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2.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter an attempt is made to discuss the concept of job satisfaction, the important theories of job satisfaction, the factors determining job satisfaction and the dissatisfaction and the consequences of job satisfaction.

In organisations, whether they are private companies, public undertakings or governmental bureaucracies, job satisfaction assumes increasingly higher significance. Any industrial organisation requires not only machines, raw materials, factory buildings, furniture and money, but also men to run it efficiently. The speed of achieving the economic goal will depend not only on how the persons work, but also on the optimal social and physical conditions in which they work. In the earlier days the management considered the raising of pay packet to be the solution to all human problems in the industries. The classical Hawthorne studies and other similar investigations in the field of industrial psychology have provided enough of evidence that quite often workers care more for other factors than those considered important for them by the management.

If employees are satisfied with their jobs, there is an increase in organisational productivity, a reduction in labour turnover and rate of accidents, and there also is good job performance.
2.2 EVOLUTION

Before the Industrial Revolution, the employer’s only aim was to get the work done by the workers whatever be the nature of work conditions. They did not care for the satisfaction of the workers.

As the industries started to grow, the primary concern of the industrialists was the improvement in productivity and not the psychological well-being of the workers. Foremost in this direction of study was Frederick Taylor, the Father of Scientific Management. His approach to job satisfaction was based on a very pragmatic but essentially pessimistic philosophy that man is motivated by money alone, the workers are essentially stupid and phlegmatic and they would be satisfied with work if they got higher economic returns from it. In this period also, satisfaction of workers was not of prime interest.

The significance of the problem of job satisfaction came to the fore with the findings of Hawthorne experiments carried out at the Philadelphia plant of the Western Electric Supply Company in the 1920’s. These investigations (Mayo, 1993; Roethlisberger and Dickson, 1939) led the organisations to believe that promoting job satisfaction would also promote productivity. Later on, the interest in the study of problem of job satisfaction, however experienced a set back when it
came to be realized that the felt satisfaction of the employees in their work roles did not necessarily lead to increased productivity. The job satisfaction of workers could be high yet their productivity could be low. Conversely, the job satisfaction could be low yet the productivity could be high. This problem still continues to be fairly important for effective organisational functioning.

This has assumed greater importance today in the current set up than it had ever been before in industrial history. The working force is getting better organized each day. It is conscious of its power of members, and is much more politically active today than it had ever been. As such, employers can hope to seek its willing co-operation if only it is kept reasonably satisfied with its job. A dissatisfied and disgruntled work group could create havoc in the organisation through go-slow tactics, agitations and strikes. Apart from human considerations, keeping the workers reasonably satisfied on the job is the demand of expediency for the smooth organisational functioning in the present-day set up.

2.3 CONCEPT OF JOB-SATISFACTION

Job satisfaction refers to a person’s feeling of satisfaction on the job, which acts as a motivation to work. Here, it is not merely satisfaction, happiness or self-contentment, but it is always in relation to the job. Job satisfaction is
necessarily one “on the job”. “Job” from the operational point of view is not only “an activity which is performed under contractual agreement and for which one gets paid” but also the “total relationship of an individual with the firm, not the specific duties or responsibilities which he might have,” Satisfaction means the simple feeling of state accompanying the attainment of any goal; the end state in feeling, accompanying the attainment by an impulse of its objective”. Satisfier means “any stimulus, situation or experience, which meets a need or represents a goal.2

Job satisfaction is a motivation factor and an integration factor as well. It is equally a morale booster. Job satisfaction refers to the attitude of the employee towards his job. It is related to the degree to which the employee’s personal needs are fulfilled in the job situation. Thus, job satisfaction is the favourableness with which employees view their work.

Job satisfaction has been defined and viewed variously by different authors.

