

PERCEPTION OF EMPLOYEES TOWARDS JOB SATISFACTION ACROSS DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES IN INDIAN FINANCIAL SECTOR

Dr. Pooja Rani
Assistant Professor,
Faculty of Management and Commerce
Jagannath University NCR, Bahadurgarh, Haryana, India

Abstract: This study aims to investigate the perception of employees towards job satisfaction with regard to demographic variables such as department, designation, and income. one-way ANOVA has been applied to know the opinions of employees towards job satisfaction (consists of six factors viz. being social, freedom to work, job development, working environment, rewards and supervisor's orientation) with respect to various demographic variables.. The study investigated that there is a mix of opinions of respondents from various demographic profiles; still major part of the study is deviated towards not significant difference among the opinions of various respondents at various levels of gender, age, department, designation and income.

Index Terms - Job Satisfaction, Employee Engagement, Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Involvement, organizational commitment, Burnout.

INTRODUCTION

Job satisfaction is relatively established area of study in human resource management and has been studied on a wide basis. Some believe it is simply how content an individual is with his or her job, in other words, whether or not they like the job or individual aspects or facets of jobs, such as nature of work or supervision (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Job_satisfaction). In the words of Evans (1998), job satisfaction expresses the amount of agreement between one's emerging expectations and the rewards that the job provides. It has a diversified range of dimensions of employees' behavior and psychology at workplace. According to Herzberg (1965), job satisfaction describes how we feel about a job and it's just one feature of job attitudes defined in the seminal work. Mueller and McCloskey (1990) signified same point of view. In their words, job satisfaction can be defined as the degree of positive effective orientation toward employment. Also according to Spector (1997), job satisfaction is the nature of one's environment of the job does affect one's feelings on the job. Also, there are many research studies on the relationship of job satisfaction and other constructs of organizational behavior like organizational commitment, job involvement, innovation, talent management, burnout, absenteeism, organizational citizenship behavior and the various other forms of attitude (Harter, Schmidt & Hayes, 2002; Robbins, Judge & Sanghi, 2009; Gunlu, Aksarayli & Percin, 2010; Kumari & Pandey, 2011). Hoppock (1935) highlighted job satisfaction as any combination of psychological, physiological and environmental circumstances that cause a person truthfully to say that he is satisfied with his job.

JOB SATISFACTION- UNDERPINNING

The English word 'satisfaction' comes from the Latin satis ("enough") and facere ("to make"), hence the dictionary definitions: (1) to fulfill the needs, expectations, wishes or desires of; (2) to meet or answer the requirements of. There are, then, two definitions of satisfaction: satisfaction as fulfillment versus satisfaction as evaluation. In the first definition, a deficit of some sort exists, and its being filled is satisfaction. In the second definition, rather than deficits, criteria (requirements) must be met, and their being met is satisfaction (Dawis, 2004). According to Fisher (2003), it is arguably a fairly stable evaluation of how the job meets the employee's needs, wants, or expectations. Numerous studies have been developed around job satisfaction and how it relates to organizational citizenship behavior, organizational commitment, employee performance, job involvement, innovation, talent management, absenteeism, and the various other forms of attitude (Harter, Schmidt & Hayes, 2002; Robbins, Judge & Sanghi, 2009; Gunlu, Aksarayli & Percin, 2010; Herzberg, Mausner & Snyderman, 1959, Weiss et al., 1967; Smith, Kendall & Hulin, 1969). Employer on one hand, link satisfaction to employee's performance and environment & facilities provided to the employees whereas on other hand, employee perceives it as an overall positive effect of his or her job, monetary and non-monetary benefits given to him or her according to the services given by him or her. Kondalkar (2007) said that job satisfaction is related to general attitude towards the job. A person having a high level of satisfaction will generally hold a positive attitude while dissatisfied people will generally display negative attitude towards life. He defined that job satisfaction is the difference between the amount of rewards workers receive and the amount they believe they should receive. Pierce, Gardner and Dunham (2002) gave a relatively different opinion, according to them; job satisfaction is a reflection of the gap between what we want from a job (values), and what we experience. The greater the gap the greater the dissatisfaction.

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

Objective of the current research is to study the perception of employees towards job satisfaction with regard to demographic variables viz. department, designation and income.

