB when fairness is controlled for. What does this mean? Basically, job satisfaction comes down to conceptions of fair outcomes, treatment, and procedures. If you don’t feel like your supervisor, the organization’s procedures, or pay policies are fair, your job satisfaction is likely to suffer significantly. However, when you perceive organizational processes and outcomes to be fair, trust is developed. And when you trust your employer, you’re more willing to
voluntarily engage in behaviors that go beyond your formal job requirements (Robbins, p. 82-3).

**Job Satisfaction and Customer Satisfaction:**

Employees in service jobs often interact with customers. Since the management of service organizations should be concerned with pleasing those customers, it is reasonable to ask: Is employees satisfaction related to positive customer outcomes? For frontline employees who have regular contact with customers, the answer is “Yes”.

The evidence indicates that satisfied employees increase customer satisfaction and loyalty. Why? In service organizations, customer retention and defection are highly dependent on how front-line employees deal with customers. Satisfied employees are more likely to be friendly, upbeat, and responsive – which customers appreciate. And because satisfied employees are less prone to turnover, customers are more likely to encounter familiar faces and receive experienced service. These qualities build customer satisfaction and loyalty. In addition, the relationship seems to apply in reverse: dissatisfied customers can increase an employee’s job dissatisfaction. Employees who have regular contact with customers report that rude, thoughtless, or unreasonably demanding customers adversely effect the employees’ job satisfaction (Robbins, p.83).

**Job Dissatisfaction Consequences:**

Assume that a person becomes dissatisfied with his job. What does this mean for behavior and performance? Does it mean anything at all? (Kroman, p.226).

One answer is that the question posed above, while it is the one that has generally been asked in these studies, is not the correct one. Rather, the question that should be the subject of investigation is under which conditions does job dissatisfaction lead to decreased performance and under which conditions does it not. (Korman, p. 227).

Some consequences of job dissatisfaction are given as under:

**Absenteeism:**

We find a consistent negative relationship between satisfaction and absenteeism, but the correlation is moderate - usually less than +.40. While it certainly
makes sense that dissatisfied employees are more likely to miss work, other factors have an impact on the relationship and reduce the correlation coefficient. Organizations that provide liberal sick leave benefits are encouraging all their employees – including those who are highly satisfied – to take days off. Assuming that you have a reasonable number of varied interests, you can find work satisfying and yet still take off work to enjoy a three-day weekend or tan yourself on a warm summer day if those days come free with no penalties (Robbins, p. 80).

An excellent illustration of how satisfaction directly leads to attendance, when there is a minimum impact from other factors, is a study done at Sears, Roebuck. Satisfaction data were available on employees at Sears’s two head quarters in Chicago and New York. In addition, it is important to note that Sear’s policy was not to permit employees to be absent from work for avoidable reasons without penalty. The occurrence of a freak April 2 snowstorm in Chicago created the opportunity to compare employee attendance at the Chicago office with attendance in New York, where the weather was quite nice. The interesting dimension in this study is that the snowstorm gave the Chicago employees a built-in excuse not to come to work. The storm crippled the city’s transportation, and individuals knew they could miss work this day with no penalty. This natural experiment permitted the comparison of attendance records for satisfied and dissatisfied employees at two locations – one where you were expected to be at work (with normal pressures for attendance) and the other where you were free to choose with no penalty involved. If satisfaction leads to attendance, when there is an absence of outside factors, the more satisfied employees should have come to work in Chicago, while dissatisfied employees should have stayed home. The study found that on this particular April 2, absenteeism rates in New York were just as high for satisfied groups of workers as for dissatisfied groups. But in Chicago, the workers with high satisfaction scores had much higher attendance than did those with lower satisfaction levels. These findings are exactly what we would have expected if satisfaction is negatively correlated with absenteeism (Robbins, p. 81).

**Turnover:**

Satisfaction is also negatively related to turnover, but the correlation is stronger than what we found for absenteeism. Yet, again, other factors such as labor-
market conditions, expectations about alternative job opportunities, and length of tenure with the organization are important constraints on the actual decision to leave one's current job.

Dissatisfied employees are the most likely to quit their jobs altogether (turnover) and to be absent frequently from work. Withdrawing from the workplace allows employees to avoid the unpleasant or punishing aspects of their work environment.

If employees do not have a variety of alternative places of employment – due to geographical constraints, family responsibilities, bad economic times, or very specialized skills – they will be unlikely to leave their jobs even if they are highly dissatisfied (Hughy, p. 94).

Figure No. 3.10. Relationships of job satisfaction to turnover and absences

Employee turnover can have several negative consequences, especially if the turnover rate is high. Often it is difficult to replace the departed employees, and the direct and indirect costs to the organization of replacing trained workers are expensive. The remaining employees may be demoralized from the loss of valued
coworkers, and both work and social patterns may be disrupted until replacements are found. Also, the organization’s reputation in the community may suffer. However, some benefits may arise from turnover, such as more opportunities for internal promotion and the infusion of expertise from newly hired employees. In other words, turnover may have functional effects.

Figure 3.11 illustrates the relationship between employee attitudes toward the organization and the organization’s attitudes toward the employee. Desirable turnover represented by cells b and d; the undesirable turnover of cell c should be minimized. Situations contributing to cell a should be encouraged; in this cell are valued employees who wish to remain with the organization. The message for managers is to look beyond overall turnover rates and examine instead the functionality of each departure (Davis, p. 214).

