CHAPTER V

JOB SATISFACTION AND EFFECTIVENESS

It may be recalled that Morse,\(^1\) Sehaffer\(^2\) and Vroom\(^3a\) and \(^3b\) have brought out the significance of individual differences in motivational variables for the prediction of job-satisfaction. The rationale associated with such predictions is the need fulfilment model. This is based on the assumptions that individuals differ in the outcomes (needs) they prefer to obtain from their jobs. Relationship between outcomes received on the job and satisfaction is dependent upon these preferences (needs). The problem of job-satisfaction, however, is interesting and significant because though a job grants status, power, dignity and feeling of achievement to the individual,

---


yet all men do not feel equally strongly about their jobs. For some, work could never be fun and must be tolerated as drudgery, and for others work appears to be fun.

It may, therefore, be concluded that two individuals, with different sets of needs, even though working in the same jobs in similar working conditions, would not necessarily exhibit the same level of job-satisfaction.

An examination of literature on job-satisfaction reveals that relationship between job-satisfaction and performance proved to be anything but simple. Double character is attributed to performance in relation to job-satisfaction: Performance as experience is a possible cause of job-satisfaction, performance as outcome is a possible consequence. The studies in India on job-satisfaction, morale and motivation tried to examine the problem from the former point of view. Concentrating on the latter variant, a review of current literature reveals that the research studies in the field have traced out varying relationship. Hans, Smith and Kendall.

---


Katzell et al.⁶ and many others have found a positive relationship between the two variables, namely, job-satisfaction and performance. Katz and his associates⁷ have established a negative relationship, whereas Brayfield and Crocket⁸ has established that there exists "no" relationship between job-satisfaction and performance. Literature revealing no single relationship between these two variables is also supported by the results of a study conducted by Vroom. Vroom⁹, comparing twenty quantitatively oriented contributions, found that the coefficient of correlation between job-satisfaction and working performance ranged between (+) 0.86 to (-) 0.31. Thus, it may be concluded that the association


between job-satisfaction and performance varies in varying situations and for varying classes of personnel.

In view of the above, it would be interesting to study the job-satisfaction of branch managers working in public sector commercial banks and explore its relationship with effectiveness. So it was proposed to test the following hypothesis:

Branch Managers scoring high on job-satisfaction would be more effective than those scoring low on job-satisfaction.

But before an attempt is made to test the aforesaid hypothesis, it may not be out of place to review the various concepts of job-satisfaction with a view to constructing an acceptable and workable definition of the term "job-satisfaction."

Various authors have used the terms "Job-satisfaction" and "Morale" interchangeably. It is intended that these two terms - "Job-satisfaction" and "Morale" - will be used interchangeably in the present study also.

While tracing the origin of the term "Job-satisfaction" one would find that the credit for bringing the term of "Job-satisfaction" into currency, perhaps, goes to Hoppock. A review of literature on job-satisfaction
revealed that the term "job-satisfaction" has been defined differently by different people. Lawler,\textsuperscript{11} while reviewing nine different operational definitions of job-satisfaction observes that in many of the operational definitions the concept of facet satisfaction has been used and the researchers have followed different ways measuring facet satisfaction. Thus, the satisfaction definitions also differ in the kind of facets they include and in what they mean by a facet. But the concept of "Facet satisfaction" is distinct from overall satisfaction. According to Lawler\textsuperscript{12} the facet satisfaction is satisfaction derived from a particular aspect of the job and overall job satisfaction is the sum of all facet satisfactions across the facets of a job.

It was, therefore, decided that in view of the objectives laid down for the present study, the overall satisfaction which a branch manager derives from his job is to be studied.


\textsuperscript{12}Ibid.
Using the concept of overall job-satisfaction, the term "Job-satisfaction" has been defined by various authors like Hoppock, Bullock, and Blum. According to Hoppock, job-satisfaction is any combination of psychological, and environmental circumstances that cause a person truthfully to say "I am satisfied with my job."

Bullock considers job-satisfaction as "an attitude which results from a balancing and summation of many specific likes and dislikes in connection with the job."

According to Blum, job-satisfaction is a generalised attitude resulting from many specific attitudes in three areas: specific job factors, individual adjustment and group relationship. Job-satisfaction is, thus, an individual phenomenon and is measured by ascertaining certain attitudes.

---


A study of the above definitions of Hoppock, Bullock and Blum reveals that the emphasis in each of these three definitions is upon employee's attitude towards his job.