STATISTICAL HYPOTHESIS

H₀: There is no significant statistical difference in the perception of employees towards job satisfaction with regard to demographic variables i.e. Department, designation, and income.

To test this main hypothesis, the following sub-hypotheses were proposed.

H_{0.1}: There is no significant statistical difference in the perception of employees from various departments towards job satisfaction.

H_{0.2}: There is no significant statistical difference in the perception of employees having various designations towards job satisfaction.

H_{0.3}: There is no significant statistical difference in the perception of employees having different income levels towards job satisfaction.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Sample and Sample Profile

The sample included in the study was drawn from financial organizations in India. Disproportionate Convenient sampling was adopted in order to choose the ultimate unit i.e. the middle level, managerial and executive level employees of financial sector. The researcher targeted 600 respondents from ten financial organizations, 60 respondents per organization. Every sincere effort was made by the researcher to avoid biasness in the selection of the respondents. The questionnaire was administered to the employees from various departments of the organizations. Out of filled/returned questionnaires, only 372 questionnaires were found to be adequate for further analysis. Demographic variables such as name and address of the organization, gender, age, department, designation, qualification, income, no. of promotions, marital status and no. of dependents of the respondents were included in the study (table 1).

Instrument for Data Collection

In order to achieve the objectives of the present study, mainly primary data was used. For primary data collection, survey method was used i.e. Information and data were collected with the help of well-structured questionnaires which were got filled from targeted respondents. In this research, job satisfaction was studied by a questionnaire which was adopted from the questionnaire developed by Weiss et al. (1967), The Minnesota's Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). MSQ is considered in view of comprehensiveness in addressing the job satisfaction in a complete way. It is a standardized questionnaire (declared to be used by any researcher) contained 20 statements related to job satisfaction on a five point rating scale from very dissatisfied to very satisfied.

Table 1: Distribution of Sample on the Basis of Demographic Variables

Demographic variables	Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	230	61.83
	Female	142	38.17
	Total	372	100.00
Age	Up to 25 yrs	160	43.01
	25-35 yrs	140	37.63
	35-45	67	18.01
	Above 45 yrs	5	1.34
	Total	372	100.00
Department	Operations	133	35.75
	Human resource	54	14.52
	Finance	45	12.10
	Information technology	28	7.53
	Marketing	112	30.11
	Total	372	100.00
Designation	Manager	37	9.95
	Assistant manager	112	30.11
	Executive	223	59.95
	Total	372	100.00
Qualification	Under graduate	16	4.30
	Graduate	72	19.35
	Post graduate	284	76.34
	Total	372	100.00

Income	Upto 2 lakhs	192	51.61
	2-4 lakhs	128	34.41
	4-6 lakhs	43	11.56
	Above 6 lakhs	9	2.42
	Total	372	100.00
No. of promotions	Nil	269	72.31
	Upto 2	90	24.19
	3-4	13	3.49
	5-6	0	0.00
	Total	372	100.00
Marital status	Married	222	59.68
	Unmarried	150	40.32
	Total	372	100.00
No. of dependents	0-2	225	60.48
	3-4	114	30.65
	More than 4	33	8.87
	Total	372	100.00

Source: Survey Data

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The data collected from the survey was analyzed using the PASW (Predictive Analytic Software) statistics 18. To achieve the research objective and to test the statistical hypotheses, ANOVA was applied.

Exploratory factor analysis of job satisfaction scale brought out six factors viz. being social, freedom to work, job development, working environment, rewards and supervisor's orientation which are denoted by JSF1 to JSF6.

These factors were further made undergo for ANOVA in order to reach at a meaningful conclusion.

PERCEPTION OF EMPLOYEES TOWARDS JOB SATISFACTION ACROSS DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

To analyze the perception of employees, independent sample t-test and one-way ANOVA are used. Demographic variable i.e. gender is tested by independent sample t-test while rest of the demographic variables such as age, designation, department, and income are tested by one-way ANOVA.