**Figure No. 3.11: Four products of employee-organization attitudes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Employee stays</th>
<th>Employee is terminated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization’s attitude toward employee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Keith Davis, p. 215.

**Tardiness:** Another way in which employees may exhibit their dissatisfaction with job conditions is through tardiness. A tardy employee is one who comes to work but arrives beyond the designated starting time. Tardiness is a type of short-period absenteeism ranging from a few minutes to several hours for each event, and it is another way in which employees physically withdraw from active involvement in the
organization. It may impede the timely completion of work and disrupt productive relationships with coworkers. Although there may be legitimate reasons for an occasional tardy arrival (like a sudden traffic jam), a pattern of tardiness is often a symptom of negative attitudes requiring managerial attention (Keith Davis, p. 216).

**Theft:** There are many causes of employee theft, some employees may steal because they feel exploited, overworked, or frustrated by the impersonal treatment that they receive from their organization. In their own minds, employees may justify this unethical behavior as a way of reestablishing a perception of lost equity, or even gaining revenge for what they consider ill treatment at the hands of a supervisor. In contrast to the situation with absenteeism and tardiness, tighter organizational controls or incentive systems do not always solve theft problems, since they are directed at the symptoms and not at the underlying causes such as severe dissatisfaction (Keith Davis, 216-217).

**Violence:** One of the most extreme consequences of employee dissatisfaction is exhibited through violence, or various forms of verbal or physical aggression at work. Although the source of violence can include customers and strangers, the effect is the same. Managers must increasingly be on the lookout for signs that employee dissatisfaction might turn into verbal or physical harm at work, and they must take appropriate preventive actions (Keith Davis, 217).

**Early Retirement:** Another topic of recent interest is the relationship between job satisfaction and the decision to take early retirement. One might expect that the choice of whether to take early retirement would be influenced by level of job satisfaction. In a study of state civil servants, Schmitt and McLane found supportive evidence those employees who chose early retirement held less positive attitudes toward their positions than did those who chose to remain working. Job level was also associated with early retirement, in that individuals in lower level jobs were more likely to take advantage of the opportunity to retire than individuals in higher level position (Robert, Dryden, p. 124).

**Union Activity:** Why do employees want unions? The evidence is strong that job dissatisfaction is a major cause of unionization.
In an important study of organizing union, researchers found that employees’ interest in unionization is based on dissatisfaction with working conditions and a perceived lack of influence to change those conditions. Employees become frustrated by low wages, by arbitrary and capricious discipline, and by uncorrected safety hazards. When employers fail to respond to employee complaints, employees realize that their power is not sufficient to deal with their employers. Collective action – unionization – may be their best solution. Satisfied employees are seldom interested in unions; they don’t perceive that they need them.

It is also not surprising that job dissatisfaction has an impact on other union activities, such as calling strikes or filing union grievances. Work units with low levels of job satisfaction do have more strikes and file more grievances than units with high levels of job satisfaction (Hughy, p 95).

**Other Effects:** When a worker is dissatisfied with the supervisor, typical reactions may include:

1. Avoiding the supervisor
2. Complaining and arguing
3. Rejecting demands and advice

Work dissatisfaction may lead to the following reactions:

1. Seeking a transfer
2. Being absent or late
3. Taking rest breaks
4. Quitting

The author of the results of this study notes that Table No. 3.12 does not include all employee reactions to satisfying and dissatisfying job facets. However, managers and supervisors would benefit from studying the reactions to dissatisfying job facets in order to identify and change the job facets that tend to be linked with dysfunctional employee behaviors (James, p. 83).
### Table No. 3.1 Types of Actions Typical Appraisal of the Job Situation and Its Aspects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object of Appraisal</th>
<th>Actions following Positive Appraisals</th>
<th>Actions Following Negative Appraisals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Job as a whole work itself | Stay on job.  
Come early; work late; seek transfer (if satiated); stay on job | Be absent or late; quit  
Seek transfer; be absent or late; take rest breaks; quit |
| Own past performance | Maintain performance; set new (higher) goals; stay on job | Increase effort; lower goal (and decrease effort); quit |
| Assigned work goals (quotas; bogeys) | Accept goal; stay on job | Reject goal (restrict output; complain; file grievance; strike; quit |
| Supervisor | Approach (see company of); accept demands and advice; stay on job | Avoid; complain and argue; use defense mechanisms; reject demands and advice; conform to demands; file grievance; strike; physical attack; quit |
| Coworkers | Approach (interact with); conform to norms (out of liking); stay on job | Avoid; argue with; conform to norms (out of fear); be absent; quit |
| Subordinates | Praise and recognize; interact with; retain; promote; stay on job | Correct; teach; criticize; harass; fire; quit |
| Promotion | Raise aspirations; stay on job | Complain; increase or decrease effort; lower aspirations; use defense mechanisms; quit |
| Pay | Stay on job; modify effort (depending on judged connection to performance) | Complain; strike; solicit competing offer; modify effort (depending on judged connection to performance); quit |
| Working conditions | Stay on job | Tolerate; be absent or late; complain; quit |


**How employees can express dissatisfaction:**

Employee dissatisfaction can be expressed in a number of ways. For example, rather than quit, employees can complain, be subordinate, steal organizational property, or shirk a part of their work responsibilities. Figure 3.13 offers four responses that differ from one another along two dimensions: constructive/destructive and active/passive. They are defined as follows:
- **Exit**: Behavior directed toward leaving the organization, including looking for a new position as well as resigning.