Porter and Lawler (1969) reported that people having high self-control, responsibility and high level of challenge derive more intrinsic satisfaction from the job.3
Luthans (1987) elaborated job satisfaction as an emotional response to a job situation. Smith et al., (1969) suggested five major characteristics which contribute to the job satisfaction of an employee. These are ‘work itself’, ‘pay package’, ‘promotional opportunities’, ‘nature of supervision’ and ‘interpersonal relationship with peers’.4

Locke (1976) defines job satisfaction as “a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences.”5

Davies (1979) found that organisational size is negatively related to job satisfaction and argued that large organisational size tends to create an unfavourable environment due to the lesser degree of communication, co-ordination and participation among employees.6

Cherrington (1989) observed that age, education and occupation are three personal characteristics that have been constantly related to job satisfaction.7

MC Cormick and Joseph Tiffin define it as “satisfaction with one’s job, which in turn is a function of the degree of need satisfaction derived from or experienced in the job.”8
Gilmer defines job satisfaction as “job satisfaction or dissatisfaction is the result of various attitudes the person holds towards his job, towards the related factors and towards life in general."

Thus, job satisfaction is an expected outcome of positive job involvement. High job satisfaction contributes to organisational commitment, job involvement, better physical and mental health and quality life to the employees. On the other hand, job dissatisfaction leads to absenteeism, labour turnover, labour problems and a negative organisational climate.

2.4 IMPORTANCE OF JOB SATISFACTION

Obviously job satisfaction significantly contributes to employees’ productivity and morale. An industrial organisation can be substantially benefited if it cares to develop general individual attitudes in its personnel that can effectively contribute to job satisfaction. If an organisation or company appropriately discovers attitudes on factors related to the job, it can take necessary steps to prevent bad situations and thereby improve the job satisfaction of its employees. Victor H. Vroom examined the relationship between job satisfaction and certain aspects of job behaviour, namely “turnover, absenteeism, accidents and job performance”. He found that “the higher an employee’s satisfaction, the less
apt, he is to leave his job; there is little relationship between the amount of job satisfaction and the degree of work absenteeism; there is negative or no relationship between accidents and job satisfaction since there is considerable evidence to show that most accidents are caused simply by chance factors. Thus while each of the categories considered by Vroom is concerned with job-related behaviours and job satisfaction, none of these seems to be directly related to actual job performance, that is, how well the employee actually accomplishes the job assigned to him.

2.5 APPROACHES TO JOB SATISFACTION

Research on job satisfaction can be divided into different schools of thought. There is what can be called the psychological needs school-exemplified by psychologists such as Maslow, Herzberg, Likert and others. They see motivation as the central factor in job satisfaction and concentrate their attention on stimuli which are believed to lead to motivation. The needs of individuals for achievement, recognition, responsibility, status and advancement are the stimuli.

A second school devotes its attention to leadership as a factor in job satisfaction. Psychologists see the behaviour of supervisors as an important
influence on employees’ attitudes and direct their observations at leadership style and the response of subordinates.

The third school, strongly represented at the Manchester Business School by Lupton, Gowler and Legge, approach job satisfaction from a quite different angle and examine the effort-reward bargain as an important variable. This leads to a consideration of how the wages and salaries of particular groups are constructed and the influences of factors such as overtime pay and the state of labour market on earnings and employees’ attitudes to them.

Yet another school of thought approaches job satisfaction from an entirely different angle and sees management ideology and values as an important influence. Writers such as Crozier and Gouldner categorise varieties of management behaviour as ‘punishment-centred’, and ‘mock’ bureaucracy. Punishment-centred bureaucracy is the type of management behaviour which responds to deviations from rules and procedures. Mock bureaucracy is said to exist when an organisation has rules and procedures but neither management nor the workers identify it with these or accept them as legitimate. In consequence they are generally ignored. Although a discussion of values as such does not appear often in the job satisfaction literature, it is clear that the kind of legislation
formulated by management, and employees' perceptions of the legitimacy of this, must have an influence on job satisfaction.

