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DEFINITIONS OF JOB SATISFACTION

This Chapter makes an attempt to provide certain definitions given by leading authors on Job Satisfaction.

i Keith Davis has defined Job Satisfaction as "the favourableness or unfavourableness with which employees view their work".

ii According to Hoppock, "Job Satisfaction is an outcome of psychological, physiological and environmental forces that cause a person to say truthfully, I am satisfied with my job".

iii According to Smith, "Job Satisfaction is the persistent feeling towards discriminable aspects of the job situation".

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

v Blum defines Job Satisfaction as "a general attitude which is the result of many specific attitudes in different area".

vi Vroom defines Job Satisfaction as "the positive orientation of an individual towards all aspects of the work situation".
vii Srivatsava states that Job Satisfaction is reflected with attitudes people hold towards their job. Positive attitudes towards job connotes satisfaction and negative attitudes towards dissatisfaction.

viii Gardinar defines "the satisfaction of an employee gets from his job depends on the needs he brings to the job and the extent to which these needs are met by the job. In short, Job Satisfaction appears to be basically a sort of ratio between what a man expects from his job and what he actually gets from it".

ix David J. Charrington states that Job Satisfaction is "the result of a comparison between that what ought to be and what is".

x Stephen P. Robins defines Job Satisfaction as "a highly subjective general impression of the benefits that derive from the job. This variable is critically linked to perception".

xi Edwin A Locke defines Job Satisfaction as "a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job experience".

xii Cormic and Ilgen defines Job Satisfaction as "the attitudes one has towards his or her job".
xiii Gliner defines Job Satisfaction as "the result of various attitudes, the person holds towards the job, towards related factors, and towards life in general".

xiv Norman and Maier defines "Job Satisfaction represents an individual's reaction. It is influenced by one's associates and team mates and by the leadership".

2 CONCEPTS OF JOB SATISFACTION

The term "Job Satisfaction" or "Work Satisfaction" have been given different connotations since their inception. Blum and Naylor are of the view that Job Satisfaction is the result of various attitudes possessed by an employee. In a "narrow" sense, they observe: "these attitudes are related to the job and are concerned with such specific factors as wages, supervision, steadiness of employment, conditions of work, advancement, opportunities, recognition of ability, fair evaluation of work, social relations on the job, prompt settlement of grievances, fair treatment of employer and other similar items".

Sinha opines "Job Satisfaction covers both the satisfaction derived from being engaged in piece of work or in any pursuit of a higher order. It is essentially related to human needs and their fulfilment through work. In fact, Job Satisfaction is generated by individual's perception of how well his job on the whole is satisfying to his various needs".
The Roberts Dictionary of Industrial Relations defines Job Satisfaction in the following words: "Those outward or inner manifestations which give the individual a sense of enjoyment or accomplishment in the performance of his work. Job Satisfaction may come from the product or items produced from the speed with which it is accomplished or from other features relating to the job and its performance. Attitudes towards the job may be affected by such items as the pay scale, the relationship of the individual to the supervisor, the working conditions including safety and many other factors which are not easily discernible on the surface".

In true sense: Job Satisfaction does not mean a perpetual smirk on the face of the employees. It does not mean turning work into a hobby, undertaken just for the pleasure of it. However, satisfied the employees, they cannot be expected to find absolute and unalloyed pleasure in it. Job Satisfaction essentially means economy of an effort, getting rid of avoidable tension, utilizing the energies of employees for better performance of work instead of allowing them to be dissipated needlessly. It has been one of the most widely investigated areas of research in Industrial Psychology in India as well as abroad, yet the bulk of existing research fails to offer a satisfactory explanation to the fundamental questions: What is
Satisfaction? And how can it be adequately and reliably measured? Recent studies on Job Satisfaction generally assume two underlying types of job elements important to employee satisfaction: those in the work process which allow for self-actualization and environmental elements in which the worker's rewards are physical and monetary. A parallel assumption pertains to the two types of employees for whom each of these are important. Friedlander made an attempt to validate such constructs through factor analysis and indicated three underlying groups of job elements important to job satisfaction: social and technical environment, intrinsic work aspects and recognition through advancement.  