- **Voice**: Actively and constructively attempting to improve conditions, including suggesting improvements, discussing problems with superiors, and some forms of union activity.

- **Loyalty**: Passively but optimistically waiting for conditions to improve, including speaking up for the organization in the face of external criticism and trusting the organization and its management to “do the right thing”.

- **Neglect**: Passively allowing conditions to worsen, including chronic absenteeism or lateness, reduced effort, and increased error rate (Robbins, p. 82).

**Figure No. 3.12: Responses to Job Dissatisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Passive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exit</td>
<td>Neglect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>Loyalty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**11. Job Satisfaction and Personal Variables**

The individual differences in job attitudes and job satisfaction exist. This is probably because of differences in the characteristics of the individuals. For some people most jobs will be dissatisfying, irrespective of the organizational conditions involved, whereas for others most jobs will be satisfying. In this section we shall review what seem to be the most important personal characteristics related to job satisfaction. (Korman, p. 225)
**Age:** Most of the evidence on the relationship between age and job satisfaction, holding such factors as occupational level constants, seems to indicate that there is a generally positive relationship between the two variables up to the pre-retirement years (approximately the early sixties) and then there is a sharp decrease (Saleh and Otis, 1964). On the other hand, there are studies that show no relationship between age and pay satisfaction (cf. Schwab and Wallace, 1973). Given this ambiguity, it would be foolhardy to try to provide a theoretical framework for this relationship at this time (Kroman, p. 225).

**Educational level:** There is a relatively consistent trend of evidence which indicates that, with occupational level held constant, there is a negative relationship between the educational level of the individual and his job satisfaction (particularly his pay satisfaction) (cf. Centers and Cantirl, 1946; Cantril, 1943; Klein and Maher, 1966; Schwab and Wallance, 1973; Lawler, 1971). Most of the researchers in this area have explained their findings on the basis of theoretical frameworks similar to or identical with reference group theory. Simply, it can be argued that the higher the educational level of the individual, the higher the level of the group he looks to for guidance as to how he should evaluate his job rewards. The higher the reference point of any group looked to, the lower the level of satisfaction with any specific job outcome (Kroman, p. 226).

**Sex:** There is as yet no consistent evidence as to whether women are more satisfied with their jobs than men, holding such factors as job and occupational level constant. The discovery that jobs are as important to the life satisfaction of women as they are to men (Kavanagh, 1974) has to have a profound effect on satisfaction studies of women (Kroman, p. 226).

Females are also more likely to be found in lower level jobs. Historically, lower female expectations for employment opportunities have been fairly consistent with the lack of opportunities for women. Evidence of sex differences in job satisfaction levels has been mixed. It is likely, however that rising expectations of women in the labor force will produce differences in job satisfaction between the sexes. (Dryden, p. 120).
Personality and Job Satisfaction:

One of the most serious omissions in job satisfaction research has been the consideration of personality as an important influence. The study of personality and the study of job satisfaction are each very complex when investigated singularly and even more complex in combination. While research has been done concerning the relationship of personality and job satisfaction, the results have been too mixed to draw many useful conclusions.

It is known that personality is very important in job preference and job choice.

Some experts believe that the impact of an individual’s personality is dissipated during the vocational choice process. In other words, personality will have more of an impact upon the vocational choice than upon the job satisfaction experienced after the choice has been made.

One possible influence of personality on satisfaction can be partially explained by the role of one’s self-concept. The self-concept is a dimension of personality which has received some attention in the explanation of job choice. People have a certain image of themselves and attempt to find a job which is compatible with this image. If the match between image and job is successful, an individual will be satisfied with the vocation. If the self-image and the job are not compatible, the person will be dissatisfied (Jame, p. 79).

Any other variables:

Job level: One of the most important variables is job level. Satisfaction is higher among workers in higher-level positions, while satisfaction tends to be lowest among holders of jobs that can be characterized as hot, heavy or dangerous, such as work in steel mills and unskilled jobs.

Length of service: Length of service and race are also frequently correlated with job satisfaction. Individuals with less time on the job and black workers are, in the aggregate, somewhat more dissatisfied than “long-termers and white workers. Of course it is difficult to draw any firm conclusions from such correlation evidence because job level is also associated with length of service and race. Long-termers tend
to be in higher level jobs; black workers tend to be less educated and are more likely
to hold unskilled positions (Dryden Robert, p.120).

Organizational size: Organizational size has been identified as a correlate of job
satisfaction. Employees in smaller organizations tend to be more satisfied than
employees in larger organizations. The size of an organization may not in and of itself
affect job satisfaction, but rather size is associated with more specific sources of
satisfaction (Dryden, Robert, p. 121).

12. How Satisfaction Develops

Two people doing exactly the same job in the same work environment may
have drastically different feelings about their level of job satisfaction. But the various
facets of job satisfaction could be the same for each person.

An individual’s expectancies are very important in determining job
satisfaction. Equity theory is concerned, in part, with the origination of these
expectancies. Some expectancies are formulated as a result of one’s beliefs about the
rewards of others who have similar backgrounds, abilities, and positions. These
individuals with whom one identifies for comparison purposes are known as referent
others.