Fifthly, there are behavioural scientists who say that the factors described above are extrinsic to the tasks an employee is required to carry out and therefore a less important factor in job satisfaction than the work itself and the way it is structured. This group concentrates on the content of work and on the job design factors. In Europe they are represented by Cooper at Liverpool, Herbst Thorsmd and Gulowsen in Norway and the Tavistook Institute in London.

Sixthly, some contributors thinking on the subject, including the Herberg School, seems to suggest that it is only necessary to identify the needs of an employee. The organisation for which he works must then ensure that these needs are met if it wishes to secure the advantages of a labour force performing at a high level of job satisfaction. As such, job satisfaction is positively related to the degree to which one’s personal needs are fulfilled in the job situation. A more realistic approach to job satisfaction may be to look at the individual’s needs in the work situation and to examine also the needs of the firm and the demands which it has to make of its employees because of pressure exerted by the environment in which it operates. This leads to a consideration of job satisfaction in terms of the degree
of fit between what an organisation requires of its employees and what the employees seek from the firm.

2.6 THEORIES OF JOB SATISFACTION

Four approaches can be identified in the theoretical work on satisfaction. Fulfilment theory was the first approach to develop. Equity theory and discrepancy theory developed later, partially as reactions against the shortcomings of fulfilment theory. Two-factor theory, the fourth approach, represents an attempt to develop a completely new approach to thinking about satisfaction.

FULFILMENT THEORY

Schaffer has argued that “Job satisfaction will vary directly with the extent to which those needs of an individual which can be satisfied are actually satisfied.” Vroom also sees job satisfaction in terms of the degree to which a job provides the person with positively valued outcomes. He equates satisfaction with valence and adds, “if we describe a person as satisfied with an object, we mean that the object has positive valence for him. However, satisfaction has a much more restricted usage. In common parlance, we refer to a person’s satisfaction only with reference to objects which he possesses.” Researchers who have adopted the fulfilment approach measure people’s satisfaction by simply asking how much
of a given facet or outcome they are receiving. Thus, these researchers view satisfaction as depending on how much of a given outcome or group of outcomes a person receives. Fulfilment theories have considered how facet-satisfaction measures combine to determine overall satisfaction. The crucial issue is whether the facet-satisfaction measures should be weighed by their importance to the person when they combine. Some job factors are more important than other job factors for each individual. Therefore, the important factors need to be weighed more in determining the individual’s total satisfaction. However, there is evidence that the individual’s facet satisfaction scores reflect this emphasis already and thus do not need to be further weighed.

A great deal of research shows that people’s satisfaction is a function both of how much they receive and of how much they feel they should and or want to receive. A foreman, for example, may be satisfied with a salary of $12,000, while a company president may be dissatisfied with a salary of $100,000, even though the president correctly perceives that he receives more than the foreman. The point is that people’s reactions to what they receive are not simply a function of how much they receive; their reactions are strongly influenced by such individual-difference factors as what they want and what they feel they should receive. Individual-difference factors suggest that the fulfilment theory approach to
job satisfaction is not valid, since this approach fails to take into account differences in people's feelings about what outcomes they should receive.

Morse stated this point of view as follows; At first, satisfaction would simply be a function of how much a person received from the situation or what we have called the amount of environmental return. It made sense to feel that those who were in more need-fulfilling environments would be more satisfied. But the amount of environmental return did not seem to be the only factor involved. Another factor obviously had to be included in order to predict satisfaction accurately. This variable was the strength of an individual's desires, or his level of aspiration in a particular area. If the environment provided little possibility for need satisfaction, those with the strongest desires, or highest aspirations, were the least happy.14 Discrepancy theory represents an attempt to take into account the fact that people do differ in their desires.