Job Satisfaction is thus derived from and is the result of many interrelated factors which cannot be completely isolated from one another for analytical purposes. However, they can, by the use of statistical techniques, be sufficiently separated so as to give an indication of their relative importance to Job Satisfaction. Most important factors among these could be classified into "personal" factors and factors "inherent" in the job. Personal factors relate to sex, age, education, intelligence, personality exclusive of intelligence and time on job. Factors inherent in the job are type of work, skill required, occupational status, job security, pay, promotion opportunity, geography, etc.
In recent years, Fleishman and Hunt has conducted studies focusing on the relations between leader behaviour and subordinates job satisfaction. The supervisory attributes which have interactions relationship with job satisfaction in this regard are the extent to which supervisors possess technical competence, establish initiating structure and show consideration towards subordinates. Some researchers have also found that leaders who possess such attitudes tend to increase the expectations of subordinates regarding important dimensions of their job experience.

Sushila Singhal has described Job Satisfaction, as the "zest" an employee displays in his harmonious relationship on the job as a result of his adjustment on three dimensions: personal, social and work. It has been argued that Job Satisfaction is a composite measure which can be obtained by a meaningful combination of the indices of personal, organisational and situational factors.

The Industrial Psychologists define Job Satisfaction as a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experience. Most investigators have treated job satisfaction as a rather complex set of variables. The reasons for doing so are quite compelling. Workers can be found to be report that they are
very much satisfied with their supervisors, indifferent toward company policies, and very much dissatisfied with their pay.

Another research on Job Satisfaction has produced two approaches to define it. "The attitude towards things approach and the internal state approach".

The attitude towards things approach assumes that Job Satisfaction really consists of many different attitudes about various components of the job. The attitudes that appear to be the most important are those concerning the work itself, whether it is challenging, stimulating and attractive. The supervisors whether they are considerate, competent and the pay whether it is adequate and equitable will also affect job satisfaction.

The internal state approach assumes that employees have a central internal feeling of overall satisfaction or dissatisfaction, positive experiences as a result of friendly co-workers, good pay, helpful supervisors and attractive jobs create a positive internal state, negative experiences by getting low pay, boring jobs, and uncomfortable working conditions create negative internal state. The overall feeling of satisfaction or dissatisfaction is a composite feeling determined by the
intensity and frequency of positive and negative experience.

Job Satisfaction is a generalised attitude, resulting from many specific attitudes in three areas viz.,

i **Specific Job Factor:** It results when there is a match between job requirements and the wants and expectations of employees.

ii **Individual Adjustment:** It expresses the extent of match between the employee's expectations of the job and the rewards that the job provides.

iii **Group Relations:** Job Satisfaction can be viewed in relation to employees' satisfaction with their home and community life.

Thus Job Satisfaction may be resultant feeling of satisfaction which the employee achieves by gaining from the job what he expects from it to satisfy his needs. It may be a function of the need strength or expectation and the potentiality of the job to provide for the fulfilment of needs.

3 **DETERMINANTS OF JOB SATISFACTION**

A work force that experiences at least a reasonable level of Job Satisfaction may bring some benefits to the
organisation that are difficult to identify or measure. At one time Social Scientists thought that the job was satisfying when there was a match between the characteristics of the job and the needs of the individual. Recent research suggests that the determinants of satisfaction are more complicated than this. To be sure people and their jobs are the basic elements involved.