Some of the situations that effect dissatisfaction have been outlined by Edward
Lawler:

1. People with high perceived inputs will be more dissatisfied with a given facet
than people with low perceived inputs.

2. People who perceived their job to be demanding will be more dissatisfied with a
given facet than people who perceived their jobs as undemanding.

3. People who receive a low outcome level will be more dissatisfied than those
who receive a high outcome level.

The more outcomes a person perceives in his comparison other to receive,
the more dissatisfied he will be with his own outcomes. This should be particularly
true when the comparison other is seen i.e. held a job that demands the same or lower
inputs. (James P. 73-74).
Managers can create satisfied employees:

A review of the evidence has identified four factors conducive to high levels of employee job satisfaction mentally challenging work, equitable rewards, supportive working conditions, and supportive colleagues, importantly; each of these factors is controllable by management.

**Mentally challenging work:** People prefer jobs that give them opportunities to use their skills and abilities and offer a variety of tasks, freedom, and feedback on how well they are doing. These characteristics make work mentally challenging.

**Equitable rewards:** Employees want pay systems and promotion policies that they perceive as being just unambiguous, and in line with their expectations. When pay is seen as fair based on job demands, individual skill level, and community pay standards, satisfaction is likely to result. Similarly, employees seek fair promotion policies and practices. Promotions provide opportunities for personal growth, more responsibilities, and increased social status. Individuals who perceive that promotion decisions are made in a fair and just manner, therefore, are likely to experience satisfaction from their jobs.

**Supportive working conditions:** Employees are concerned with their work environment for both personal comfort and facilitating doing a good job. Studies demonstrate that employees prefer physical surroundings that are not dangerous or uncomfortable. In addition, most employees prefer working relatively close to home, in clean and relatively modern facilities, and with adequate tools and equipment.

**Supportive colleagues:** People get more out of work than merely money or tangible achievements. For most employees, work also fills the need for social interaction. Not surprisingly, therefore, having friendly and supportive co-workers leads to increased job satisfaction. The behavior of one’s boss is also a major determinant of satisfaction. Studies generally find that employee satisfaction is increased when the immediate supervisor understands and friendly, offers praise for good performance, listens to employees opinions, and shows a personal interest in them.

The notion that managers and organizations can control the level of employee job satisfaction is inherently attractive. It fits nicely with the view that managers directly influence organizational processes and outcomes. Unfortunately
there is a growing body of evidence that challenges the notion that managers control the factors that influence employee job satisfaction. The most recent findings indicate that employee job satisfaction is largely genetically determined.

Given these findings, there is probably little that most managers can do to influence employee satisfaction. In spite of the fact that managers and organizations go to extensive lengths to try to improve employee job satisfaction through actions such as manipulating job characteristics, working conditions, and rewards, these actions are likely to have little effect. The only place where managers will have any significant influence will be through their control of the selection process. If managers want satisfied workers, they need to make sure their selection process screens out the negative, maladjusted, trouble-making fault-finders who derive little satisfaction in anything about their jobs (Robbins, p. 85).

13. Job Satisfaction of Managers

Cummings and ElSalmi in their review of the literature agreed with Porter and Lawler that an increasing number of research reports involving managers have appeared since 1959. Although the motivation-hygiene theory (Herzberg et al.) is not limited to any organizational level, a number of managerial studies discussed in the Cummings-ElSalmi review were based on that theory.

Porter described his research as an attempt to discover how managers perceive the psychological aspects or characteristics of their jobs. In this vein Cummings and ElSalmi wrote:

He [Porter] was concerned with the relationships between several organizational variables (job level, line/staff type of jobs, total organization size, and flat/tall organization structure), on the one hand, and the manager’s perception of needs and need satisfaction on the other…

Some needs are more important to the individual manager than are others, just as they are for his subordinates at the lowest organizational level. The managers then value opportunities to satisfy these needs. If the opportunities to placate these needs are available in the work environment, the manager will have more job satisfaction than he would if they were not.
A manager may well be functioning at a different need level than lower level organizational members because he has had greater possibilities in the past to satisfy his lower-order need. Another distinction can be made in terms of different jobs within the organization. (Dorothy, p. 425-427).

B. Researches conducted on Job Satisfaction

1. Studies of the World:

There are several different scales for the measurement of job satisfaction. The Job Description Index (JDI) by Smith (1979). This instrument yields measures of job satisfaction for 5 aspects of the work situation: work itself, supervision, coworkers, pay and opportunities for promotion, another instrument illustration features of special interest is Minnesota satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) developed by Weiss, Davis and Lofquist (1967). It involves reinforcers in work environment such as ability utilization, advancement, financial compensation, relation with coworkers and supervisors, creativity, variety or work and working conditions. Minnesota Satisfaction Scales (MSS) was developed by Gibson (1970) to measure how satisfactorily individuals perform on their jobs. Minnesota Importance Questionnaire (MIQ) was designed by Gay (1971) to assess the relative value of different vocational needs for the individual. Minnesota Job Description Questionnaire (MJDQ) was devised by Borger and Tinsley (1968) to measure the kinds and amount of reinforcers provided by each job.

Chandraiah. K. and Agrawal, S.C. et al. (2003) used five factors which include work, supervisor, co-workers, pay and promotion and used the job descriptive index questionnaire that has developed by Smith and Kendal in 1966 and they had studied sample for 105 managers in 6 large scale industries situated in and around Calcutta city, India.