Regarding the individual's attitude towards his job, Blum\(^{16}\) has said that although attitudes are not job-satisfaction, job-satisfaction comprises a number of attitudes. The attitude of an employee towards his job is an aggregate resulting from summation of many likes and dislike in connection with the job.

Brayfield and Rothe\(^{17}\) have adopted a similar approach. According to these authors, job-satisfaction could be inferred from the individual's attitude towards his work. They have opined that the attitude of an employee towards his job elicits an expression of the feelings of the employee towards his job.

In view of these discussions, it was proposed that for the purpose of the present study, job-satisfaction

\(^{16}\)ibid.

axiomatically is construed as the attitude branch managers hold towards their jobs. Positive attitude towards the job connotes satisfaction with it and negative attitude towards it connotes dissatisfaction.

**MEASURING JOB-SATISFACTION**

Various people have measured job-satisfaction in various ways. Many researchers on job-satisfaction have followed what may be termed as "Incentive Approach," some have used "Human Relations Approach;" while some others have followed "Need Satisfaction Concept" to measure job-satisfaction.

Under "Incentive approach" to job-satisfaction, it was suggested that if by some means or other an employee's attitude to the incentives could be identified and the relative importance of these incentives to the employee could be established, the attitude of the employee towards these incentives would determine the level of satisfaction which he would derive from his job.

Maier\(^\text{18}\) has summarised the data of some of the

studies which lay down the relative importance of various incentives that would contribute to job-satisfaction. In India Ganguli has compiled results from three studies on Indian workers' ranking of various job-factors that could contribute to the satisfaction or dissatisfaction of employees in their job.

This incentive approach, however, does not seem to be a plausible and logical explanation of job-satisfaction on the following grounds.

The incentive approach over stresses the economic aspect of the job and seems to neglect other aspects such as better interpersonal relations and other social aspects of work environment, which could affect the satisfaction derived from the job.

Besides this, the assumption that the attitudes people hold to different elements of their job is synonymous with job-satisfaction, does not stand the test of reason. An individual may be satisfied with one or more aspects of his job and yet be dissatisfied with it on the whole.

---

The incentives approach has over-emphasized the importance of "On the job factors." It seems to be unidimensional approach which completely neglects "off the job factors" that affect satisfaction with a job.

In view of the above it appears that the incentive approach provides only a partial explanation of the phenomenon of job-satisfaction. Various aspects of a job seem to have some relationship with the satisfaction an individual derives from his work, but this cannot explain those situations where morale of an individual is high in spite of bad working conditions and lower wages. Brown cites many incidents of this nature.

It would, therefore, be undesirable to adopt the incentive approach to measure job-satisfaction for the present study.

It may be recalled that another approach to the study of job-satisfaction is "Human Relations Approach." This has a beginning with Hawthorne experiments which shifted the attention of researchers from the physical and psychophysical characteristics of the job to the social and emotional aspects of work behaviour. Regarding

Hawthorne experiments, Blum observed
probably the most significant results of
these studies are, the fact that workers are
affected by factors outside the job to an
even greater extent than by those on the job
itself, and that they organise into informal
social groups. These organisations take
precedence over management-employee
organisations and determine production to as
great an extent as do changes of a job-
environment nature. The disregard of "outside
the job" factors and employee self-grouping has
led many studies conducted by management to
erroneous conclusions.

The human relations approach in spite of having
made significant contributions to the understanding of
work motivation, seems to suffer from certain drawbacks.
Whyte and Miller²² have summarised the main points of
criticism by saying that such an approach "neglected"
the impact of larger economic and social environment on
the internal social systems, "over-emphasized" the problem
of communication; maintained an "anti-individual" bias by
stressing that the non-logical and irrational ways of
human behaviour were in conflict with the rational and

²¹ Milton Blum, op. cit., p. 306.

²² F. Whyte William and Frank, Miller in Joseph
New York: John Wiley, 1957, p. 331 and as quoted by
S. Devdas Pillai, Man and Mackiner. Bombay, Popular
Parkshan, 1968, p. 15.
logical ways of the organisation, and spoke of stability and harmony as the goals of human relations in Industry.

Thus, human relations approach also seems to be a one-sided approach. So it could at best be considered as a partial explanation to the phenomenon of job-satisfaction.