Brayfield and Crockeit suggested that conditions conducive to Job Satisfaction may have an effect on the quality of the applicants drawn into the organisation, on the quality of job performance and on the harmony of labour management relations. On the other hand, the 'hidden costs' that accrue from dissatisfaction of work force are like costs such as having to have more supervision greater time devoted to handling grievances and complaints, poor community relations and unmeasurable effects on the total organisational efficiency. Further, the commonly held hypothesis is that employees who experience high or positive job satisfaction in their work are more productive as a result. Also, it does not necessarily mean to increase everyone's satisfaction and thereby to make 'everybody's happy', but rather to make sure that the best performing employees must be satisfied.
Vroom classified the elements into Individual Factors and Situational Factors. The Individual Factors which is otherwise known as Personal Variables and it includes age, academic career, marital status, dependents, sex, community surroundings and social approach to society. The Situational Factors or Work Role includes working conditions, routine, supervision and work load.

According to Abraham Korman, there are two types of variables which determine the Job Satisfaction of an individual. These are Organisational Variables and Personal Variables. Organisational variables include occupational level, job content, considerate leadership, pay and promotional opportunities, interaction and the work group. The Personal Variables include age, educational level, sex etc.

*Stagner, Flebbe and Wood studies the Job Satisfaction of 715 male unionised rail-road workers. He classified the determining factors of Job Satisfaction as general working conditions, unionist relations, general quality of supervisors and grievance handling procedure.

*Gadel studied a female sample of part-time clerical workers who were of average age of 41 years. They were compared for their job satisfaction with full-time workers. The findings revealed that the part-time workers
performed as satisfactorily as young full-time workers with higher job satisfaction. The workers had relatively lower turnover than the middle aged part-time workers\textsuperscript{10}.

- Some of the determinants are listed by Gadet viz., type of work, working conditions, pay, co-workers, ease of completing the work and advancement opportunities. About 60 per cent of the sample workers are atleast 40 years of old and most of them are married. Security, supervision, company prestige and working hours are of the factors which are listed from the old group of women workers.

Rose and Zander interviewed from the sample of skilled women workers in a company and identified recognition, autonomy, doing important work and fair evaluation of work done as the determinants of Job Satisfaction\textsuperscript{11}.

Durgannand Sinha pointed out that the job status, type of work, supervisory behaviours and work group as the determinants of Job Satisfaction towards office and manual workers\textsuperscript{12}.

According to Herzberg the determining factors of job satisfaction were classified into motivational factors or satisfiers and maintenance factors or dissatisfiers\textsuperscript{13}. The Motivational factors are achievement, recognition,
advancement, work itself, possibility of growth and responsibility. The Maintenance factors are company policy and administration, technical supervision, interpersonal relations with supervisors, interpersonal relations with peers, interpersonal relations with subordinates, salary, job security, personal life, working conditions and status.

Intrinsic factors are internal rewards that occur after or away from work, providing no direct satisfaction at the time the work is performed. Employees of extrinsic factors are retirement plans, health insurance, vacation and so on. Robert Spillanes classified intrinsic factors such as recognition of abilities, opportunities to develop feeling of achievement, responsibility given by supervisors, possibilities for advancement and the nature of the work itself. The extrinsic factors are working conditions, salaries, company policies, relationship with colleagues and supervision.

The study carried out by Myers at Texas Instruments, although the results generally were in line with what would be predicted from Herzberg's findings, there were some differences in the motivational and maintenance factors. Myers have classified the motivational factors such as growth, achievement, responsibility and recognition. It is further classified into delegation, access to
information, freedom to act, discretionary awards, profit sharing, company growth, promotion, education, membership, involvement, goal setting, planning, problem solving, performance appraisal and work simplification.

Myers also classified the maintenance factors viz., The first factor is physical which includes work load, work rules, equipment, location, grounds, rest rooms and continued temperature, ventilation, lighting and noise. The second maintenance factor includes work groups, social groups, sports, professional group and interest group. The third factor economic and finance includes wage and salaries, profit sharing, social security, workmen's compensation, retirement benefits, paid leave and insurance. The fourth factor is security which includes fairness, consistency, re-assurance, friendliness, seniority rights and grievances handling. The fifth factor is orientation which includes job instruction, group meetings, induction, grapevine and bulletin. The last factor is status which includes job classification, privileges, relationships and company status.