Van de ven and Ferry (1980) described job satisfaction as an effective reaction of feeling of employees with job, supervision, co-workers, pay and his/her current and future career progress.

Sreedevi and M.S.P. Sindhuja (2005) conducted the study to find out the degree of satisfaction with the sub components of communication in the organization and also job satisfaction among faculty members. The study was conducted in S.V.
University, Tirupati. The total sample size was 125. Among them 25 were Professors, 44 readers and 56 were lecturers. Majority of the faculty members were satisfied with their jobs, however, the degree of satisfaction of the faculty members in the organization was considerably different as per their hierarchy and status in the organization.

S. Narayan Rao (1986) tried to examine the relationship between sex differences and job satisfaction and found that there was no difference in job satisfaction on the basis of sex. Length of service was found to be significantly related to intrinsic motivation among the primary school groups. The occupational level and job satisfaction were also found to be significantly unrelated among both the collegiate and the primary school groups. Job satisfaction was not found to be related to length of service. The collegiate teachers would have more job satisfaction than the primary school teachers. The long and medium service women teachers were more job satisfied in terms of their teaching. Chase (1951) reported women teachers to be more satisfied than men teachers (Hulin & Smith, pp. 88-92).

Smith Barbara and Palco, H. (2003) have measured job satisfaction in the university of Carnegie Melton. In this survey, 771 staff members completed the 150 questions.

Employees were asked to rate their satisfaction with immediate supervisors, coworkers, opportunities... job satisfaction and the results were found as under:

More than 75 per cent said they intend to remain with Carnegie Melton for at least three years. Sixty-three had plan for staying indefinitely. Many if not most, staff chose to be in a university environment because they valued the business they were in and the university work environment was very attractive to many people.

Mishael Middaugh (1995), studied job satisfaction among the employees of Delaware University. The majority of DU professional and salaried staff/employees were satisfied with their jobs and the university, like the kind of work they were doing and thought UD benefits are excellent. The employees were most satisfied with overall benefits, their jobs, and job satisfaction was low in recognition. There was no difference in job satisfaction between male and female employees.
Dixit (1993) probed job satisfaction of male and female in primary school teachers with respect to service conditions viz. salary, physical facilities, institutional plans and policies, satisfaction with authorities, social status, family welfare, and rapport with students and relationship with coworkers. The results revealed that the female teachers were more satisfied than male teachers with regard to their salary, promotion, authority, institutional plans and policies. The female teachers also enjoyed good rapport with the students and better relationship with their coworker.

Nazrul Islam (2003) dialed with the job satisfaction of women workers and managerial policies of Garment companies in Bangladesh in his study. The results that followed indicate that the age of Bangladeshi women workers has a significant relationship with job satisfaction factors such as fair pay, salary, supervision. A positive significant correlation between the age of workers and fair pay argues that the higher the age of workers the more the pay will be perceived fair. Older workers have more salary and fair supervision. Higher skilled workers feel more fairness in pay, more work satisfaction, and get better salary. They have higher opportunity to perform more important tasks.

Thompson (1971) found supportive supervisory styles to be associated with higher levels of job satisfaction. Herman (1973) concluded from his study that attitudes differ from performance. They affect it in one way or the other depending upon their nature. This finding supports Lawler's hypothesis that indicated that the higher pay is associated with higher satisfaction. Females are significantly more satisfied with their pay than males.

Hulin and Smith (1957) in their study indicated significant differences between males and females for job satisfaction, with females less satisfied with their job.

Wild and Dawson (1957) examined the effect of age, marital status and length of service on the relative importance of factors responsible for job satisfaction. Their finding was that age and marital status did affect the perceived importance of various aspects of their job and the importance of pay.

Saleh Shoukry, D. and Jayl Otis (1964) have studied the relationship between age and job satisfaction in a company manufacturing electrical appliances and several other companies engaged in the production of chemicals, oil, and the results
confirmed the hypothesis that the level of job satisfaction increases with age until the pre retirement period when it declines.

Hulin Charles & Smith Patricia Cain (1964) found that the female workers were significantly less satisfied than their male counterparts.

Benge (1944) and Stockford and Kunze (1950) concluded that women are more satisfied than men, while Cole (1940) reported women to be less satisfied than men.

Hulin and Smith (1964) found that the male workers were more satisfied with their work than the females.

Klein S.M. and Maher, R.J. (1966) found college educated managers to be less satisfied with pay company to non-college educated group. Education was found to be negatively related to satisfaction. The college educated group is significantly less satisfied than the non college educated group on both of the items.

Wild Ray and Dawson, J.A. (1972) have reported that the age and marital status have significant effects on the relationship of job attitudes to job satisfaction. In particular the relationships of the attitudes to pay, supervision, physical working conditions mental vs. physical work and social peer relations with job satisfaction appear to be influenced by these biographical variables. Age appears to affect the extent to which the attitude to self-actualization is related to job satisfaction. The relationship of many of the job attitudes to overall job satisfaction is clearly affected by the third biographical variable – length of service.

Garske, Gregory G. (1999) examined the preferences and dislikes of job and career reported by a group of rehabilitation professionals. 66 Ohio rehabilitation counselors (mean age 43 years) who completed a questionnaire overwhelmingly reported that the most liked aspect of their job was working and assisting people to solve problems. They reported dealing with bureaucracies and paper mark on the most disliked aspects. Most of them expressed some degree of satisfaction with working conditions, salary and supervisors.