DISCREPANCY THEORY

Recently many psychologists have argued for a discrepancy approach to thinking about satisfaction. They maintain that satisfaction is determined by the differences between the actual outcomes a person receives and some other outcome level. The theories differ widely in their definitions of this other outcome
level. For some theories it is the outcome level the person feels should be received, and for other theories it is the outcome level the person expects to receive. All of the theoretical approaches argue that what is received should be compared with another outcome level, and when there is a difference when received outcome is below the other outcome level, dissatisfaction results, thus, if a person expects or thinks he should be satisfied with pay. Further, the prediction is that he will be more dissatisfied than the person who receives a salary $9,000 and expects or thinks he should receive a salary of $10,000.

Katzell and Locke have probably presented the two most completely developed discrepancy theory approaches to satisfaction. According to Katzell, Satisfaction = 1 - (|X-V|)/V, where X equals the actual amount of the outcome and V equals the desired amount of the outcome.¹⁵ Like many discrepancy theorists, he sees satisfaction as the difference between an actual amount and some desired amount; but, unlike most discrepancy theorists, he assumes that this difference should be divided by the desired amount of the outcome. By using Katzell’s formula, it is to be believed that the more a person wants of an outcome the less dissatisfied he would be with a given discrepancy. He offers no evidence for this assumption, and it is hard to support logically. A discrepancy from what is desired would seem to be equally dissatisfying regardless of how much is desired. Katzell
also speaks of "actual" discrepancies, while most discrepancy theorists talk of "perceived" discrepancies. Note also that by Katzell's formula, getting more than the desired amount should produce less satisfaction than getting the desired amount.

Locke has stated a discrepancy theory that differs from Katzell's in several ways. First, Locke emphasizes that the perceived discrepancy, not the actual discrepancy, is important. He also argues that satisfaction is determined by the simple difference between what the person wants and what he perceives he receives. The more his wants exceed what he receives the greater is his dissatisfaction. Locke says, "Job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are a function of the perceived relationship between what one wants from one's job and what one perceives it is offering".

Porter in measuring satisfaction, asks people how much of a given outcome there should be for their job and how much of a given outcome there actually is; he considers the discrepancy to be the most widely used. It differs from Locke's approach since it sees satisfaction as influenced not by how much a person wants but by how much he feels he should receive. 16
A few researchers have argued that satisfaction is determined by what a person expects to receive rather than by what he wants or feels he should receive. Thus, the literature on job satisfaction contains three different discrepancy approaches; the first looks at what people want, the second at what people feel they should receive, and the third at what people expect to receive. The last of these approaches has seldom been used and can be dismissed. As Locke points out, the expectation approach is hard to defend logically. Admittedly, getting what is not expected may lead to surprise, but it hardly need lead to dissatisfaction.

It is not obvious on logical grounds that either of the first two approaches can be rejected as meaningless. Both approaches seem to be addressing important but perhaps different affective reactions to a job. There clearly is a difference between asking people how much they want and how much they think they should receive. People do respond differently to such questions. A person’s satisfaction with the fairness of what he receives for his present job would seem to be more influenced by what he feels he should receive than by what he ultimately aspires to. The difference between what the person aspires to or wants and what he receives gives us an insight into his satisfaction with his present situation relative to his long-term aspired to, or desired, situation. These two discrepancy measures can and do yield different results. For example, a person can feel that his present
pay is appropriate for his present job, and in this sense he can be satisfied; however, he can feel that his present pay is much below what he wants, and in this sense he can be dissatisfied. In most cases, however, these two discrepancies probably are closely related and influence each other. Thus, the difference between the two discrepancies may not be as large or as important as some theorists have argued.

Like the fulfilment theorists, many discrepancy theorists argue that total job satisfaction is influenced by the sum of the discrepancies that are present for each job factor. Thus, a person's overall job satisfaction would be equal to his pay-satisfaction discrepancy plus his supervision-satisfaction discrepancy, and so on. It has been argued that in computing such a sum it is important to weigh each of the discrepancies by the importance of that factor to the person, the argument being that important factors influence job satisfaction more strongly than unimportant ones. Locke, however, argues that such a weighing is redundant, since the discrepancy score is a measure of importance in itself, because large discrepancies tend to appear only for important items.17

Most discrepancy theories allow for the possibility of a person saying he is receiving more outcomes than he should receive, or more outcomes than he wants to receive. However, the theories do not stress this point, which presents some
problems for them. It is not clear how to equate dissatisfaction (or whatever this feeling might be called) due to over-reward with dissatisfaction due to under-reward.