4 THEORIES OF JOB SATISFACTION

After understanding the meaning of the concepts of Job Satisfaction certain major theories given by the experts are to be discussed. This would enable the present
researcher to have an insight into the major theories available on the subject so as to draw a proper dimension into the present study. In this part the theories given by Maslow, Herzberg, Alderfer, Victor Vroom, Porter and Lawler and Stancy Adams are outlined below.

i Content Theories

The Content Theories of work motivation attempt to determine what it is that motivates people at work. The content theorists are concerned with identifying the needs/drives that people have and how these needs/drives are prioritized.

a Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs

In 1935 Abraham Maslow developed the first and one of the most popular theories of motivation\textsuperscript{15}. Maslow stated that individual have five needs, which he arranged in a hierarchy from the most basic level to the highest: physiological, safety, belonging and love, esteem and self-actualization\textsuperscript{16}.

**Physiological Needs:** Physiological needs refer to the most basic needs an individual has. These includes needs for food, clothing and shelter. Physiological needs dominate when all needs are unsatisfied. According to theory, once these basic needs are satisfied, they no longer motivate.
Safety Needs: These needs are otherwise called as security needs. These include (i) protection from physiological dangers (fire, accident); (ii) economic security (fringe benefits, health, insurance programmes) and (iii) the desire for an orderly, predictable environment.

Belongingness and Love Needs: Man is a gregarious being and he wants to belong, to associate, to gain acceptance from associates, to give and receive friendship and affection. Social needs tend to be stronger for some people than for others and stronger in certain situations.

Esteem Needs: Esteem needs are two fold in nature; self esteem and esteem of others. Self esteem needs include those for self-confidence, achievement, competence, self-respect, knowledge and for independence and freedom. The second group of esteem needs are those that related at one's reputation, needs for status, for recognition, for appreciation and the deserved respect of one's fellow/associates.

Self-Actualization Needs: Self-actualization needs reflect individual's desire to grow and develop to their fullest potential. Individuals often want the opportunity to be creative on the job. In other words, self actualization needs refer to becoming what one is capable of becoming.
b  Herzberg's Two Factor Theory

Frederick Herzberg and his associates' view of motivation complements that of the other needs theorists. They suggest that motivators - features of a job's content including responsibility, autonomy, self-esteem and self-actualization opportunities - are factors that satisfy higher order needs, motivate a person to exert more effort, and hence encourage the person to perform better, hygiene factors - factors that can meet physiological, security or social needs, including physical working conditions, salary, benefits, and other features of a job's context-satisfy lower order needs and prevent dissatisfaction.

Unlike the other theories, the two factor theory focuses on increasing overall satisfaction rather than relying simply on meeting individual needs.

Hygiene factors do not motivate because they do not encourage individuals to exert more effort. But hygiene factors must first be satisfied to bring the individual to a point of neutrality so that the motivators will have an effect.

c  Alderfer's ERG Theory

An extension of the Herzberg and especially, the Maslow content theories of work motivation comes from the
work of Clayton Alderfer. Similar to Maslow and Herzberg, he does feel that there is value in categorizing needs and that there is a basic distinction between lower order needs and higher order needs.

Alderfer identified three groups of core needs: existence, relatedness, and growth (hence ERG theory). The existence needs are concerned with survival (physiological well-being). The relatedness needs stress the importance of interpersonal, social relationships. The growth needs are concerned with the individual's intrinsic desire for personal development.

Unlike Maslow and Herzberg, he does not contend that a lower-level need has to be fulfilled before a higher-level need is motivating or that deprivation is the only way to activate a need. Under ERG theory the person's background may dictate that the relatedness needs will take precedence over unfulfilled existence needs and that the more the growth needs are satisfied, the more they will increase in intensity.