Maslow's concept of need satisfaction seems to be a good analytical tool in an attempt to explain the phenomenon of job-satisfaction. The need theory makes certain basic assumptions. The first one is that human behaviour is caused by an individual's need structure. The second is that human behaviour is goal directed, the goal being the satisfaction of needs. When an individual comes to work, he brings with him certain needs which seem to be associated with the rewards or gratifications he is seeking from his work. These needs may be, broadly speaking, physical needs, security needs, social needs and ego needs. If the individual feels that he is able to satisfy those needs which are of significant importance to him, he is likely to develop a positive attitude towards his job and thus achieve greater satisfaction with it.

The concept of need satisfaction for the understanding of phenomenon of job-satisfaction seems workable as it involves both "on the job" and "off the job" factors. Researchers like Porter have measured job-satisfaction in different need areas. But the universality of the need hierarchy for all individuals at varying times is of doubtful validity.

It is, thus, argued that the common problem with all the above-discussed approaches to the measuring of job-satisfaction is the problem of specifying which facets (factors) are relevant in a given setting to a particular person. Regarding the contributions of job-facet satisfaction to an individual's total satisfaction from his job, Lawler has said "job-satisfaction has been conceptualised as a weighted sum of job-facet satisfactions. In order to account for individual differences in the value people place on various facets, some investigators have used rating of the importance of


25 E.E. Lawler, and J.P. Wanous, loc. cit.
the facets to weigh the facet satisfaction before summing them to obtain an overall satisfaction score." He has quoted the work of Blood, Mikes and Hulin, Ewen, and Schaffer to support his assertion.

Moreover research evidence does not show any universality in the choice of factors which have been used to measure job-satisfaction. For example Porter measured satisfaction in different need areas while Smith et al. measured satisfaction with such concrete job factors as pay and promotions.

Thus, the discussions made here reveal that there are a number of aspects which contribute to overall

29 R.H. Schaffer, loc. cit.
30 L.W. Porter, loc. cit.
satisfaction and dissatisfaction of workers with their job. This would, therefore, require a selection of factors which would measure job-satisfaction of branch managers. But keeping in view the time and resource constraint with the present researcher, it is not possible to rank various factors affecting the job-satisfaction in the hierarchy of importance. Moreover, the technique of ranking various factors into a hierarchy of importance presents several significant problems. Different employees can have different meanings for the terminology used in attitude survey and hardly any agreement exists concerning the order of importance of these factors. Commenting on this drawback Kornhauser\textsuperscript{32} states:

> Some investigators put almost all their emphasis on personal determinantal influences. Among the latter, certain ones stress wages and material conditions, while others consider intangible and subtle relations predominant. Studies show that physical conditions of work are of little importance, but other studies demonstrate that changes in particular physical surroundings, such as ventilation and lighting, produce markedly significant results. Social relations with fellow workers are of paramount

\textsuperscript{32}A. Kornhauser, "Psychological studies of Employee Attitudes," \textit{Journal of Consulting Psychology}, 8:133, 1944.
importance or they are entirely omitted from considerations. The same sort of disagreement occurs with respect to almost every influence.

Another measure of job-satisfaction, as used by Brayfield and Rothe, is what is termed as "Global measure of overall satisfaction." It concerns with eliciting generalised undifferentiated evaluation of job and measures the attitudes of an individual towards his job as a whole. Lawler\textsuperscript{33} has viewed overall job satisfaction as a function of job facet satisfaction. He refers to the studies conducted by Ewen and Schaffer to support his view. Ewen\textsuperscript{34} summed satisfaction score from five components of job-description index and correlated the sums with two measures of overall satisfaction, the Brayfield and Rothe\textsuperscript{35} scale. The correlation between the job-description index sums and two measures of overall job-satisfaction ranged from (+) 0.50 to (+) 0.74. Schaffer\textsuperscript{36} reported a correlation of (+) 0.44 between mean satisfaction of twelve needs and overall satisfaction measure.

\textsuperscript{33}E.E. Lawler and P.J. Wanour, \textit{loc. cit.}
\textsuperscript{34}R.B. Ewen, \textit{loc. cit.}
\textsuperscript{35}A.H. Brayfield and Rothe, \textit{loc. cit.}
\textsuperscript{36}R.H. Schaffer, \textit{loc. cit.}
It may also be contested that the phenomenon of satisfaction with job can only be understood in its totality. It can logically be argued that job-satisfaction is simply not the summation of likes and dislikes of specific aspects in the work situation. An individual is an organised whole and his behaviour has to be understood in its totality.

