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2.1 Introduction

Job satisfaction is one of the most difficult aspects to measure in the field of organizational behaviour. There are two extreme points of view within which investigators may choose a framework for the study of satisfaction. One view is to assume that satisfaction is a unitary concept representing a state of mind in the individual which has no single referent. This is not to say that satisfaction, or the individual’s overall feeling of content or discontent in a particular social context is unreal. On the contrary, the feeling or state of mind is real but not subject to fragmentation into discrete parts. The individual’s satisfaction or dissatisfaction is determined by his total situation at work and at home in every aspect of his life. Disaffections in one aspect of life, say work, will spill over and become disaffections in another. This point of view holds that seeking discrete elements of satisfaction denies the concept of the individual as an organic whole who perceives his world as a totality rather than as isolated experiences. This point of view acted as a stimulant in studies of job satisfaction to attempt to understand the individual as intensively as possible, to see his world as he sees it and to sense the meaning of experience for him. This approach elicited rich data but made measurement and comparisons difficult and imprecise.
The second point of view, in the extreme, holds that an individual’s satisfaction can be separated for purposes of study into major areas such as his job, the pay he receives, his supervision, the company he works for and so forth. The researcher can observe and separate these elements. Nevertheless, the subject can identify and separate these elements consciously and indicate relative degrees of satisfaction with each of them. Measurement, therefore, becomes possible and specific comparisons too, feasible. Researches with this point of view were conducted using fairly standardized interviews followed by questionnaire or survey approach.

Some researchers took a middle position between these two extremes in studying job satisfaction. More precisely, whether they belonged to the first or the second camp, the emphasis remained mostly on the components of job satisfaction, making explicit comparisons across the role of incumbents and ranking them in their degree of satisfaction.

Conjecture about the specific factors influencing job attitudes have appeared since the first writings in industrial psychology, but experimental studies were slow in supporting or opposing early opinions. A great many different terms have been used to express job factors in various studies. It is almost certain that some of the specific job factors have considerably more influence than others. In some studies, factors to be rated have been listed whereas in others, open-ended questions requiring the worker to provide his own “list” of job factors, were used.

Recent researches on the determinants of job satisfaction are based on the rationale that job satisfaction is derived from, and is caused by, many interrelated factors.
Although these factors can never be completely isolated from one another for analysis, they can by the use of statistical tools, be separated to give an indication of their relative importance to job satisfaction. These factors differ in their importance not only from factory to factory but also from one individual to another and for the same individual from time to time, so much so that “even hourly changes have been discovered”.

**EARLY STUDIES ON FACTORS OF JOB SATISFACTION**

An individual’s satisfaction on the job is related to his total self and therefore, it cannot be explained on the basis of any single factor. Researchers – through theoretical speculation and factor analytic procedure – have identified a number of factors of job satisfaction, each composed of a number of job aspects. Some components of job satisfaction repeatedly emerged in studies whereas some varied from study to study. Hoppock, the earliest investigator in this field, in 1935 suggested that there are six major components of job satisfaction. These are as follows:

a) The way the individual reacts to unpleasant situations;

b) The facility with which he adjusts himself to other persons;

c) The relative status in the social and economic group with which he identifies himself;

d) The nature of work in relation to the abilities, interests and preparation of the worker;

e) Security; and

f) Loyalty.

Most of the early researchers measured these specific factors of job satisfaction in their respective studies. It seems that Hoppock was aware that job satisfaction is an
important generalized attitude in an individual instead of being a specific attitude about specific job factors. Secondly, he also tapped on the idea of vocational adjustment as an aspect of job satisfaction by emphasizing on the individual’s emotional adjustment. It suggests that those who are emotionally unstable may have considerably more difficulty in adjusting to a job and therefore, be more dissatisfied.

Hoppock’s second factor of job satisfaction deals with satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) with supervision, co-worker etc. It is anybody’s guess that the most rugged, aggressive and independent worker will not be satisfied at work if he cannot get along with the working group. Furthermore, adjustment to people on the outside affects a person’s adjustment to his job. For example, if one is maladjusted in his home or social life, it will influence his satisfaction at his job.

Employees’ relative status in the social and economic group with which the worker identifies himself is another factor of job satisfaction. As an individual, we strongly desire to be approved and respected by others viz., friends, colleagues, co-workers, club members etc. So long as this desire is attained, one’s feeling of being satisfied enhances. For example, the factory worker whose friends also work in the factory can feel he is as good as they are and so he will have greater job satisfaction than the factory worker whose friends are mainly office workers.

The fourth factor according to Hoppock is the nature of work in relation to the abilities, interests and preparation of the workers. So long as one’s ability, interest and previous experiential learning are in accordance with the nature of the job he is assigned to perform in the factory, good feelings about the job will remain associated with the
particular worker. Contrary to it, misfit between both, interest and ability on the one hand and nature of job on the other hand, will lead to job dissatisfaction. For example, an incompetent manager who is not able to keep up may conclude that his factory workers come to him with problems just to embarrass him or to prove their smartness.