Overall, the ERG theory seems to take some of the strong points of the earlier content theories but is less restrictive and limiting.
The content models attempted to identify what motivates people at work (for example, self-actualization, responsibility and growth). The process theories, on the other hand, are more concerned with the cognitive antecedents that go into motivation or effort and, more important, with the way they relate to each other.

### Expectancy Theory

Victor H. Vroom developed an approach to motivation, known as expectancy theory, that attempts to explain behaviour in terms of an individual's goals and choices and the expectations of achieving these goals. It assumes that people can determine which outcomes they prefer and can make realistic estimates of their chances of obtaining them.

Victor Vroom's model states that motivation is a function of expectancy, valence, and instrumentality. In other words,

\[
\text{Motivation} = \text{Expectancy} \times \text{Valence} \times \text{Instrumentality} \\
(E \times V \times I)
\]

This simple formulation identifies the three basic components of expectancy theory.
E, or expectancy, refers to a person's perception of the probability that effort will lead to performance.

V, or valence, refers to a person's perception of the value of the projected outcomes; that is, how much the person likes or dislikes receiving those outcomes.

I, or instrumentality, refers to a person's perception of the probability that certain outcomes, positive or negative, will be attached to performance.

In short, the strength of the motivation to perform a certain act will depend on the algebraic sum of the products of the valences for the outcome (which include instrumentality) times of the expectancies.

b Porter-Lawler Model

Porter and Lawler dealt the relationship between satisfaction and performance with the help of a motivation model.20

Porter and Lawler start with the premise that motivation (effort or force) does not equal satisfaction and/or performance. Motivation, satisfaction, and performance are all separate variables and relate in ways different from what was traditionally assumed. The Exhibit 2 depicts the multivariable model used to explain the complex relationship that exists between motivation,
EXHIBIT 2
THE PORTER-LAWLER MOTIVATION MODEL

Value of Reward

Ableities and Traits

Perceived Equitable Rewards

Performance (accomplishment)

Intrinsic Rewards

Extrinsic Rewards

Satisfaction

Role perception

Perceived effort-reward Probability

Effort
performance, and satisfaction. As shown in the model boxes 1, 2, and 3 are basically the same as the Vroom's equation. It is important, however, that Porter and Lawler point out that effort does not directly lead to performance. It is mediated by abilities/traits and role perceptions. More important in Porter-Lawler model is what happens after the performance. The rewards that follow and how these are perceived will determine satisfaction. In other words, the Porter-Lawler model suggests that performance leads to satisfaction.

iii Equity Theory

Stancy Adams argues that a major input into job performance and satisfaction is the degree of equity (or inequity) that the people perceive in their work situation. Here an individual's perception of the fairness of rewards he receives is an important factor of job satisfaction.  

Individual's subjective judgments about the equity or fairness of the reward play a key role. If the people feel, they are inadequately rewarded they may be dissatisfied. If they view reward as equitable they will probably continue at the same level of output. If people think that rewards are greater than what is considered equitably, they may be very much satisfied and they may work hard.
5 STUDIES ON JOB SATISFACTION

In reviewing the literature on Job Satisfaction, it becomes evident that the term Job Satisfaction has been used differently by different people. Terms like 'Morale', 'Motivation' and 'Job Satisfaction' have been used interchangeably in most of the studies.

The earliest researchers on Job Satisfaction were carried out in individual companies. Interest in the study of the Human Relations in industry started with Mayo's pioneer work known as Hawthorne studies of Roethlisberger and Dickson. The complete Hawthorne studies were done in a series of experiments: Experiments on illumination, Relay Assembly Test Room and Mica Splitting Test Room, Mass Interviewing Programme, Bank Wiring Observation Room and Personnel Counselling. Although the experiments may not be regarded as 'acme of perfection' yet they are significant because they represent an honest and concerted effort to understand employees, instead of approaching the problem only from the managerial point of view of increasing efficiency on an economic level. These experiments established the significance of the human relationship, within the work organisation. This provided a new frame of reference.
Blum observes, "probably the most significant results of these studies are the fact that workers are affected by factors outside the job to a greater extent than by those on the job itself, and that they organise into informal social groups. The Hawthorne studies show the complete interrelatedness of the various problems and demonstrate that changes in work environment, rest pauses, hours of work, hours in working week, fatigue, monotony, incentives, employee attitudes, employee organisation, both formal and informal, and employee-employer relations are all intimately related". However, the real significance of these studies cannot be understood only in terms of their findings, but also because they set the ball rolling in a new field of understanding human relations.