Department -wise Analysis of Job Satisfaction Factors

Table 2 reflects that mean value, S.D and F-Value and value of significance for the respondents of various departments regarding factors of job satisfaction. The mean values for JSF1 i.e. 'being social' are 3.386, 3.154, 3.281, 3.226 and 3.119 with values of S.D. 0.514, 0.563, 0.564, 0.560 and 0.595. The value of F is 3.989 at significance level of 0.004. It can be concluded that there is a significant difference (the value of significance level for F-test is less than 0.05) among the opinions of respondents of various departments whether it is operations, human resource, finance, information technology and marketing regarding the factor 'being social'. Similarly, for JSF2 and JSF3 i.e. 'freedom to work' and 'job development' the F-values of which are 5.897 and 3.772 with values of significance 0.000 and 0.005 respectively have a significant difference among the opinions of employees from various departments. But in case of JSF4, JSF5 and JSF6 i.e. 'working environment', 'rewards' and 'supervisor's orientation' (the F-values of which are 0.786, 0.792 and 0.208 with values of significance 0.537, 0.531 and 0.934 respectively). It can be clearly seen from the table 2 that there is no significant difference among the opinions of employees of various departments as values of significance is greater than 0.05.

Table 2: Department -wise Analysis of Job Satisfaction Factors

Factors		Department	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F Value	Sig. Level
JSF1	Being Social	Operations	133	3.386	0.514	3.989	0.004<0.05 SD
		Human Resources	54	3.154	0.563		
		Finance	45	3.281	0.564		
		Information Technology	28	3.226	0.560		
		Marketing	112	3.119	0.595		
		Total	372	3.247	0.565		
JSF2	Freedom to work	Operations	133	3.479	0.475	5.897	0.000<0.05 SD
		Human Resources	54	3.301	0.441		
		Finance	45	3.311	0.506		

		Information Technology	28	3.375	0.511		
		Marketing	112	3.179	0.515		
		Total	372	3.335	0.502		
JSF3	Job Development	Operations	133	3.417	0.537	3.772	0.005<0.05 SD
		Human Resources	54	3.269	0.649		
		Finance	45	3.189	0.606		
		Information Technology	28	3.268	0.569		
		Marketing	112	3.129	0.643		
		Total	372	3.270	0.607		
JSF4	Working Environment	Operations	133	3.321	0.551	0.786	0.537>0.05 NSD
		Human Resources	54	3.340	0.544		
		Finance	45	3.378	0.447		
		Information Technology	28	3.345	0.540		
		Marketing	112	3.238	0.526		
		Total	372	3.307	0.530		
JSF5	Rewards	Operations	133	3.333	0.480	0.792	0.531>0.05 NSD
		Human Resources	54	3.265	0.573		
		Finance	45	3.237	0.490		
		Information Technology	28	3.357	0.587		
		Marketing	112	3.238	0.503		
		Total	372	3.285	0.510		
JSF6	Supervisor's Orientation	Operations	133	3.316	0.611	0.208	0.934>0.05 NSD
		Human Resources	54	3.380	0.590		
		Finance	45	3.289	0.653		
		Information Technology	28	3.375	0.675		
		Marketing	112	3.330	0.522		
		Total	372	3.331	0.590		

Source: Survey Data

To fathom out, it can be concluded from above analysis that employees of various departments have similar opinions about three factors of job satisfaction which are 'working environment', 'rewards' and 'supervisor's orientation' and have significant different opinions about other three factors of job satisfaction which are 'being social', 'freedom to work' and 'job development'. Therefore in case of department, null hypothesis is i.e. $H_{0.1}$ is partially rejected (because there are significant differences in three factors out of six factors).

Designation-wise Analysis of Job Satisfaction Factors

Table 3 shows that mean value, S.D and F-Value and value of significance for the respondents of various designations regarding factors of Job Satisfaction. The mean value for the JSF1 i.e. 'being social' for employees at designations of manager, assistant manager and executive are 3.306, 3.271 and 3.226 with values of S.D. are 0.579, 0.536 and 0.578. The value of F is 0.461 at significance level of 0.631. Therefore, it is concluded there is not any significant difference found (the value of significance level for F-test is more than 0.05) among the responses of employees present at various designations regarding 'being social'. Similarly, for JSF2, JSF3, JSF4 and JSF5 i.e. 'freedom to work', 'job development', 'working environment' and 'rewards' the F-value of which are 0.426, 0.668, 0.645 and 0.264 with values of significance 0.654, 0.514, 0.525 and 0.768 respectively there is no significant difference among the opinions of employees from various designations as all significance values are more than 0.05. But in case of JSF6 i.e. 'supervisor's orientation' (mean values of which are 3.581, 3.259 and 3.325 with S.D. values 0.507, 0.585 and 0.597), F-value is 4.237 with value of significance 0.015 which is less than 0.05. It clearly states that there is a significant statistical difference among the opinions of employees present at various designations.