Fifth job satisfaction factor which emerged in Hoppock’s study is security which is both social and economic. Furthermore, security is a relative instead of an absolute concept. Merely being in a job does not mean that the person has a feeling of security because his basic insecurities may prevent the feeling of any great job security. On the other hand, one may have the feeling of job security in adventurous and dangerous jobs though life in it may be in the balance.

Hoppock speculated that job security may lead to job satisfaction in some people when they are employed in certain occupations and not in others.

Loyalty is reported as the last factor of job satisfaction in Hoppock’s study. The feeling that the worker has for his firm or boss, or both, contributes to job satisfaction which may vary from employee to employee. It is, in fact, this factor of loyalty that leads people to sacrifice their own needs and purposes and prompts them to serve beyond the line of duty in relation to job requirements.

After Hoppock, a number of theoretical speculations and empirical investigations have been reported in leading academic journals of the time. A review of such studies reveals that a specific factor is represented by a number of job aspects. Furthermore, a great many terms have been used by researchers to express the same job factors. A deep analysis of the contents of such studies reveals that the same factors of job satisfaction
have been reported in various studies under different names. However, many studies have also tapped on some new factors accountable for job satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson and Capwell in 1957 reviewed more than one hundred and fifty such studies and listed various job aspects in ten different categories, each representing on-the-job components of job satisfaction. These job factors are briefly defined as follows:

(1) Intrinisic Aspect of Job
This factor was more frequently mentioned in studies than any of the other nine factors. It includes all of the many aspects of the work which would tend to be constant for the work regardless of where the work was performed.

(2) Supervision
Those aspects of job situation mentioned second-most frequently pertain to the relationships of the worker with his immediate superiors. Supervision, as a factor, generally influences job satisfaction.

(3) Working Conditions
The next most frequently mentioned factor includes those physical aspects of the working environment which are not necessarily a part of the work. They are more a function of the particular organization or company. ‘Hours’ is also included in this factor because it is primarily a function of the organization, affecting the individual’s comfort and convenience in much the same way as other physical working conditions. In many studies, comparisons involving ‘hours’ have been separated from those involving other working conditions.
(4) Wages
This factor includes all aspects of the job involving present monetary remuneration for work done. This is one of the most homogeneous of the ten major factors.

(5) Opportunity for Advancement
This factor includes all those job aspects which the individual sees as potential sources of betterment of economic position, organizational status, or professional experience. This factor is also reported to be relatively homogeneous as seen from the similarity of the job aspects listed elsewhere.

(6) Security
Security is defined to include those features of the job situation which lead to assurance for continued employment, either within the same company or within the same type of work or profession. In some instances, this means that the opportunity for mobility is absent but continued employment is assured. In other cases, the immediate job continuation may not be as secure but there are sufficient opportunities for immediate re-employment elsewhere so that survival pressures and unstable labour demands arouse little or no anxiety in the worker.

(7) Company and Management
This factor includes many of those aspects of the worker’s immediate situation which are a function of organizational administration and policy. This factor is rather unique in the sense that administration policies either directly or indirectly affect many of the other factors. In its most specific sense, this factor involves the relationships of the worker with all company superiors above the level of immediate supervision.
(8) Social Aspect of the Job

It includes all job aspects involved in the relationships of the worker with other employees, especially those employees at the same or nearly the same level within the organization. This factor includes all on-the-job contacts among these individuals, whether those contacts are for working and operating purposes or for more personal reasons. As with the supervision factor, social aspects as a general influence on job attitudes are also included in the analysis and comparisons.

(9) Communication

This factor includes those aspects of the job situation which involve the spreading of information in any direction within the organization. Terms such as information on employee status, information on new developments, information on what the company is doing, information on personnel policies and procedures, information on company lines of authority, suggestion systems, instructions and orders, annual reports etc. are used in literature to represent this factor.

(10) Benefits

This factor includes all those specific phases of company policy which attempt to prepare the worker for emergencies, illnesses, old age and hospitalization. Also, the company allowances for holidays, leave and vacations are included within this factor.

Further, in 1959, Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman evolved their own design and procedure to study job attitudes in too. For the first time, the factors-attitudes-effects (F-A-E) complex was studied as a unit. In the semi-structured interview, individuals were asked to think and report of the times (i) when they felt most happy with their jobs (high)
and (ii) when they felt most unhappy about their jobs (low). These ‘narrational data’ were
subjected to rigorous analysis for identifying the potential satisfiers and dissatisfiers.

About 200 interviews with accountants and engineers from nine steel and
engineering companies provided data for this study. A five-fold analysis procedure was
adopted. The factors studied were (i) description of the person speaking; (ii) an overall
description of the sequence of events; (iii) description of the objective situation in the
sequence of events (first level factors); (iv) description of the needs, motives and
perceptions of the person speaking (second order factors); and (v) description of the
behavioural and other effects of his attitudes.