Hoppock's study was a community-wide survey in the town of New Hope, Pennsylvania, 88 per cent of the 351 adult employees responded to his questionnaire. Hoppock prepared an Index of Job Satisfaction. The results indicate that the average index is highest in the professional, managerial category and relatively they are more satisfied employees.

Hoppock also conducted a survey of 500 teachers from 51 rural communities of North-Eastern United States. He estimated their job satisfaction on four attitude scales. On the basis of the scores on all these scales 100 most
satisfied and 100 least satisfied teachers were further interviewed. Finally, Hoppock proposed six major components of Job Satisfaction: i. Individual's reactions to unpleasant situations, ii. Facility of adjusting with other individuals, iii. Standing in the socio-economic group with which one has identified, iv. Relationship between demands of the job and the worker's abilities, interests and training, v. Security, and vi. Loyalty.

The Study conducted by Evans and Lasseau at the General Motors Corporation, U.S.A. is another major relevant study of similar historical significance. This study evolved a novel technique to assess employee attitudes. A competition for prizes was organised and letters from the 2,97,401 employees excluding the supervisory and management employees of the General Motors Corporation were invited. The employees were asked to write a letter on the subject. The employees were free to discuss any or all favourable aspects of their job. Though the responses were limited only to positive aspects of the job, the absence of the mention of certain factors was also considered significant for finding out the negative aspects. Arithmetic Analysis was done on every tenth entry of the first 10,000 letters. They yielded 150 themes which on the basis of frequency were further reduced to approximately one-half. Finally, they were regrouped into 18 themes. This study draw the attention
of the Social Scientists towards the problem of satisfaction and dissatisfaction derived by the individual from his job.

Meltzer and Salter studied Job Satisfaction of 704 physiologists with reference to the organisational structure within which they worked. On categorising the respondents on the basis of administrative levels within the organisation, they found a negative correlation between the levels of administration and job satisfaction. However, when size was controlled so that they had ratios of number of supervisory levels to size, they found generally insignificant relationships between 'tallness' or 'flatness' of the organisation and job satisfaction.

Porter and Lawler made a comparative study of Job Satisfaction of managerial staff of companies having tall and flat organisation. It was a nation-wide sample consisting of more than 1,900 managers drawn from all levels of management. It was found that job satisfaction of the managerial staff of the companies having flat organisation and employing less than 5,000 people was greater than their counterpart in the tall organisation. But for companies employing more than 5,000 people, the picture was reversed. They concluded that the effect of a tall or a flat organisation structure does not appear very simple and unequivocal. The size is one of the factors affecting the
relative advantages of one or the other type of structure. Moreover, the level at which the employees work in an organisation was also an important factor.

Pelz observes that the attitude towards management and supervisors also exercises significant influence on job attitudes. In his study of 8,000 non-supervisory employees and 750 of their immediate supervisors, he found significant relationship between employees' satisfaction and such supervisory variables as degree to which supervisor is concerned with employees as individuals, type of recognition given by the supervisor for good work, decision making etc.

Robinson and Hoppock have collected the data on 191 assorted studies reporting percentage of job satisfaction. The medium figure is 18 per cent dissatisfied. A summary of many previous studies on job satisfaction suggests that two-third of the workers were dissatisfied.