Moreover the object of the present research study is not to establish a causal relationship between managerial effectiveness and job-satisfaction but to find out the extent to which effectiveness is associated with job-satisfaction and a correlational analysis of the data has been preferred to an experimental study. It is, therefore, expected that the overall satisfaction score with the job will serve the purpose and is proposed to be applied in the present study.

In view of the working definition of job-satisfaction currently being followed and discussions made above, it is decided to use a global measure of job-satisfaction.

**Tool to Measure Job-Satisfaction**

Job-satisfaction can be measured by means of interviews, questionnaires and attitude scaling.
(Blum and Russ, 36 Porter, 37 and Pestonjee 38) and also from the behavioural indices on the job-like performance, turnover and absenteeism (Ganguli, 39 Likert, 40 Sinha and Singh, 41 Vroom 42, and Sinha and Nair 43).

But in view of the foregoing discussion, it was logical to use attitude scaling to measure overall satisfaction of the branch managers with their job. Job-satisfaction index by Brayfield and Rothe has been preferred because of its brevity, simplicity in use, and high validity and reliability indices. This scale measures general attitude of the people towards their job. It can be applied to all English knowing individual.


37E. W. Porter, loc. cit.

38C. Pestonjee, loc. cit.


and in all types of organisations. Moreover this scale has been used by researchers like Ewen to measure overall satisfaction of people with their job.

The proposed scale is a five point Likert scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. It has in all eighteen statements out of which eight elicit positive attitude for the job and ten elicit negative attitude for the job (See Appendix VI).

**SCORING**

Each positive statement is assigned 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1 points for strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree and strongly disagree responses respectively. Each negative statement is assigned 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 points for strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree and strongly disagree responses respectively. Summative scoring is done. The maximum and minimum score on the scale is 90 and 18 respectively.

**ADMINISTRATION OF JOB-SATISFACTION INDEX**

It may be recalled here that the focus in the present study was upon the branch managers working in

---

44R.R. Ewen, loc. cit.
medium and large branches of public sector commercial banks operating in four large cities of Punjab and Chandigarh. There were in all 305 branch managers constituting the sample out of whom only 249 had consented to cooperate with the researcher. All these respondents belonged to the same cadre of management namely middle management and have equal scope for promotion. All of them were working at district headquarters. They were engaged in a similar job having almost similar authority and responsibility. In brief, care was taken, as far as possible, to keep extraneous factors which could affect job-satisfaction under control.

For the purpose of collection of data these selected 249 branch managers were contacted individually. After giving self-introduction and identity the researcher explained to them the purpose of his meeting them. They were assured that all the information collected from them would be kept confidential and would be used for academic purpose only. They were told that their identity was not being asked anywhere. All this appeared to have satisfied them about the information being kept confidential.
A copy of Brayfield's job-satisfaction index was supplied to each of them. Job-satisfaction index had eighteen statements written on a Likert type five point scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree with the middle point as neutral calling undecided. Out of eighteen statements eight were positive and ten were negative statements. The respondents were requested to record their responses for all the eighteen statements by putting a tick in any of the five columns relevant to them in case of each statement.

As the test material for other two variables, included in the study, was also handed over to them simultaneously so it was not possible for all of them to handover their responses there and then and it was decided to collect their responses later on or to receive through mail.

**COLLECTION AND PRESENTATION OF DATA ON JOB-SATISFACTION**

The complete responses on job-satisfaction index were received from 210 respondents. But the responses of only 150 respondents, who had given responses on other two variables and whose performance evaluation scores
were also available, were considered for analysis. Items at serial number 1, 2, 5, 7, 12, 13, 15 and 17 in the scale used, which were positive statements were assigned 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1 point for strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree and strongly disagree respectively and statements at serial numbers 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 16 and 18 were negative items and were assigned 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 points for strongly agree, agree, undecided disagree and strongly disagree respectively. The responses of all the respondents were arranged in the same order in which their effectiveness scores were arranged. The scoring was done manually. The maximum and minimum score on the scale was 90 and 18 respectively. The scores obtained by the respondents ranged between 45 and 87 with sample mean score 69.79 and standard deviation 7.95.