**EQUITY THEORY**

Equity theory is primarily a motivation theory, but it has some important things to say about the causes of satisfaction/dissatisfaction. Adams (1963, 1965) argues in his version of equity theory that satisfaction is determined by a person's perceived input-outcome balance in the following manner: the perceived equity of a person's rewards is determined by his input-outcome balance; this perceived equity, in turn, determines satisfaction. Satisfaction results when perceived equity exists, and dissatisfaction results when perceived inequity exists. Thus, satisfaction is determined by the perceived ratio of what a person receives from his job, relative to what a person puts into his job. According to equity theory, either under-reward or over-reward can lead to dissatisfaction, although the feelings are somewhat different. The theory emphasizes that over-reward leads to feelings of guilt, while under-reward leads to feelings of unfair treatment.

Equity theory emphasizes the importance of other people's input-outcome balance in determining how a person will judge the equity of his own input-outcome balance. Equity theory argues that people evaluate the fairness of
their own input-outcome balance with their “comparison-other” (the person they compare with). This emphasis does not enter into either discrepancy theory or fulfilment theory as they are usually stated. Although there is an implied reference to “other” in the discussion of how people develop their feelings about what their outcomes should be, discrepancy theory does not explicitly state that this perception is based on perceptions of what other people contribute and receive. This difference points out a strength of equity theory relative to discrepancy theory. Equity theory rather clearly states how a person assesses his inputs and outcomes in order to develop his perception of the fairness of his input-outcome balance. Discrepancy theory, on the other hand, is vague about how people decide what their outcomes should be.

**TWO-FACTOR THEORY**

Modern two-factor theory was originally developed by Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell (1957), in which the authors stated that job factors could be classified according to whether the factors contribute primarily to satisfaction or to dissatisfaction. Two years later, Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman published the results of a research study, which they interpreted as supportive of the theory. Since 1959, much research has been directed towards testing the two-factor theory. Two aspects of the theory are unique and account for the attention it has received.
First, the two-factor theory says that satisfaction and dissatisfaction do not exist on a continuum running from satisfaction through neutral to dissatisfaction. Two independent continua exist, one running from satisfied to neutral and another running from dissatisfied to neutral. Second, the theory stresses that different job facets influence feeling of satisfaction and dissatisfaction. The results of a study made by Herzberg which show that factors such as achievement, recognition, work itself, and responsibility are mentioned in connection with satisfying experiences, while working conditions, interpersonal relations, supervision, and company policy are usually mentioned in connection with dissatisfying experiences. The study shows the frequency with which each factor is mentioned in connection with high (satisfying) and low (dissatisfying) work experiences.

Perhaps the most interesting aspect of Herberg’s theory is that at the same time a person can be highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied. Also the theory implies that factors such as better working conditions cannot increase or cause satisfaction, as they can only affect the amount of dissatisfaction that is experienced. The only way satisfaction can be increased is by effecting changes in those factors contributing primarily to satisfaction.

The results of the studies designed to test the two-factor theory, have not provided clear-cut support for the theory, nor have these studies allowed for the
total rejection of the theory. Even proponents of the theory admit that the same factors can cause both satisfaction and dissatisfaction and that a given factor can cause satisfaction in one group of people and dissatisfaction in another. Other researchers point out that results supporting the theory seem to be obtainable only when certain limited research methodologies are used.