Pheysey, Payne and Pugh in a study of manufacturing firms, found that formality and rule orientation were related to employee satisfaction with promotion and fellow workers and greater involvement of managers with group.
Sirota found that medium amounts of information about management philosophy, goals and operations procedures were more highly associated with employee satisfaction and advancement. The results were interpreted as casting doubt on the assumption that maximum satisfaction of ego needs results in the highest degree of employee-management harmony.

Friedlander and Pickle studied the extent to which small business firms were able to satisfy the needs of owners, customers, employees and the public concluded that it was very difficult for an organisation to satisfy all the demands made upon it.

Hollander and Bair reported that highly motivated members of a group tend to identify more strongly with authority figures than do the members who are low in motivation.

The U.S. department of Labour revealed 524 boys and girls who were out of school and were in the labour market. Their age ranged from 14 to 19 years. The findings revealed that job satisfaction decreased with increase in age.

Sinha and Sharma explored attitude towards union and job satisfaction on a sample of 100 workers of a light
engineering factory. They found a significant negative association between the two and at the same time, age and marital status were significantly associated with job satisfaction.

Sinha and Nair reported that satisfied worker is usually more skilled, is either fresh to the organisation or has put in many years in it and has a few dependents to support. This study was conducted on the employees of a large machinery manufacturing plant in South India.

Natraj and Hafeez on a sample of skilled workers found that besides education and salary, age also was significantly related to job satisfaction.

Inlow did not find evidence that employees are satisfied in the early phase of their service. He showed that the first two years of work had greatest depressing influence on job satisfaction. His study revealed two important things: i. new workers were less satisfied than the old and, ii. the married workers were more satisfied than the unmarried ones.

Gibaja examined the work attitude in terms of exposure to urbanisation, industrialization and education. The sample included 615 industrial and 98 farm workers. The results indicated that the industrial workers find more satisfaction in work than the rural workers.
Amachree used reference group concept as focus of his study of 315 workers from a mining company. The assumption made in the study was that satisfaction is relative both to the social location of the workers and the significant others with whom the worker compares himself. It was found that worker's satisfaction is related more to reference group comparison than to level of skill and other existential situations in the work place. Comparative reference group constitutes available theoretical scheme for analysing the patterns of satisfaction and/or dissatisfaction which industrial worker derives from participating in industrial productive activities.

Herzberg, et al, studied accountants and engineers from seven Steel and Engineering Company. About 200 interviews were conducted. The significance of the study lies in the fact that it challenged the conventional explanation of job satisfaction that satisfaction and dissatisfaction are two ends of a continuum with a neutral position mid-way where the individual is neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. A five fold analysis was adopted. The first level factors, observed in the study were recognition, achievement, possibility of growth, advancement, salary, interpersonal relations, supervision, responsibility, company policy, working condition, work itself, factors in personal life, status and job security. The second level
factors were feeling related to recognition, achievement, growth, responsibility, group feelings, interest, status, security, fairness, pride and salary. The results of the study supported the hypothesis that there are different sets of factors which act as satisfiers and dissatisfiers. The five factors as strong determinant of job satisfaction were: recognition, achievement, responsibility, advancement and nature of work. The factors of dissatisfaction were supervision, salary, working conditions, inter-personal relations and company policy. The two groups of factors are: 'what a person does' i.e., the job content factors or hygiene factors.

Ronan studies 241 employees to assess the relative importance of 18 job characteristics in relation to job satisfaction. He asked his respondents to rate the characteristics on a seven point scale. The findings revealed that while there were differences in the important rankings among three groups of employees consisting of managerial, salaried and hourly employees, there was also substantial agreement. Some of the most marked disagreements were that job security was not important for salaried workers, but it was important to both managerial and hourly workers. However, in general, he found his data in good agreement with previous studies in showing importance of nature of work, pay and job security.
Hulin and Smith were presented how job satisfaction is influenced by group variables. They were interested in exploring whether men would differ significantly from women in the same plant in terms of their job satisfaction. They obtained measures of five separate aspects of job satisfaction from 295 male workers and 163 female workers drawn from four different plants. The data were analysed with respect to the mean job satisfaction for the male and female workers. It indicates that in three plants, the female workers were significantly less satisfied than their male counterparts while in the fourth plant, there was no significant difference. A test on the relative side of the differences indicated that the ordering of the differences in satisfaction level was somewhat consistent across the four samples.