A first order factor, according to investigators, is an objective element of the
situation in which the respondent finds a source for his good or bad feelings about the
job. The second level factors were an outcome of a crucial self examination which in
turn, was obtained or facilitated by enquiring “what did those events (as suggested in first
level factors) mean to you” Diverse first level factors were found capable of arousing a
given feeling or attitude (second order factor). For example, a feeling of recognition
could come from words of praise, from a promotion or from a new job assignment and
these three alternatives merely mean for the subject that his worth has been recognized.
The following 14 first level factors of job satisfaction were found in this study:

i) Recognition

ii) Achievement

iii) Possibility of growth

iv) Advancement

v) Salary
vi) Interpersonal relations with superiors, subordinates, peers
vii) Technical Supervision
viii) Responsibility
ix) Company policy and administration
x) Working conditions
xi) Nature of work
xii) Factors in personal life
xiii) Status
xiv) Job security

The second level factors of job satisfaction were generated from the self examination of subjects. The respondents reported the particular need and value systems which specified their attitude towards the job at the time of the following events being described. From the unsorted data, the following list of second level factors emerged:

i) Feelings of recognition

ii) Feelings of achievement

iii) Feelings of possible growth, blocks to growth, first level factors perceived as evidence of actual growth

iv) Feelings of responsibility, lack of responsibility or diminished responsibility

v) Group feelings: feelings of belonging or isolation, socio-technical or purely social

vi) Feelings of interest or lack of interest in the performance of the job

vii) Feelings of increased or decreased status

viii) Feelings of increased or decreased security
ix) Feelings of fairness and unfairness

x) Feelings of pride or of inadequacy or guilt

xi) Feelings about salary

Results of this investigation substantiated the hypothesis that there are different sets of factors which act as satisfiers and dissatisfies.

**OTHER STUDIES ON FACTORS OF JOB SATISFACTION**

As stated elsewhere in this chapter, many studies which addressed the problem of components of job satisfaction have reported same factors under various names whereas others have reported some new factors / job aspects accounting for job satisfaction. For the benefit of the scholars, we have summarized the findings of some such studies. It is evident from this review that job satisfaction, at the best, can be defined in terms of summation of employee’s feelings on-and-off the job conditions. Further, a look into the issue highlights that each, on-and-off the-job factors is still divisible in distinct areas of job satisfaction.

Zaleznik, Cristensen and Roethlisberger (1958) studied the components of job satisfaction. They used open-ended questions, intended to tap spontaneous statements on the workers’ beliefs about what makes a job a good one, a worker a good person to be around, and so forth. The study revealed the following six factors as accountable for various degrees of job satisfactions:
a)  *Intrinsic characteristics of his job:* The degree to which the worker felt the job provided him with an outlet for his technical work skills.

b)  *The extended features of his job:* His feelings about the pay, the physical working conditions, benefits etc.

c)  *The supervisor:* The worker’s feelings towards his foreman as a boss.

d)  *His associates at work:* His feelings on working with the particular people in the department.

e)  *The company:* His feelings about working for this particular concern.

f)  *The union:* His feelings in being a member of his particular union.

Worthy (1950) has reported that there are at least six factors, namely, company in general, the local organization, local management, immediate supervision, co-workers and working conditions which comprise job satisfaction. Grove and Kerr (1951) have concluded that ‘wages’ and ‘liking for work associates’ are the major components of job satisfaction. Morse in 1953 identified job content, identification with the company, financial and job status, and pride in group performance as basic ingredients of job satisfaction.

Evans and Laseau (1950) studied various job factors in relation to components of job satisfaction and identified eleven such factors which were reported by more than 30 per cent of respondents. These factors in their order of preference were found to be as follows: income, interesting and important nature of job, pride in company, fellow workers, immediate boss, management, working conditions, security, chance to get a lead, benefit plans and safety measures.
Jurgenson assessed the importance of several job factors on the basis of the responses obtained from approximately 4,000 aspirants. Nine factors emerged in the study which were ranked in the following order: (1) job security, (ii) opportunity for advancement, (iii) type of work, (iv) pride in company, (v) pay and co-workers, (vi) supervisor, (vii) hours, (viii) working conditions and (ix) benefits.

Stagner, Flebbs and Wood: (1952) studied job satisfaction of railroad employees and found that the present supervisor, union-management relations, handling of grievances and general working conditions are important factors in job satisfaction. Smith’s study of 1955 enumerated six factors of job satisfaction which included social and personal adjustment of the individual along with such factors as the social status of the job, the company and the supervisor.

In 1949, Reynolds and Shister conducted a study on factory workers and sought the reason for their quitting the previous job and also the reasons for their being satisfied or dissatisfied in the present job. They found that the workers gave the same reason for leaving the earlier job as also for being dissatisfied in their current job. The five factors of primary importance which emerged in this study were (a) physical characteristics of the job, (b) closeness of supervision, (c) adequacy of wages, (d) treatment by the company and (e) intrinsic interest in the work. Job security was generally important for satisfaction whereas wages emerged as the major source of dissatisfaction.