Ducharme, Lori J. and Martin Jack K. (2000) beneficiaries of social support in the workplace have received only limited attention from sociologists. Work group interactions, especially social support received from coworkers, significantly contribute to job satisfaction. This article assesses the effects of co-worker support on
job satisfaction, paring particular attention to the nature and influence of instrumental
coworker support both relative to and in conjunction with affective coworker support.

Weaver, Charles N. and Hinson Shelley (2000) examined data from 21
nationally representative opinion surveys from 1972 to 1996 on the job satisfaction of
Asian-Americans. The authors suggested that the heterogeneous nature of Asian-
Americans language, culture and regency of immigration, indicate that they may
report obtaining different amounts of satisfaction from their job. However, 199 Asian-
Americans reported job satisfaction more like 1,231 African-Americans than 1,709
Euro-Americans and Asian-Americans from China, Japan, India and the Philippines,
reported similar job satisfaction. These differences persisted when age, education,
occupation and personal income were held constant.

Ndiwane Abrahm, N. (2003) found that the nurses sampled in urban
communities were more satisfied than their rural colleagues with work, pay and
opportunities for promotions. Medical house officers were more satisfied with their
pay than hospital nurses, but job satisfaction did not differ between these two groups.
However, pay was significantly associated with job satisfaction for all categories of
nurses.

McsGracken, Carolyn, G. (2001) had used JDI consisting of six sub-scales,
work on job, pay, opportunities for promotion, supervision, people on job, and job in
general. Respondents of East Tennessee state University indicated high satisfaction in
work, supervision, and people and job in general but showed dissatisfaction with pay.
Negative feelings were measured in opportunities for promotion, with significantly
less satisfaction for older, more experienced, tenured faculty and associate Professors.
Non-tenured faculty members were significantly more satisfied in work and
supervision than were tenured respondents.

Winefield Tony (2001) had studied a sample from Australian university staff
(9000) respondents in seventeen universities. The results indicated that job
satisfaction was substantially low.

Oswald, A. and Gardner, J. (2001) reported that the levels of job satisfaction
were high in Britain. It was higher among women than men.
Simens S. & Scott, A. (2003) have reported female GP (General practitioners, Scottish) principals, white GP principals, female GP non principals and GP non principals aged under 40 years or 55 years and over reported higher levels of job satisfaction than male GP principals. GP principals from another ethnic background, male GP non-principals and GP principals aged between 40 and 56 yeas. Doctors who worked full time as a GP i.e. more than or equal to 50 having per week, were less likely to be satisfied with their job than part time doctors, women reported higher levels of job satisfaction.

2. Indian Studies:

Most Indian studies on job satisfaction, on the other hand, have concerned themselves with the specific aspects of work. These studies on managers/supervisors or workers have essentially used one of the following three methods of data collection.

1. A variety of factors are provided to the respondents and they are asked to rank order them in terms of their contribution to their job satisfaction. These factors have been identified either on the basis of published research or individual experiences. Very little or no attempt has been made to identify a list of factors that may be unique to a specific industry or sample of study.

2. Some others have used critical incidents method in the fashion in which it was used by Herzberg (1959) and have tried to identify the factors contributing to job satisfaction. Alternatively, using the rank order system as in 1 above, the respondents have been provided with the list of six motivators (achievement, recognition, responsibility, work itself, advancement, and growth) and ten hygiene factors (supervision, company policy and administration, working conditions, inter-personal relationship with superior, peer and subordinate, status, salary, job security, and factors in personal life) and have been asked to indicate those most important to them.

3. Yet another set of studies, particularly dealing with managers and supervisors have used Porter's (1961) need satisfaction questionnaire.
Although quite a number of studies on what satisfies Indian employees have been conducted, in the following pages the results of a representative sample of these studies separately for managers/supervisors and the workers are presented.

Managers/Supervisors:

The results of a representative sample of 17 studies on managers/supervisors from different organizations are summarized in Table No. 3.2. In this table only the top five factors contributing to job satisfaction have been indicated. On the question of what satisfies Indian managers/supervisors, the following conclusions can be drawn on the basis of data presented in the table:

1. A variety of job ranking factors have been identified by managers/supervisors. Except for two factors – in domestic life and adequate money – all of them relate to job content category. So it is either achievement, responsibility, recognition, feeling of worth, or relationship with co-workers that seem to satisfy Indian managers/supervisors most.

2. A total of 18 factors have been mentioned. If we count the frequency distribution of all the factors mentioned in Table No. 3.2 the following rank order emerges (Saiyadain, p. 18-19)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table No. 3.2: Ranking factors of Job satisfaction by Managers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with boss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with co-workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money/salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Saiyadain, p. 18.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table No. 3.3: Ranking factors of Job satisfaction by workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary/wages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with boss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with co-workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility for suggestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Saiyadain, p. 19.
Workers:

The results of a representative sample of 16 studies dealing with different samples of Indian workers from different organizations are summarized in table No. 3.3.