EFFECTIVENESS AND JOB-SATISFACTION

It may be recalled that effectiveness of branch managers was measured on Likert type five point scale containing thirty characteristics. The maximum and minimum score on the scale was 150 and 30 respectively on the basis of degree of effectiveness. The branch managers were grouped into three categories namely,
Highly effective," "moderately effective" and "less effective" and the following criteria was used for the said categorisation:

Highly effective .. Those scoring 124 or above on effectiveness scale

Moderately effective .. Those scoring less than 124 but more than 106 on effectiveness scale

Less effective .. Those scoring 106 or less on effectiveness scale

It may also be recalled that there was no ineffective category of branch managers.

To test the hypothesis laid down earlier in this chapter the mean of the scores obtained by respondents in three categories of branch managers on job-satisfaction index were computed and compared. Test of significance was applied to see if the difference between two means was significant or otherwise. To validate the results a correlational analysis of the data was done. The coefficient of correlation for the total sample (n = 150) and also for each of the three groups were computed.
The mean of the scores obtained by the respondents in a category was the sum of scores obtained on job-satisfaction index by all the respondents in the category divided by the number of these respondents. An example may clarify it.

There are 42 branch managers in highly effective category and the sum of the scores obtained on job-satisfaction index by these respondents was 3529. The mean of their scores will, thus, be 3529 divided by 42 which comes to 72.60.

The same procedure was to calculate the mean of the scores obtained on job-satisfaction index by moderately effective and less effective categories of respondents. The relevant data regarding the job-satisfaction mean scores and effectiveness mean scores for the three categories has been entered in Table 5.1.

The data in Table 5.1 reveals that job-satisfaction mean scores obtained by three categorise viz., Highly Effective, Moderately Effective and Less Effective, are 72.60, 69.75 and 67.09 respectively. This indicates that highly effective category branch managers are having higher job-satisfaction mean score as compared to
Table 5.1
Group comparison of Mean and S.D. of effectiveness scores and job-satisfaction scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of branch managers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly effective</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>129.04</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>72.60</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately effective</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>115.20</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>69.75</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less effective</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>98.68</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>67.69</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>114.31</td>
<td>12.47</td>
<td>69.81</td>
<td>7.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

moderately effective branch managers, who in turn are having higher job-satisfaction mean score than less effective managers. This establishes that the trend is in the expected direction that is, branch managers with high job-satisfaction are having higher effectiveness scores as compared to those with lesser job-satisfaction.

The test of significance was then applied to see the significance of the difference between mean scores. "t" ratios were calculated and the relevant data have been entered in Table 5.2.
### Table 5.2

**Group comparison of Mean, Standard Deviations and MT* Ratio for three categories of Branch Managers on Job-Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group comparison</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>MT* ratio</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly effective</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>72.60</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>Significant at .05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately effective</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69.75</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less effective</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>67.09</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly effective</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>72.60</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>Significant at .01 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less effective</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>67.09</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. One tail test of significance was used.
An examination of data in Table 5.2 reveals that *t* ratio between job-satisfaction mean scores obtained by highly effective and moderately effective groups is 1.95. *t* ratio between job-satisfaction mean scores moderately effective and less effective groups is 1.79 while this ratio between highly effective and less effective groups is 3.15. This indicates that the *t* ratios for the first two comparison groups are significant when p = 0.05 while *t* ratio for the third comparison group is significant when p = 0.01.

The data in Table 5.2, therefore, validate the hypothesis, that is, managers who score more on effectiveness scale also score high on job-satisfaction than those who score low on effectiveness scale.

The purpose of the study was to see the association between effectiveness and job-satisfaction of branch managers. It was natural, therefore, to look for evidence of association or dis-association between effectiveness and job-satisfaction of branch managers. So it was decided to make a correlational analysis of the data. The value of product moment correlation coefficient for the total sample (n = 150) was computed and has been entered in Table 5.3. Looking at Table 5.3,
TABLE 5.3

Values of Pearson's Product Moment Coefficient of Correlation between Scores on Job Satisfaction and Scores on Effectiveness for the total sample and for each of the three categories of branch managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of branch managers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(r)</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.310</td>
<td>Significant at .01 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly effective group</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.342</td>
<td>Significant at .05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately effective group</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>Insignificant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less effective group</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.324</td>
<td>Significant at .05 level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

one observes that the value of \(r\) for the total sample is (+) 0.310 which, when compared with critical value of \(r\) at the desirable degree of freedom, is found to be significant at .01 level. The significant value of \(r\) between job-satisfaction and effectiveness indicate that there is a significant and positive correlation between the two variables. This further validates the hypothesis that higher the effectiveness, the higher would be job-satisfaction score and vice-versa.
Intra group correlations between job-satisfaction and effectiveness were also calculated to further validate the hypothesis. The values of Pearson correlation coefficient for the two variables in each of three groups have been also entered in Table 5.3.