In nut shell, it can be extracted from above analysis that employees present on various designations have similar opinions about five factors of job satisfaction which are 'being social', 'freedom to work', 'job development', 'working environment', and 'rewards' and have significant different opinions about only one factor of job satisfaction which is 'supervisor's orientation'. Therefore in case of designation, null hypothesis i.e. $H_{0.2}$ is partially rejected (because there are significant differences in only single factor out of six factors).

Table 3: Designation-wise Analysis of Job Satisfaction Factors

Factors		Designation	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F Value	Sig. Level
JSF1	Being Social	Manager	37	3.306	0.579	0.461	0.631>0.05 NSD

		Assistant Manager	112	3.271	0.536		
		Executive	223	3.226	0.578		
		Total	372	3.247	0.565		
JSF2	Freedom to Work	Manager	37	3.378	0.477	0.426	0.654>0.05 NSD
		Assistant Manager	112	3.301	0.509		
		Executive	223	3.344	0.503		
		Total	372	3.335	0.502		
JSF3	Job Development	Manager	37	3.378	0.606	0.668	0.514>0.05 NSD
		Assistant Manager	112	3.250	0.589		
		Executive	223	3.262	0.617		
		Total	372	3.270	0.607		
JSF4	Working Environment	Manager	37	3.396	0.407	0.645	0.525>0.05 NSD
		Assistant Manager	112	3.283	0.524		
		Executive	223	3.305	0.550		
		Total	372	3.307	0.530		
JSF5	Rewards	Manager	37	3.342	0.461	0.264	0.768>0.05 NSD
		Assistant Manager	112	3.283	0.501		
		Executive	223	3.277	0.524		
		Total	372	3.285	0.510		
JSF6	Supervisor's Orientation	Manager	37	3.581	0.507	4.237	0.015<0.05 SD
		Assistant Manager	112	3.259	0.585		
		Executive	223	3.325	0.597		
		Total	372	3.331	0.590		

Source: Survey Data

Income- wise Analysis of Job Satisfaction Factors

Table 4 depicts the mean value, S.D and F-Value and value of significance for the respondents on the basis of income they get from their organizations regarding factors of job satisfaction. The means value for JSF1 i.e. 'being social' for employees at income levels of upto 2 lakhs, 2-4 lakhs, 4-6 lakhs and above 6 lakhs are 3.201, 3.289, 3.264 and 3.556 with values of S.D. 0.578, 0.549, 0.571 and 0.373 respectively. The F-value is 1.569 at significance level of 0.197.

Table 4: Income-wise Analysis of Job Satisfaction Factors

Factors		Income level	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F Value	Sig. Level
JSF1	Being Social	upto 2 lakhs	192	3.201	0.578	1.569	0.197>0.05 NSD
		2-4 lakhs	128	3.289	0.549		
		4-6 lakhs	43	3.264	0.571		
		above 6 lakhs	9	3.556	0.373		
		Total	372	3.247	0.565		
JSF2	Freedom to Work	upto 2 lakhs	192	3.322	0.478	0.206	0.893>0.05 NSD
		2-4 lakhs	128	3.342	0.515		
		4-6 lakhs	43	3.349	0.590		
		above 6 lakhs	9	3.444	0.391		
		Total	372	3.335	0.502		
JSF3	Job Development	upto 2 lakhs	192	3.227	0.603	0.786	0.503>0.05 NSD
		2-4 lakhs	128	3.324	0.613		
		4-6 lakhs	43	3.279	0.580		
		above 6 lakhs	9	3.389	0.741		
		Total	372	3.270	0.607		
JSF4	Working Environment	upto 2 lakhs	192	3.274	0.522	1.271	0.284>0.05 NSD
		2-4 lakhs	128	3.320	0.552		
		4-6 lakhs	43	3.357	0.527		
		above 6 lakhs	9	3.593	0.278		