Harrel (1964) has given a long list of the determinants of job satisfaction by grouping them into three broad factors. Each factor was identified as being composed of a number of job aspects. These are as follows:
a) Personal factors: Sex, age, number of dependents, time on job, intelligence, education and personality.

b) Factors inherent in the job: Type of work, skill required, occupational status, geography and size of the plant.

c) Factors controlled by management: Security, pay, fringe benefits, opportunity for advancement, working conditions, co-workers, responsibility and supervision.

Blum and Naylor (1968) considered job satisfaction as a result of many attitudes possessed by a worker. It is a general attitude which is the result of many specific attitudes in three areas, namely, specific job factors, individual characteristics and group relationships outside the job. French, Kornhauser and Marrow (1946) compiled a list of on-the-job and off-the-job factors which were found by various investigators as underlying causes of satisfaction and dissatisfaction of workers. These are:

a) Factors in the individual: Ability, health, age, temperament, desires and expectations, neurotic tendencies, unconscious conflicts etc.

b) Factors in life away from work: Home conditions, recreation, consumer problems, labour union conditions, activities, socio-politico-economic conditions etc.

c) Factors in employment relations: Wages or earnings, steadiness of employment, transfer, lay-off and re-hiring procedures, kind of work performed, supervision, training, condition of work, opportunities for advancement, opportunity to use ability, social relationships on the job, recognition and fair evaluation of work, opportunities for participation, free interchange of ideas, prompt and fair settling of grievances, understanding and respect by the employer.
The above classification suggests that workers’ satisfaction does not arise merely from on-the-job factors but ‘runs the whole gamut of man’s needs and aspirations’.

On the basis of review of job satisfaction studies, Siegel (1962), comes to the conclusion that all the results may be “conveniently grouped under two headings on the basis of their pertinence to factors (i) intrinsic or (ii) extrinsic to the job itself”. Factors intrinsic to the job include pay, job security, participation and personal recognition, hours and working conditions and occupational status. Factors extrinsic to the job are perceptions about supervision, sex, age, level of intelligence, job experience or length of service and personal adjustment. “Job satisfaction” according to Ghiselli and Brown (1955), “has many different points of reference, and few workers indeed are satisfied with all aspects of their jobs.” Brayfield and Crockett (1955) asserted that there are at least three social systems which are important in worker satisfaction. These are fellow workers, the company and the community.

Tiffin and McCormick (1962), have suggested that to understand human behaviour, it is always desirable to have some idea about ‘the sets of values by which people live, and about the satisfactions associated with the type of work they do’. On the problem of job satisfaction, they opined that ‘job satisfaction… is influenced both, by the extent to which the work a person does is intrinsically interesting to him, and by his attitude towards the total work situation, including the company, his supervisor, and his fellow workers’. In the same line of thought have emerged the ten factors of job satisfaction when Scott and others in 1960 reviewed the relevant literature. These are pay; co-workers; supervision; type of work (job demand or intrinsic job satisfaction); working
As stated earlier and as it is evident from preceding citation of studies, there are at least two major sets of factors: one related to on-the-job factors and another, related to off-the-job factors. Pestonjee (1973) in a review of job satisfaction studies, identified that both sets of factors consist of two subsets or areas which are again composed of many intertwined job aspects. For example, job and management areas comprise on-the-job (or intrinsic) factors. Likewise, personal adjustment and social relations areas encompass off-the-job factors. It is important to note that off-the-job components of job satisfaction, though not directly connected with the job, are presumed to have a bearing on job satisfaction. These four areas with their related ‘aspects’ are as follows:

1. **Job Area**: Nature of work, dull, dangerous, interesting, hours of work, fellow workers, opportunities on the job for promotion and advancement (prospects), over-time regulations, interest in work, physical environment, machines and tools, etc.

2. **Management Area**: Supervisory treatment, participation, rewards and punishment, praises and blames, leave policy, favouritism.

3. **Personal Adjustment**: Emotionality, health, home and living conditions, finances, relation with family members etc.

4. **Social Relations**: Neighbours, friends and associates, attitudes towards people in the community, participation in social activities, sociability, caste-barriers etc.
FACTOR ANALYTIC APPROACH TO JOB SATISFACTION FACTORS

Researchers, on the basis of empirical findings, attempted to determine minimum number of relatively independent variables which influence job satisfaction. Others, on the basis of cross-section / comparative analysis of the findings of various studies attempted to identify job factors which were often identified by individual scholars in their respective studies. Further, attempts were made to estimate the influence of each factor in the genesis of satisfaction or dissatisfaction as well as the impact of variables such as sex, occupation, occupational level, age, education, length of service, dependents, veteran status etc. on these factors. One special kind of statistical procedure, namely, factor analysis which can be of vital importance for such studies, however had not been used by earlier scholars. Factor analytic procedure attempts to determine both the basic elements or “factors” comprising job attitudes as well as the relative importance of each such ‘factor’. In job satisfaction studies, a factor analysis is usually performed on an attitude questionnaire which covers many areas influencing overall job satisfaction and morale. The factors which evolved from this mathematical model are often difficult to interpret and subject to the perceptions and biases of the individual investigators.