The major unanswered question with respect to the two-factor theory is whether satisfaction and dissatisfaction really are two separate dimensions. The evidence is not sufficient to establish that satisfaction and dissatisfaction are separate, making this the crucial unproven aspect of the theory. Neither the fact that some factors can contribute to both satisfaction and dissatisfaction nor the fact that, in some populations, some factors contribute to satisfaction while, in other populations, these same factors contribute to dissatisfaction, which is sufficient reason to reject the theory. Although these findings raise questions about the correctness of the theory, they do not destroy its core concept, which is that satisfaction and dissatisfaction are, in fact, on different continua.

Significantly, while considerable research has tried to determine which factors contribute to satisfaction or dissatisfaction, little attention has been directed towards testing the motivation and performance implications of the theory. In agreement with the theory, the subjects reported that the presence of satisifiers
boosted performance, while the presence of dissatisfiers reduced performance. At best, the results of this study give weak evidence that these job factors influence performance as suggested by the theory. Only self-reports of performance were used, and in many cases, the subjects were reporting on events that had happened some time prior to the date of the interviews. The evidence, although not at all conclusive, at least suggests the kinds of experiences that might lead to a strong motivation to perform effectively. Unfortunately, Herzberg and others did not develop any theoretical concept to explain why the job factors should affect performance. Their theory contains little explanation of why outcomes are attractive, and it fails to consider the importance of associative connections in determining which of a number of behaviours a person would choose to perform in order to obtain a desired outcome. Thus, it is not a theory of motivation, rather, it is a theory primarily concerned with explaining the determinants of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction.
MODEL OF THE DETERMINANTS OF FACET SATISFACTION

FIGURE 2.1
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2.7 A MODEL OF FACET SATISFACTION

Figure 2.1 presents a model of the determinants of facet satisfaction. The model is intended to be applicable to understanding what determines a person's satisfaction with any facet of the job. The model assumes that the same psychological processes operate to determine satisfaction, with job factors ranging from pay to supervision and satisfaction with the work itself. The model given in Figure 2.1 is a discrepancy model in the sense that it shows satisfaction as the difference between a) what a person feels he should receive, and b) what he perceives that he actually receives. The model indicates that when the person's perception of what his outcome level is and his perception of what his outcome level should be are in agreement, the person would be satisfied. When a person perceives his outcome level as falling below what he feels it should be, he would be dissatisfied. However, when a person's perceived outcome level exceeds what he feels it should be, he would have feelings of guilt and inequity and perhaps some discomfort. Thus, for any job factor, the assumption is that satisfaction with the factor will be determined by the differences between how much of the factor there is and how much of the factor the person feels there should be.

Present outcome level is shown to be the key influence on a person's perception of what rewards he receives, but his perception is also shown to be
influenced by his perception of what his “referent others” receive. The higher the outcome levels of his “referent others”, the lower his outcome level will appear. Thus, a person’s psychological view of how much of a factor he receives is said to be influenced by more than just the objective amount of the factor. Because of this psychological influence, the same amount of reward often can be seen quite differently by two people; to one person it can be a small amount, while to another person, it can be a large amount.

The model given in Figure 2.1 also shows that a person’s perception of what his reward level should be is influenced by a number of factors. Perhaps the most important influence is perceived to be job inputs. These inputs include all of the skills, abilities, and training a person brings to the job as well as the behaviour he exhibits on the job. The greater he perceives his inputs to be, the higher will be his perception of what his outcomes should be. Because of this relationship, people with high job inputs must receive more rewards than people with low job inputs or they will be dissatisfied. The model also shows that a person’s perception of what his outcomes should be is influenced by his perception of the job demands. The greater the demands made by the job, the more he will perceive he should receive. Job demands include such things as job difficulty, responsibilities, and organization level. If outcomes do not rise along with these factors, the clear
prediction of the model is that the people who perceive they have the more difficult, higher-level jobs will be the most dissatisfied.