		Total	372	3.307	0.530		
JSF5	Rewards	upto 2 lakhs	192	3.240	0.530	2.581	0.053>0.05 NSD
		2-4 lakhs	128	3.344	0.479		
		4-6 lakhs	43	3.240	0.521		
		above 6 lakhs	9	3.630	0.261		
		Total	372	3.285	0.510		
JSF6	Supervisor's Orientation	upto 2 lakhs	192	3.336	0.595	0.615	0.606>0.05 NSD
		2-4 lakhs	128	3.297	0.593		
		4-6 lakhs	43	3.360	0.611		
		above 6 lakhs	9	3.556	0.300		
		Total	372	3.331	0.590		

Source: Survey Data

Therefore, it can be clearly said that there is a not any significant difference (the value of significance level for F-test is greater than 0.05) regarding 'being social' among the opinions of employees of various levels of income whether getting salaries upto 2 lakhs, 2-4 lakhs, 4-6 lakhs and above 6 lakhs from their organizations. Similarly, for JSF2, JSF3, JSF4, JSF5 and JSF6 i.e. 'freedom to work', 'job development', 'working environment', 'rewards' and 'supervisor's orientation' (F-values of which are 0.206, 0.786, 1.271, 2.581 and 0.615 with values of significance 0.893, 0.503, 0.284, 0.053 and 0.606 respectively), it can be clearly stated that there is no significant difference among the opinions of employees of various income levels as values of significance for these factors are greater than 0.05.

To sum up, it can be concluded that employees getting various salaries from their organizations have similar opinions about all factors of job satisfaction. It means all the employees in a particular organization whether getting salary upto 2 lakhs, 2-4 lakhs, 4-6 lakhs and above 6 lakhs are having indifferent views about all factors of job satisfaction in their organizations. Therefore in case of income, null hypothesis i.e. H_0 is fully rejected or completely accepted (because there are non-significant differences for all six factors job satisfaction).

CONCLUSION

From the statistical analysis, it can be summarized that there is a mix of opinions of respondents at various demographic levels. In case of department, it is found that employees of various departments have similar opinions about three factors of job satisfaction which are 'working environment', 'rewards' and 'supervisor's competence' and have significant different opinions about other three factors of job satisfaction which are 'being social', 'freedom to work' and 'job development' whereas in case of designation, the employees of various designations have no significant different opinions about all factors of job satisfaction except the factor 'supervisor's orientation'. On the other hand, in case of income, it is found that employees getting various salaries from their organizations have similar opinions about all factors of job satisfaction.

In order to conclude, it can be said that in case of department, null hypothesis is partially rejected (because there are significant differences in three factors out of six factors). Similarly in case of designation, null hypothesis is partially rejected (because there are significant differences in only one factor out of six factors). Whereas in case of income, null hypothesis is completely accepted (as there are non-significant differences among perception of employees having various income levels for all six factors of job satisfaction). In nut shell, it can be said that overall, the opinions of employees are not significantly different if there is a talk about job satisfaction.

REFERENCES

Articles

- Anitha, R. (2011). A Study on Job Satisfaction of Paper Mill Employees with Special Reference to Udumalpet and Palani Taluk. *Journal of Management and Science*, 1(1), 36-47.
- Armentor, J. & Forsyth, C. J. (1995). Determinants of Job Satisfaction among Social Workers. *International Review of Modern Sociology*, 25(2), 51-63.
- Christen, M., Iyer, G. & Soberman, D. (2006). Job Satisfaction, Job Performance and Effort: A Re-Examination Using Agency Theory. *Journal of Marketing*, 70 (January 2006), 137-150.
- Dawis, R. V. (2004). Job Satisfaction. In: *Comprehensive Handbook of Psychological Assessment: Industrial and Organizational Assessment* (Eds: J. C. Thomas & M. Hersen). John Wiley and Sons, 470-481.
- Dugguh, S., I. & Ayaga, D. (2014). Job Satisfaction Theories: Traceability to Employee Performance in Organizations. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 16(5), 11-18.
- Eid, M. T. I. (2016). Highlighting the Main Factors of Job Satisfaction among Jordanian Hospital Employees, *Journal of Applied Quantitative Methods*, 11(1), 80-88.