Baehr (1954), reports a typical factorial study of an attitude questionnaire. The original questionnaire consisted of 76 questions which was designed to reflect attitudes towards 14 phases of the work situation, such as working conditions, pay, confidence in management, adequacy of communication, status and recognition, and opportunity for growth and advancement. The mathematical procedures of factor analysis were applied to determine the basic components of the work situation which affect employee morale. The result indicates that the 14 different parts of the job questionnaire
group themselves into four major job factors common to all jobs and three or four other ‘factors’ specific to the job. For example, a factor which Baehr calls immediate supervision includes both the human relations aspect of supervision and the purely technical aspects of the supervisor’s job. Presumably, measuring the attitudes towards these seven or eight factors is essentially the same as measuring the attitudes in all 14 of the original phases of the work situation.

Recent research findings such as one conducted by Levine (1968) tend to suggest that there is a ‘general factor’ of job satisfaction. This general factor is interrelated to such other factors as working conditions, personal adjustment, type of work, fellow workers, supervision, nature of company, job security, job status and level of aspiration etc. This is found to be true in case of different samples taken from various populations like handicapped and normal workers, manual and clerical workers, skilled and unskilled workers etc.

Different-factor analytic studies of job satisfaction have revealed varied number of job factors. For example, on the basis of a factor analytic study, Twery, Schmid and Wringley (1958) have identified the following common factors of job satisfaction: (a) general attitude towards the job, (b) satisfaction with the supervisor, (c) satisfaction with the higher echelon, (d) satisfaction with living conditions and (e) satisfaction with co-workers. ‘Monetary variety’ factor was also found in addition to the above five factors.
Hammond (1954) has reported 5 factors of job satisfaction which were obtained in factor analytic study. These are: financial success, personal and social success, technical satisfaction, social contact satisfaction and social service satisfaction.

The company and its policies emerged as another most important factor in their review of the 12 studies. The fairness of the company and management as interpreted by the employee appears often to be more objective measures of fairness in terms of actual benefits to the employee. This factor includes such things as the interest of the company in employee welfare, confidence in management’s good sense and satisfaction with the organization as a system.

The third distinct factor which has been reported in six out of the 12 studies is related to the satisfaction with intrinsic aspects of the job, such as interest and variety. The fourth factor which appeared in substantially the same form in as many as six studies is that referring to supervision. This apparently includes specific aspects of the job such as foremanship, consideration and fairness, proper evaluation, information, ability to handle people etc.

Many other factors which emerged from factor analytic studies may be grouped into two fairly distinct categories. One group of factors pertains to aspirations of the individual such as his views on promotion and advancement and the provisions for future emergencies and benefits. Eight of the studies have reported factors which can be put into this category. The other group of factors pertains to present adaptation to the job including such disparate aspects as working conditions, hours, social aspects and present income status. In summary Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson and Capwell, have identified six relatively independent factors of job satisfaction. These are as follows:
a) General satisfaction and morale.
b) Attitudes towards the company and its policies.
c) Satisfaction with intrinsic aspects of the job.
d) Attitudes towards immediate supervision.
e) Attitudes towards satisfaction of aspirations.
f) Satisfaction with conditions of present job.

Pestonjee in 1981, analysed on-and-off-the-job components of job satisfaction. It was done primarily with a view to find the factor components associated with on-and-off-the dimensions of job satisfaction. The analysis revealed that on-the-job satisfaction is summation of the employee’s feelings in the following ten factors of job satisfaction: supervisory treatment / consideration; equity (work load and pay); supportive function; interest in work; rules and regulations; intrinsic satisfaction; regard for organization; working condition; co-operation of the co-workers; and supervision / nurturance of subordinates. Likewise, off-the-job satisfaction was found to be summation of worker’s feelings in the following eleven off-the-job factors: Relations with family members; emotionality-neuroticism; perception of people in the society; anxiety about health; sociability; intrapsychic factors: extroversion-introversion; neighbourhood; intrapsychic factors; trust; isolation; and living conditions. Therefore the employee’s collective or generalized feelings and beliefs in the above stated 21 job and non-job factors map overall job satisfaction.
2.2 Review of literature

An overview of literature concerned with the concept of job satisfaction has been presented here. The review is mostly about the objectives and variables selected for the study.

Alun wiff and Nye (1992) in their study, ‘Gender and the Relationship between perceived fairness of pay or promotion and job satisfaction”, evaluated potential gender differences among 12,979 personnel in 30 different organizational systems by using the correlations between (a) fairness and job satisfaction scores and (b) standardized group differences in the perceived amounts of pay and fairness in promotion and expressed levels of phased job satisfaction. They found that the fairness satisfaction relationship was not higher for man, and there were no practical differences in perceptions of fairness and job satisfaction between men and women.¹

A study of Asha, (1994) entitled “Job satisfaction among women in relation to their family environment”, analysed whether the socio – psychological characteristics of family had any effect on the job satisfaction of women employees. The findings of the study revealed that job satisfaction among women employees was related to their perception of family environment.²

Brewer, E.W. & MC Mahan – Landers, J.(2003), studied the “Job satisfaction among industrial and technical teacher educators”, The purpose of their study was to explore the relationship between job stress and job satisfaction among industrial and technical teacher educators. The survey was conducted in the United States by adopting the random sampling method. Their study revealed significant relationships among
various facets of job satisfaction and stress – factors related to lack of organizational support seem to have a greater input on job satisfaction than stresses related to the job itself.\(^3\)

Clark (1986) in his research entitled “The intellectual enterprise and academic life in America” opined that demographic variables influenced job satisfaction. He also stressed that the tenure status of faculty members influenced job satisfaction.