The model shows that a person’s perception of what his outcomes should be is influenced by what the person perceives his “comparison-other’s” inputs and outcomes to be. This aspect of the model is taken directly from equity theory and is included to stress the fact that people look at the inputs and outcomes of others in order to determine what their own outcome level should be. If a person’s “comparison-other’s” inputs are the same as the person’s inputs but the other’s outcomes are much higher, the person will feel that he should be receiving more outcomes and will be dissatisfied as a result.

The model allows for the possibility that people will feel that their outcomes exceed what they should be. The feelings produced by this condition are quite different from those produced by under-reward. Because of this difference, it does not make sense to refer to a person who feels over-rewarded as being dissatisfied. There is considerable evidence that very few people feel over-rewarded, and this fact can be explained by the model. Even when people are highly rewarded, the social-comparison aspect of satisfaction means that people can avoid feeling over-rewarded by looking around and finding someone to compare with who is doing equally well. Also, a person tends to value his own
inputs much higher than they are valued by others. Because of this discrepancy, a person's perception of what his outcomes should be is often not shared by those administering his rewards, and is often above what he actually receives. Finally, the person can easily increase his perception of his inputs and thereby justify a high reward level.

As a way of summarizing some of the implications of the model, statements can be made about who should be dissatisfied if the model is correct, other things being equal:

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

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

3. People who perceive similar others as having a more favourable input-outcome balance will be more dissatisfied with a given facet than people who perceive their own balance as similar to or better than that of others.

4. People who receive a low outcome level will be more dissatisfied than those who receive a high outcome level.
5. The more outcomes the other receives in comparison, the more dissatisfied the person will be with his own outcomes. This should be particularly true when the ‘comparison-other’ is seen to hold a job that demands the same or fewer inputs.

2.8 FACTORS RELATING TO JOB SATISFACTION AND DISSATISFACTION

The nature and extent of factors contributing to job satisfaction are not yet fully known. But a good deal of research studies in various countries with different cultures which have accumulated by now, have certainly advanced the understanding of the factors.

The studies of Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman and the two-factor theory of job satisfaction -dissatisfaction proposed by them provide possibly the broadest scope so far in understanding the relevant factors prevailing across cultures as well as in India.

Herzberg and his associates explored job satisfaction from a basically dynamic view and offered an approach to an understanding of motivation to work. They noted an important distinction between two kinds of factors: One group of factors dealt with the nature of job and the other was related to the environment in which the job was done. One set of factors, according to them, contributed to
satisfaction. They are referred to as intrinsic, job content, motivators, or satisfiers.

Another set of factors contributed to dissatisfaction. They are termed as extrinsic, job context, hygiene, or dissatisfiers. The details of the two sets of factors are presented in Table 2.1.

### TABLE 2.1

Factors Associated With Job Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction in Two-Factor Theory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors in Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Factors in Job Dissatisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivators/Satisfiers</strong></td>
<td><strong>Extrinsic/Job Context/Hygiene/ Dissatisfiers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic/Job Content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself</td>
<td>Relations with Co-employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Relations with Subordinates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>Relations with Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Growth</td>
<td>Technical Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Company Policies and Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Life</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the theory, satisfiers (or motivators) which contributed to feelings of satisfaction had little to contribute to dissatisfied feeling. Similarly,
dissatisfiers (or ‘hygiene’) contributed more to dissatisfaction than they did to satisfaction. In other words, it was suggested, that satisfaction and dissatisfaction were two separate, distinct, and independent feelings. They were of unipolar dimensions, that is, the opposite of satisfaction is no satisfaction instead of dissatisfaction (which was the traditional view) and the opposite of dissatisfaction is no dissatisfaction instead of satisfaction.

2.9 CONSEQUENCES

While job satisfaction is obviously of great personal concern, employers are also concerned with the consequences of job satisfaction, for it greatly affects employees’ behaviour. Hence, it is essential to examine the ways in which job satisfaction/dissatisfaction affects employees’ behaviour, to consider how job satisfaction affects a variety of factors, some economic and some personal.