- Fisher, C. D. (2003). Why do Lay People believe that Satisfaction and Performance are correlated? Possible Sources of a Commonsense Theory. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 24(6), 753-777.
- Furnham, A., Petrides, K.V., Jackson, C.J. & Cotter, T. (2002). Do Personality Factors Predict Job Satisfaction?. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 33(8), 1325-1342.
- Ganzach, Y. (1998). Intelligence and Job Satisfaction. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 41(5), 526-539.
- Graham, M. W. & Messner, P. E. (1998). Principals and Job Satisfaction. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 12(5), 196-202.
- Gunlu, E., Aksarayli, M. & Percin, N. S. (2010). Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment of Hotel Managers in Turkey. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 22(5), 693-717.
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L. & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-Unit-Level Relationship between Employee Satisfaction, Employee Engagement, and Business Outcomes: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 268-79.
- Islam, M. R., Rasul, M. T. & Waliullah, G.M. (2012). Analysis of the Factors that affect Job Satisfaction: A Case Study on Private Companies Employees of Bangladesh. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 4(4), 35-46.
- Johnson, G. J. & Johnson, W. R. (1995). Subjective Underemployment and Job Satisfaction. *Review of Modern Sociology*, 25(1), 73-84.
- Judge, T. A., Locke, E. A., Durham, C. C. & Kluger, A. N. (1998). Dispositional Effects on Job and Life Satisfaction: The Role of Core Evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(1), 17.
- Kalliath, P. & Kalliath, T. (2015). Work-Family Conflict and Its Impact on Job Satisfaction of Social Workers. *British Journal of Social Work*, 45(1), 241-259.
- Kumari, G. & Pandey, K. M. (2011). Job Satisfaction in Public Sector and Private Sector: A Comparison. *International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology*, 2(3), 222-228.
- Lee, M. & Lee, S. (2008). The Influence of Emotional Intelligence and Organizational Climate for Nurse Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Business Administration*, 4(1), 1-10.
- Linz, S. J. (2003). Job Satisfaction among Russian Workers. *International Journal of Manpower*, 24(6), 626-652.
- Locke, E. A. (1969). What is Job Satisfaction? *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 4(4), 309-336.
- Martins, H. & Proença, T. (2012). Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire-Psychometric Properties and Validation in a Population of Portuguese Hospital Workers. *FEP Working Papers*, 471, 1-20.
- Mueller, C. W. & McCloskey, J. C. (1990). Nurses' Job Satisfaction: A Proposed Measure. *Nursing Research*, 39(2), 113-116.
- Neog, B. B. & Barua, M. (2014). Factors Influencing Employee's Job Satisfaction: An Empirical Study among Employees of Automobile Service Workshops in Assam. *The SIJ Transactions on Industrial, Financial & Business Management*, 2(7), 305-315.
- Nowack, K. (2010). Employee Engagement, Job Satisfaction, Retention and Stress, 1-5. Available at: www.envisialearning.com on July 15, 2011.
- Parvin M. M. & Kabir, M. M. N. (2011). Factors Affecting Employee Job Satisfaction of Pharmaceutical Sector. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research*, 1(9), 113-123
- Qasim, S., Cheema, F. E. A. & Syed, N. A. (2012). Exploring Factors Affecting Employees Job Satisfaction at Work. *Journal of Management and Social Sciences*, 8(1), 31-39.
- Rao, S. M. & Poornima S. (2014). A Study on the Job Satisfaction Factors in the Banking Sector. *International Research Journal of Business and Management*, 4(4), 26-31.
- Shmailan, A. S. B. (2016). The Relationship between Job Satisfaction, Job Performance and Employee Engagement: An Explorative Study. *Issues in Business Management and Economics*, 4(1), 1-8.
- Sinha, E. (2013). A research work on Employee Satisfaction measurement with special reference to KRIBHCO, Surat. *International Journal of Modern Engineering Research*, 3(1), 523-529.
- Susan J. L. (2003). Job Satisfaction among Russian Workers. *International Journal of Manpower*, 24(6), 626-652.
- Thakur, P. (2014). A Research Paper on the Effect of Employee Engagement on Job Satisfaction in IT Sector. *Journal of Business Management & Social Sciences Research*, 3(5), 31-39.
- Weiss, H. M. (2002). Deconstructing Job Satisfaction: Separating Evaluations, Beliefs and Affective Experiences. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12(2), 173-194.
- Wickramasinghe, V. (2009). Predictors of Job Satisfaction among IT Graduates in Offshore Outsourced IT Firms. *Personnel Review*, 38(4), 413 - 431.