Generally tenure assured faculty members have reported higher job satisfaction than tenure lacking faculty members.\(^4\)

A study entitled “A comparison of job satisfaction between public and private sector managers” by Schneider, Debora and Vought Bobby (1993) found a significant difference between the job satisfaction of public and private sector employees.\(^5\)

Du Brins (1988) has defined that job satisfaction is the outcome of pleasure or contentment associated with a job”. If you like your job intensely, you will experience your job intensely. Then you will experience high level of job satisfaction. If you dislike your job intensely you will experience job dissatisfaction.\(^6\)

Fiorentino L.M. (1999), in his, doctoral research titled “Job satisfaction among the faculty in higher education” found that the women faculty members in higher education have reported a low level of job satisfaction more than men faculty members.\(^7\)
Gangardes (1954) suggested in his study that good and efficient employees and good employee – morale cannot be built just by increasing the pay of the employees. The employees want suitable work and supervisors want preservation of self – respect.\(^8\)

Ganguli (1957) found that the province of birth, the amount of schooling, the total income, the amount of annual increment were not related to the morale score and morale showed cyclical changes with age as well as with length of service. Employees with short service and long service have a higher morale than those in the middle group.\(^9\)

George S. Odiorne (1955) in his study has pointed out that the type and quality of equipment provided to workers by management significantly affect the level of employees morale.\(^10\)

Gordon. O.J. (1955) indicates that a better understanding of morale dimensions in managerial decisions is essential so as to know how an individual performs his work. He lists out four different morale dimensions as “General need for satisfaction, recognition and status, self-respect and self-expression.”\(^11\)

According to the study of Herzberg. F., et. al., (1964) higher job levels and higher wages generally contribute to higher job satisfaction and the type of leadership has beneficial effects on job satisfaction. But these efforts are modified greatly by situational factors, like age and tenure.\(^12\)
Hoppock (1935), observed that job satisfaction is a combination of psychological, physiological and environmental circumstances that cause a person to say “I am satisfied with the job”\textsuperscript{13}

Leader behaviour which is most closely related to an individual’s needs should be related to job stress. Hone and Mitchell (1974), suggested that such behaviour includes directive, supportive, participative and achievement oriented behaviour. The studies in this area appear to offer support for the supportive interpersonal recognition and acceptance – stress relationship.\textsuperscript{14}

Jaime X. Castillo and Jamic Cano (2004), conducted a study in the Ohio State University on the main campus in Columbus and Ohio. Their questionnaire consisted of three parts viz, the job satisfaction index, wood’s satisfaction / dissatisfaction scale and demographic characteristics. They found that faculty in the colleges were generally satisfied with their jobs. The factor ‘work itself’ was the most motivating aspect for faculty in their study. Interestingly, they identified that the faculty was most satisfied with the contents of their job and least satisfied with the context in which their job was performed. They suggested to enhance the context in which faculty members are supervised and the funds to be sought and secured to provide leadership development opportunities for department chairs.\textsuperscript{15}

In a study “Employees satisfaction and its organizational predictors” by Jai Sinha (1995) which provided evidence to support a new conceptual frame work. Employee’s satisfaction was divided into five elements: employee’s satisfaction with their organization, life satisfaction, satisfying nature of their job, expectancy to satisfy their
most salient needs, and unproblematic properties of their work. Work climate and human relations contribute directly or indirectly through other factors to organizational satisfaction in case of managers.\textsuperscript{16}

Jomes G.Worthy (1950) in his study observed that the organizational structure of the company is an important factor affecting the level of morale and he emphasized that the rigidity of the organizational structure conflicted excessively with individual self–expression and maximum morale.\textsuperscript{17}

Joe Flower (1992) has portrayed the applicability of Bluke and Mounton 3 dimensional grid which focuses on the concern for productivity, concern for people and their motivation. Organizations can use the grid as a lens through which people can see themselves and their organizations more clearly.\textsuperscript{18}

Jones, et. al. (1996) in an article “Leader’s behaviour, work attitudes and turnover of sale people: An integrative study” developed a structural model of sales people’s perceptions of their supervisor’s behaviour on the sale for role perceptions. Job anxiety, job satisfaction, propensity to leave and actual turnover. The results show that sales manager’s leadership behaviour directly and indirectly influences job satisfaction, which influences sales people’s propensity to leave the organization and actual turnover.\textsuperscript{19}

In the study, “Job satisfaction of Librarians of African Descent employed in ARL Academic Libraries”, Joyce K. Thornton (2000) examined job satisfaction of librarians of African descent employed in academic libraries and holding memberships in the association of research libraries. The results of a three – part job satisfaction survey were
presented. The survey identified areas of satisfaction and dissatisfaction for this group of librarians.  