**Table No. 3.4**

Top Five Factors Contributing to the Job Satisfaction of Managers and Supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Studies</th>
<th>1st Rank</th>
<th>2nd Rank</th>
<th>3rd Rank</th>
<th>4th Rank</th>
<th>5th Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ganguli (1965) First line supervisor N=13</td>
<td>Adequate money</td>
<td>Promotional opportunity</td>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>Sympathetic treatment from boss</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lahri &amp; Srivastava (1967) Middle level managers N=93</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Domestic life</td>
<td>Accomplishment</td>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>Utilization of abilities on the job Company itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawlapurkar et al. (1968) Middle Managers N=30</td>
<td>Job contents</td>
<td>Opportunity for advancement</td>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>Boss</td>
<td>Company itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padaki &amp; Dolke (1970) Supervisors N=150</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayal &amp; Saiyadain (1970) Technical supervisors N=20</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Work itself</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Inter- personal relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rao (1970) N=30</td>
<td>Relation with co-worker</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Work itself</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhattacharya (1972) Managers N=210</td>
<td>Feeling of doing a worthwhile job</td>
<td>Obtaining cooperation from people</td>
<td>Matching ability with job</td>
<td>Recognition outside the company</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pestonjee &amp; Basu (1972) Public sector managers N=50</td>
<td>Liking for work</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Domestic life</td>
<td>Work condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pestonjee &amp; Basu (1972) Private sector managers N=30</td>
<td>Domestic life</td>
<td>Liking for work</td>
<td>Friendliness with supervisor</td>
<td>Best use of abilities</td>
<td>Relationship with co-workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumar, Singh &amp; Keshato (1981) Middle Managers N=29</td>
<td>Nature of work</td>
<td>Adequate earning</td>
<td>Responsibility and independence</td>
<td>Respect and recognition</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Saiyadain, pp. 22-25.
### Table No. 3.5
Top Five Factors Contributing to the Job Satisfaction of Workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Studies</th>
<th>1st Rank</th>
<th>2nd Rank</th>
<th>3rd Rank</th>
<th>4th Rank</th>
<th>5th Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bose (1951) Industrial workers N=400</td>
<td>Earning</td>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>Free medical aid</td>
<td>Good and sympathetic supervisor</td>
<td>Leave with more pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ganguli (1954) Engineering factory workers N=380</td>
<td>Earning</td>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>Opportunity for advancement</td>
<td>Opportunity to learn the job</td>
<td>Sympathetic supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinha (1958) Manual workers N=100</td>
<td>Boss</td>
<td>Suitable type of work</td>
<td>Good personal relations with colleagues</td>
<td>Work according to health</td>
<td>Work according to ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ganguli (1958) Foundry workers N=100</td>
<td>Adequate earnings</td>
<td>Opportunity for advancement</td>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>Opportunity to learn the job</td>
<td>Adequate personal benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singh &amp; Wherry (1963) Factors workers N=200</td>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>Adequate earnings</td>
<td>Adequate personal benefits</td>
<td>Opportunity for advancement</td>
<td>Comfortable working conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapoor (1967) Factory workers N=391</td>
<td>Adequate earnings</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>Opportunity for advancement</td>
<td>Work group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaid (1968) Gang labour (road construction) N=75</td>
<td>Adequate earnings</td>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Opportunity for advancement</td>
<td>Work group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desai (1968) Blue collar workers N=75</td>
<td>Adequate earning</td>
<td>Good and sympathetic supervisor</td>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>Adequate personal benefits</td>
<td>Suitable type of work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mukherjee (1968) Textile workers N=100</td>
<td>Adequate earning</td>
<td>Opportunity for advancement</td>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>Opportunity for increased income</td>
<td>Suitable type of work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rao &amp; Ganguli (1971) Skilled workers N=75</td>
<td>Personal life</td>
<td>Adequate earnings</td>
<td>Opportunity for advancement</td>
<td>Comfortable working conditions</td>
<td>Company policy and administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misra (1983) Clerical grade employees N=50</td>
<td>Inter-personal relations with co-workers</td>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>Inter-personal relations with boss</td>
<td>Fringe benefits</td>
<td>Facility to offer suggestions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In India, seventeen studies conducted between 1962 and 1998 the samples were reviewed to examine the relationship between job satisfaction and age, marital status, education, income, number of dependent and length of service. These studies are summarized in Table No. 3.6.

### Table No. 3.6

**Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Personnel Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal characteristics</th>
<th>No relationship</th>
<th>Positive relationship</th>
<th>Negative relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MARITAL STATUS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDUCATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vasudeva &amp; Rajbir (1976)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also a number of studies on relationship between job satisfaction and gender have shown as under:

1. Dixit (1993) the results revealed that the female teachers were more satisfied than male teachers also Padmavathi (1995) and Parda et al. (1996).

2. Nagarthnamma and Bharthi (1990) Meena and Arezoo (1990) and Agarwal and Das (1990), the sex difference observed with regard to job satisfaction of incumbents.

3. Mason et al. (1995) reported that men and women in management did not differ in terms of their job satisfaction.

3. Iranian Studies:

    Haidar Ali, Hooman (2001) had studied 8000 samples which included 2000 administrators and 6000 workers in Iran’s governmental organizations within 10 provinces (states). Researcher used MSQ questionnaire after developing it. The results have shown that – (i) the job satisfaction of employees are higher than managers, (ii) there was no significance difference in the job satisfaction between female and male, (iii) the workers with low qualification were more satisfied than with high qualification, (iv) generally manager’s job satisfaction with increasing qualification up to Graduate level decreased but after Graduate up to PG level increased.