Books

- Armstrong, M. (2010). *A Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice*. Kogan Page Ltd.
- Arnold, J. & Feldman, C. (1986). *Organizational Behavior*. McGraw Hill.
- Bhattacharya, D. K. (2007). *Human Resource Research Methods*. Oxford University Press.
- Evans, L. (1998). *Teacher Morale, Job Satisfaction and Motivation*. Sage.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B. & Snyderman, B. (1959). *The Motivation to Work*. Wiley.
- Ho, R. (2006). *Handbook of Univariate and Multivariate Data Analysis and Interpretation with SPSS*. Chapman & Hall/ CRC Taylor & Francis Group.
- Hoppock, R. (1935). *Job Satisfaction*. Harper and Brothers.
- Hulin, C. L. & Judge, T. A. (2003). *Job Attitudes. Handbook of Psychology*. John Wiley.
- Kandula, S. R. (2007). *HRM in Practice*. Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd.
- Kinicki, A. & Kreitner, R. (2009). *Organizational Behavior*. Tata McGraw-Hill Education Pvt. Ltd.
- Kodalkar, V. G. (2007). *Organizational Behaviour*. New Age International (P) Ltd.
- Malhotra, N. K. & Dash, S. (2011). *Marketing Research: An Applied Orientation*. Pearson Education.
- Maslach, C. & Leiter, M. P. (1997). *The Truth about Burnout: How Organizations Cause Personal Stress and What to do about it*. Jossey-Bass.
- Moore, D. S. (2007). *The Basic Practice of Statistics*. WH Freeman.
- Nelson, D.L. & Quick, J. C. (2009). *Organizational Behavior: Foundations, Realities & Challenges*. South Western Cengage Learning.
- Newstrom J. W. & Davis K. (2009). *Organizational Behavior-Human Behavior at Work*. Tata McGraw-Hill.
- Nunnally, J. C. & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric Theory*. McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1970). *Introduction to Psychological Measurement*. McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Pallant, J. (2005). *SPSS Survival Manual*. Allen & Unwin.
- Pattanayak, B. (2009). *Human Resource Management*. PHI Learning Pvt. Ltd.
- Pierce, J. L., Gardner, D. G. & Dunham, R. B. (2002). *Management and Organizational Behavior*. South Western Thomson Learning.
- Robbins, S. P., Judge, T.A. & Sanghi, S. (2009). *Organizational Behavior*. Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd.
- Robbins, S., Judge, T. A., Millett, B. & Boyle, M. (2013). *Organizational Behaviour*. Pearson Higher Education.
- Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M. & Hulin, C. L. (1969). *The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement: A Strategy for the Study of Attitudes*. Rand McNally.
- Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes, and Consequences*. Sage.
- Storey, J., Wright, P.M. & Ulrich, D. (2009). *The Routledge Companion to Strategic Human Resource Management*. Taylor & Francis.

Dissertations / Reports / Proceedings

- Employee Job Satisfaction and Engagement Revitalizing a Changing Workforce-A Research Report by The Society for Human Resource Management. Available at: www.shrm.org/hr-today/trends-and-forecasting/research-and-surveys on July 27, 2016.
- Waskiewicz, S. P. (1999). *Variables that Contribute to Job Satisfaction of Secondary School Assistant Principals* (Doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University).
- Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., England, G. W. & Lofquist L. H. (1967). *Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
- White, A. P. (2008). *An Examination of Virginia Soil and Water Conservation District Employee Job Satisfaction* (Doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University).

e-Resources

- Job Satisfaction. Available at: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Job_satisfaction.htm on September 4, 2017.
- Redmond, B. F. (2015). *Job Satisfaction*. Available at: <https://wikispaces.psu.edu /display/PSYCH484/11.+Job+Satisfaction> on May 2, 2017.