Karthikeyani, (1990) in her study titled A study of job satisfaction of women teachers in colleges (with special reference to Sivaganga District) studied the extent of job satisfaction of women teachers and factors contributing to job satisfaction. She analysed job satisfaction scale, overall impact, element of job satisfaction and made factor wise analysis. She found that job satisfaction is independent of designation of the teacher and nature of the college does not influence the level of job satisfaction among women teachers. She also inferred that women teachers working in co-education colleges did not find higher satisfaction. She suggested that the participation of teachers in selection of students must be implemented. She concluded that a majority of women teachers in Sivaganga District have average level of job satisfaction.  

In a study which measured the level of perceived and desired autonomy people either received or wished for in decision making, level of job satisfaction and level of organizational commitment, Lawson Survey (1993) has come out with findings which show that there was no relationship between perceived participation in decision making and the level of job satisfaction. However, the absolute difference between perceived and preferred leadership study was significantly related.  

While organizational climate involves a perceptual description of the work setting, satisfaction is an affective evaluation of aspects of the job itself. In addition, climate and culture have some methodological differences. So says Minwir Alshamman (1992) in an article on organizational culture.
In a study by Mosharraf Hossain (2000) entitled, “Job satisfaction of Commercial Bank Employees in Bangladesh: A comparative study of private and public sectors”, the satisfaction of commercial bank employees and the consequences on related issues were investigated. The results revealed that the public sector bank employees were in a better position in terms of their job satisfaction than their counterparts in private sector banks and the executives were more satisfied than the non–executives. Job satisfaction has significant positive correlation with performance. Employees of banks in Bangladesh were highly dissatisfied with salary, lack of fair promotional opportunity, low job status and absence of recognition of good work.24

In their study on “Motivation and reward in non profit inter organizational collaboration in low income neighbourhoods”, Matrey and Shay (1998) made a qualitative study of motivation and reward among non-profit managers who collaborated in order to create a community – based service network. Findings suggested that it was also the management and leadership that together helped sustain participation.25

Noel (1996), in an article “Building Trust” discusses that complete trust in an organization would lead to open communication, mutual respect, appreciation, commitment, security, pride and confidence.26

In a study entitled “Job satisfaction : How to motivate today’s workers”, Oliver (1989) gave strategies to managers for developing job satisfaction of employees such as treating employees as the most important assets, providing solid lines of internal communication, improving working conditions and involving the best workers in decision making.27
According to Rao. A. (1971), age, income, length of service and tenure have little relationship while education, caste, and skill have a stronger association with job satisfaction.  

Sanderson, et. al., (2000) say in their report entitled “The American faculty poll”, Chicago, National Opinion Research Centre stressed that ethnic minorities generally have expressed lower job satisfaction than their white counterparts. Also tenure track also influences the level of job satisfaction.

In a study entitled, occupational level and job satisfaction, Satya Choudhry (1989) compared the extent of job satisfaction among the employees of public and private sector organizations. The findings revealed that there was no significant difference in the mean job satisfaction scores of public and private sector employees and there was no relationship between job satisfaction and occupational level within both the sectors.

Sing and D.M. Pestunjee, (1990) in their article say “Job involvement, sense of participation and job satisfaction. A study in Banking Industry”, provided evidence to the effect that the three independent variables namely occupational level, job involvement and sense of participation affected job satisfaction positively. The occupational level was found to have a significant influence on job satisfaction of both the categories of bank employees. Clerical cadre was having more satisfaction in the job and social relations areas in comparison with the officer’s cadre in terms of job satisfaction.
Singh and Patiraj Kumari: (1988) in their study, “A study on Individual need strength, motivation and job involvement in relation to job satisfaction, productivity and absenteeism” found that employees with high desire for higher order need satisfaction, tended to work harder and were more satisfied. The study established that strength was positively associated with job satisfaction and performance. The results indicated a positive relationship of motivation with job satisfaction but it did not affect performance and absenteeism. The workers designated as high job involved groups were more satisfied in comparison to low job involved group. The interaction effect of individual variables of strength, motivation and job involvement taken together, did not affect employee’s job satisfaction, performance and absenteeism.32

Smith and Walter, T. (1982) in their study entitled, “Sex differences in the job satisfaction of University Professors”, studied the job satisfaction of 51 Male – Female matched pairs of University professors with the job description index and found that three ‘t’ tests were non – significant and two were significant at the 0.05 level. They concluded that either no significant sex differences in job satisfaction existed or that, if found, the differences were not psychologically meaningful.33