    Manjamed Z. et al. (2005) have studied level of job satisfaction of nursing personnel in Iran. Sample size was 4000. The result had shown that the majority of nurses had moderate level of job satisfaction in domains of working place situation (62.9%), relationship with colleagues (69.6%), professional situation (74.3%), supervision (57.6%), job satisfaction level was low in domains 2 test shown job security (63.5%) and salary and benefits (77.3%) significant relationship between age, job position, level of education, job experience.

4. Study for AMU:

    Mohd. Israrul Haque (2004) had studied job satisfaction on 1359 teachers (the sample size of 300) was considered adequate and representative. The academicians are moderately satisfied with their jobs 38 per cent (all dimensions) are satisfied. There is no significant difference in the attitudes of different respondents with respect to age. Both male and female academicians are moderately satisfied with their job but
male respondents are little more satisfied (m = 3.39 than the female respondents, f = 3.31). Job satisfaction was found to be increasing with agent at decreasing rate. There is significant difference in job satisfaction between two groups. Teachers are high satisfied on work (job) moderately satisfied on autonomy in job, coworkers, salary and dissatisfied on promotion, physical facilities.

Nasir Ali (1999) had carried out one survey in Aligarh Muslim University (JNMCH). Sample was 250 doctors (males = 142 and females = 108). In that study the result revealed that the female doctors were more satisfied than male doctors. It was found that high age group of doctors were significantly more satisfied than low age group of doctors. The high experience group's job satisfaction was more than low experience. The degree of job satisfaction among married doctors was significantly higher than the unmarried group of doctors and the married male doctors and unmarried male doctors did not differ significantly in terms of job satisfaction, but the groups of married female doctors and unmarried female doctors were significantly different with regard to the degree of job satisfaction.

Erphan Sheeba (2002) had studied the sample of J.N.M.C.H. Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh. The number of sample was 190 doctors and 170 paramedical staff. The items of the questionnaire were related to working conditions, opportunities for promotion, social relationship, co-operation and benefits related to the job. The results had shown that the mean job satisfaction score of paramedical staff was higher than that of the doctors. The high and low age group of doctors and paramedical staff did not differ significantly with respect to their degree of job satisfaction. The high age group is slightly more satisfied than the low age group counterparts.

The mean job satisfaction of male and female are almost equal. The two groups do not differ significantly. The mean scores of male and female doctors were compared in terms of their tenet of job satisfaction. It was found that the means of two groups were almost similar and these two groups did not differ significantly.

The mean job satisfaction of high experienced group was significantly more than low experienced group. The married and unmarried did not differ significantly in terms of their degree of job satisfaction. Also the results for doctors and paramedical staff male and female were separately seemed. The level of job satisfaction between Muslims and Hindus did not differ.
The result also revealed that the occupational difference did not emerge as a contributory factor of job satisfaction.

Faiz Md. Minhaj (2000), this study was conducted on 73 section officers from all offices and departments of AMU Aligarh.

The results had shown that the mean satisfaction on the basis of salary decreased as the age group was going upward. On the basis of promotion policy, the condition was same as above. On the basis of working condition the situation was vice-versa. The level of satisfaction with supervisor increased with the increase in age group. The satisfaction level was decreasing as the age group was increasing. Same were the cases as above on the basis of statistics of the job, work load, possibility of achievement in the job and liberty in doing job.

There was no significant difference in job satisfaction with salary, promotion, working condition, supervisor and subordinates in age groups. High age groups are more satisfied than low age groups with status of the job, workload and job achievement. It was also shown by the result that there was no significant difference in job satisfaction with salary and between high and low experience groups. As with promotion, working condition, supervisor, job status, work load and job achievement. There was no significant difference in job satisfaction level with salary, supervisor, and job status between graduate and post-graduate groups but the graduate group was more satisfied than post-graduate with promotion. Graduate was less satisfied than postgraduate with work load, job achievement, briefly the section officers have been satisfied with all items of job satisfaction in AMU, Aligarh.

5. Study for PNU:

Hozoory Mohammad Javad (2003) had studied job satisfaction among PNU teachers. Researcher had selected 200 teachers as sample. The results of the study are presented as follows:

1. Female teachers were more satisfied than male teachers.
2. Teachers’ job satisfaction was lower than average.
3. Teachers’ job satisfaction was very low with academic works.
4. There was significant difference on job satisfaction between teachers with PG degree and Ph.D. degree (Academic works) (PG degree more than Ph.D. degree).

5. Teachers were not satisfied with research policies and procedures regarding processing and approval.

6. Female teachers were more satisfied than their male counterparts with respect to research policies and procedures.

7. The teachers have been found satisfied with students' behavior but they were not so satisfied with the level of their scientific work.

8. There was no significant difference between sex and job satisfaction, experience of teachers and job satisfaction on student's behavior in terms of job satisfaction.

9. Teachers were found to be satisfied with supervisors (chairman/head).

10. Teachers were satisfied with their salary to the extent of just an average.

11. They were not satisfied with promotion.

12. There was no significant difference on job satisfaction among teachers in terms of their co-workers.

13. Teachers were not satisfied with facilities (female more than male) male teachers were more dissatisfied with the facilities (loans union, bonus, work place, computer, campus, chamber, insurance and any other services etc.) than the male teachers.
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