Job Satisfaction and Job Performance

In the 1950’s two major literature reviews showed that in most studies only a slight relationship was found between satisfaction and performance. A later review by Vroom also showed that studies had not found a strong relationship between satisfaction and performance. In other words, better performers did seem to be slightly more satisfied than poor performers. Lawler and Porter explained
this as “performance causes satisfaction”. Good performance may lead to rewards, which in turn lead to satisfaction. Clearly, a more logical view is that performance is determined by people’s efforts to obtain the goals and outcomes they desire, and satisfaction is determined by the outcomes people actually obtain. Yet, for some reason, many people believed - and some people still do believe - that the “satisfaction causes performance” view is the best.

**Job Satisfaction and Turnover**

In most studies, researchers have measured job satisfaction among a number of employees and then waited to see which of the employees studied left during an ensuring time period (typically, a year). The satisfaction scores of the employees who left have then been compared with the remaining employees’ scores. Although relationships between satisfaction scores and turnover have not always been very strong, the studies in this area have consistently shown that dissatisfied workers were more likely than satisfied workers to terminate employment. Thus, satisfaction scores can predict turnover.

**Job Satisfaction and Accidents**

Research on the relationship between job satisfaction and accident generally shows that the higher the satisfaction with the job, the lower is the rate
of accidents. A satisfied employee would not be careless or negligent and would encounter lesser possibilities of running into an accident situation. The more favourable attitude towards the job would make him more positively inclined to his job and there would be a lesser probability of getting in to an unexpected, incorrect or uncontrolled event in which either his action or the reaction of an object or person may result in personal injury.

Dissatisfied workers are more likely to have accidents in order to remove themselves from their unpleasant work situation. To conclude, dissatisfaction is associated with a predisposition towards accidents.

**Job Satisfaction and Absenteeism**

In every-day life certain contingencies require a little extra effort on the part of the workers to come work. For a dissatisfied worker these may be major reasons for missing the work but for a satisfied worker these may be irrelevant. The fact, however, remains that the absence from work, adds considerable cost to the process of output. Like turnover, absenteeism has been found to be related to job dissatisfaction. If workers absent themselves voluntarily without giving prior notice it amounts to dissatisfaction with the work. The research studies that have separated voluntary absences from overall absences have, in fact, found that
voluntary absence rates are much more closely related to dissatisfaction than are overall absence rates.22

Job Satisfaction and Unionism

In the Indian context where unions are strong and persuasive, to think of job satisfaction without unionism would be very unrealistic. Most workers tend to look up at the union official to settle their grievances. The purpose of unions is to protect the economic interest of its members and to ensure and maintain desirable working conditions for them. In addition, they also serve as watch dogs to unfair labour practices. To conclude, dissatisfaction with work makes the employee to form or join a union.

Job Satisfaction and Productivity

Of all behaviours that job satisfaction or dissatisfaction could affect, the most important is performance. It is generally assumed that a satisfied employee will also be a productive employee. It is quite natural that more positive feelings about work lead to greater output and higher quality work.

Job Satisfaction and Organisational Effectiveness

The research evidence on the determinants of satisfaction suggests that satisfaction is very much influenced by the actual rewards a person receives though the organisation has a considerable amount of control over these rewards. Absenteeism and turnover have a direct influence on organisational effectiveness.
The organisation can control absenteeism and turnover by rewarding well the best performers. Although identifying and rewarding the better performers is not always easy, the effort may have significant pay-offs in terms of increased organizational effectiveness.

2.10 SUMMARY

Obviously, without the efforts of the worker, the other factors of production would be useless. Man primarily works to satisfy his needs. Satisfaction of needs is essential both for physical as well as for providing man with pleasure and comforts. People seek satisfaction of needs and pleasure in work. The extent of job satisfaction is reflected in their behaviours. Satisfied workers produce more, work more and they also feel happy to work.
FOOTNOTES