An examination of data in Table 5.3 depicts that "r" in moderately effective group is insignificant and may be attributed to chance, so it is ignored. But the value of "r" in highly effective and less effective groups is (+) 0.34 and (+) 0.32 respectively which is significant when p<0.05. A significantly high positive correlation between the two variables within the groups also validates the hypothesis "Branch managers scoring high on job-satisfaction would be more effective than those scoring low on job-satisfaction."

Many researchers like Herzberg et al.46

Katzell et al., Likert, Smith and Kendall to name a few, have revealed a similar association between job-satisfaction and performance. Desai also, while studying other correlates of job-satisfaction found job-satisfaction to be positively correlated with production. In another research study conducted by Srivastava, the coefficient of correlation between morale and productivity was (+) 0.369 which was significant at 0.01 level. It may be recalled that many researchers have been using the terms

49 P.C. Smith and L.M. Kendall, loc. cit.
"job-satisfaction" and "morale" interchangeably and
these have been used interchangeably in the present study
also.

Deivasenapathy\(^5^2\) has conducted a study on the
association between job-satisfaction and success of
entrepreneurs. After statistical treatment of the data
the author worked out the value of \(\chi^2\) (Chi-square) to be
63.127 which was significant at 0.01 level. The study,
thus revealed a significant positive association between
job-satisfaction and success of entrepreneur.

An entrepreneur, according to McClelland\(^5^3\) is
one who has more responsibility for initiating decisions,
more individual responsibility for decisions and their
affects, and a job which entails more risks and challenges.
Sarma\(^5^4\) has also defined entrepreneur as one who
undertakes the task of creating something new, organising,
coordinating, undertaking risks and handling
uncertainties.

It may be recalled that a branch manager, in the

\(^5^2\) Deivasenapathy, "Motivational Determinants of
Success among Small Scale Entrepreneurs," Unpublished

\(^5^3\) D. McClelland, The Achieving Society, New York,

\(^5^4\) V.C. Sharma, "Entrepreneurship Development
in Some Asian Countries: a Comparative Study," Light and
the present day Indian Commercial Banking, has to undertake a challenging job of developmental banking. He is expected to develop banking habits among the masses around. The concept of lending against the future earning capacity of viable project to be financed rather than merely against the assets which a borrower could pledge as a collateral security, puts more responsibility and risk upon a branch manager because a manager, as head of a branch has the ultimate responsibility, at the branch level, for all decisions and their effects. Moreover, a manager as head of a branch organises the affairs at the branch. For smooth and effective working at the branch he is to maintain a coordinating link within the branch, between the Head Office and the branch and also with the customer.

Thus a branch manager's roles and responsibilities may be favourably compared with those of an entrepreneur as described by Deivasenapathy in his research study. The findings of the study conducted by Deivasenapathy could, therefore, be said to be in agreement with the results in the present research work. Researches conducted by
Likert, Ketzell et al., Smith and Kendall support the positive relationship between job-satisfaction and performance which relationship is uncovered in the present research study also.

It is, therefore, concluded that the branch manager's effectiveness and job-satisfaction are positively associated. Thus, the data collected during the present research study confirmed the hypothesis laid down earlier in this chapter that is "Branch Managers scoring high on job-satisfaction would be more effective as compared to those who score low on job-satisfaction."

SUMMARY

The chapter was devoted to lay down a working definition of the term "job-satisfaction." The rationale for the approach adopted to study job-satisfaction of branch managers and the tool used to measure their job-satisfaction were discussed. The

55 R. Likert, loc. cit.
56 R.A. Katzell et al. loc. cit.
57 P.C. Smith and L.M. Kendall, loc. cit.
procedure for administration of the job-satisfaction index and scoring was explained in this chapter. The data collected was treated statistically to see its association with effectiveness and test the hypothesis laid down for the study. The chapter reveals that job-satisfaction and effectiveness are positively associated and thus, confirms the hypothesis which shows that the results are in agreement with those derived by many other researchers in this field.