According to John P Wanous some correlations have been found between job satisfaction and performance, but these are often small and not statistically significant. This enlightens that correlation between job satisfaction and productivity is quite complex, being influenced by many intervening variables, such as reward that an employee receives.

The question of whether job satisfaction leads to productivity leads to job satisfaction is answered by Lawler.
and Porter in the article referred above suggesting that productivity leads to rewards and if these are perceived to be equitable, employee satisfaction is the result.

Robest viewed that satisfaction and productivity are in a circular relationship in which each affects the other. He assumes that performance leads to rewards and satisfaction which then lead to more effort because of high perceived expectancy. The high effort leads to effective performance which again leads to satisfaction in a circular relationship.

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 work. It is evident from his study that Indian workers have consistently ranked adequate earning at number one. Job security and opportunity for advancement are other factors which are ranked high by Indian workers, while such factors as working hours, relations with colleagues, job status and prestige have been ranked low as motivators in the work situation. It is, however, not possible to accept the 'incentive approach' as a plausible and logical explanation of job satisfaction. The incentive approach has over-emphasised the importance of job factors in studying job satisfaction. It seems to be a
unidimensional approach, which completely neglects 'off the job factors' that could affect satisfaction with work. It presumes that removing disincentives at work such as bad working conditions, longer working hours, etc., and providing rational incentives such as piece rate earnings, opportunities for earning more money and other fringe benefits are likely to create positive attitudes towards the job. The incentive approach overstresses the economic aspects of job and seems to neglect other factors such as better inter-personal relations, and other social aspects of the work environment, which could affect the satisfaction derived from work.

Pestonjee examined levels of employees' morale and job satisfaction prevailing under democratic and autocratic organisational structures among the employees of two departments of a textile mill. He found that the democratic work group had the lowest number of dissatisfied employees whereas the autocratic work group had the lowest number of highly satisfied employees. Thus, he concludes that a democratic organisational structure is conducive to higher morale and job satisfaction.

Ganguli in his Calcutta study found that as high as 66 per cent of engineering workers were satisfied with their job and only 34 per cent were dissatisfied.
Kapoor in a National representative study of 1,741 workers found that 75 per cent of the workers were satisfied with their jobs and only 25 per cent were dissatisfied. He also analysed some important determinants of job satisfaction. The underlying assumption of his study was that employee satisfaction is a function of the discrepancy between worker's expectation/aspirations and actual achievement. The greater the discrepancy, the stronger the dissatisfaction will be and vice versa. The study was conducted on a sample of 391 workers from 16 factories in North India. The findings revealed that wages ranked highest in worker's expectation and job security, opportunity for advancement and housing followed in this order. Workers showed general dissatisfaction due to non-achievement of their high expectations concerning wages. Job security on the other hand did not cause any significant amount of dissatisfaction. The study concluded that wages, housing and opportunity for advancement may be considered as worker's primary needs and placed into a 'hierarchy of prepotency' which if it remains unfulfilled causes dissatisfaction.

Dixit has reviewed some of the researchers regarding preference of various job factors by workers in India. Their order of importance is adequate salary, job security, adequate personal benefits, opportunities for advancement and comfortable working conditions.
Sinka contends that inadequate salary and job insecurity were dissatisfiers while interesting work, social status and boss were the factors that created job satisfaction.

Prasad however confirms that the job preferences of Indian Workers are good wages, job security, promotion, appreciation of work, interesting work and management loyalty to workers in that order.

6 SUMMARY

In this Chapter, various definitions and concepts and the determinants of job satisfaction are analysed. The major theories available on job satisfaction are presented and various made in this area of job satisfaction are also brought out.
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