Schalar (1979) in his article titled “A Role of Expectancy Perceptions Model for participation in decision making” stated that the participation (centralization – decentralization) and occupational type or level in the organization are the two qualities of organizational structure which have been examined by stress researchers. An individual’s participation in the decision making process, especially when there are decisions related to his / her work perceived as legitimate should be related to his / her
needs for meaningfulness, a sense of responsibility, autonomy, certainty and predictability and also a sense of ownership. The general findings suggest that most stress, holding other organizational qualities constant, occurs for individuals in managerial positions and those in the health care profession. These relationships appear to be consistent with the interpretation that their organizational and occupational positions are highly related to an individual’s need for a sense of responsibility and autonomy.\(^{34}\)

Sinha (1974) defines job satisfaction as a “reintegration of effect produced by individual’s perception of fulfillment of his needs in relation to his work and the situations surrounding it.”\(^{35}\)

Sugumar. M. and V. Rajaram (1993) in their study “The relationship between general aggression, assertiveness and job satisfaction among the P.T.C. Bus Conductors”, studied the relationship between general aggression, assertiveness and job satisfaction among the bus conductors, 100 conductors chosen from a depot of the Pallavan Transport Corporation were stratified into two groups of 50 assertive and 50 aggressive conductors, were studied. The results suggested that job satisfaction was more related to the situational factors rather than the general personality factors.\(^{36}\)

“Job satisfaction in peaceful and disturbed textile industries”, a study by Vandana Misra (1994) pointed out that the employees working in disturbed organizations were relatively more dissatisfied than the employees working in peaceful organizations. The dissatisfaction of employees in disturbed organizations was
due to insecurity of job, the complexity of management polices, the lack of opportunity for participation in decision making, want of pension and other benefits. In order to make the employees satisfied with their job and maintain industrial peace, they should be made to feel secure in their jobs and should be given opportunities to participate in decision-making.  

In a study, “Perceived Management styles and job satisfaction of executives of private sector firms”, Vijayakumar. V.S.R. (1996) tried to relate perceived management styles of the organizations, with the job satisfaction of the executives. The findings of the study clearly showed that the perceived management style influenced job satisfaction of the executives of bureaucratic organizations. Job satisfaction increased when perceived management style moved towards participatory decision-making, leadership, control and goal setting styles.  

Venkatachalam and K.Sivasankara Redely (1996) in their article, “Impact of job level and job tenure on work involvement, job involvement and job satisfaction in different organizations”, examined the impact of job level, job tenure and type of organization. The analysis of variance revealed significant influence of job level on work involvement and job involvement. Further, it also revealed that the job tenure did not have any impact on work involvement; job tenure did not have any impact on work involvement, job involvement and job satisfaction.  

Timothy A. Judge and Shinichiro Watanabe (1993) in their study, “Another look at the job satisfaction – Life Satisfaction Relationship” analysed the relationship between job satisfaction and life satisfaction of employees. The result of the study revealed that
there was a strong relationship between job satisfaction and life satisfaction of employees.\textsuperscript{40}

The father of scientific management, Taylor’s (1911) approach to job satisfaction was based on a most pragmatic and essentially pessimistic philosophy that man is motivated by money alone. That the workers are essentially “Stupid and Phlegmatic” and that they would be satisfied with work if they get higher economic return from it”.\textsuperscript{41}

Winifred Raphael (1947) in his study has pointed out the main causes of poor morale as frustration resulting from lack of recognition. The belief that promotions are unfair and the fear of being in-efficient that may be nourished by the management practice of using blame much more frequently than praise.\textsuperscript{42}

Young et. al., (1998) in an article “organizations commitment among public service employees”, examined the factors associated with organizational commitment among blue collar workers. The results indicated that pay did not correlate significantly with commitment. On the other hand promotion, job satisfaction, intrinsic and extrinsic rewards were among those which led to commitment.\textsuperscript{43}

Verma. O.P. and Ramna Roy (1998) in their study, “work motivation and job satisfaction as the determinants of organizational commitments”, explored the possible effects of work motivation and job satisfaction on organizational commitment by selecting a sample of 68 executives in Bharat Cooking Coal Ltd., Dhanbad. Their study revealed that high job satisfaction group had shown greater degree of organizational commitment than the low job satisfaction group. They found that work motivation and job satisfaction both affect organizational commitment positively and therefore, it was important for the organizations to provide sufficient work motivation and job satisfaction
to their employees so as to make them committed to their organizations they were serving in.\textsuperscript{44}

\subsection*{2.3 Summary}

The various studies relevant to the job satisfaction were reviewed since no similar studies have been undertaken either in the field of job satisfaction or in the field of education, it is highly necessary to study the job satisfaction of the teachers. In this context, the researcher has made an attempt to study the job satisfaction of teachers working in the Arts and Science Colleges of Sivagangai District in TamilNadu.

In the present study support by superiors, professional development, nature of job, working conditions, relationship with colleagues, monetary benefits, nonmonetary benefits, students behavior, rewards and recognitions, etc. have been selected as the important variables determining the job satisfaction of college teachers. Various statistical technique have been used for analysis and interpretation of data.
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