

JOB SATISFACTION AND MOTIVATIONAL MEASURES- A CASE STUDY OF NON-TEACHING STAFFS OF BANARAS HINDU UNIVERSITY

Dr. Pooja Singh (Corresponding Author)

Vidya Mandir Degree College, Kaimganj

Abstract

The present study is concerned with identifying the effect of demographic variables on job satisfaction of non-teaching personnel of Banaras Hindu University (B.H.U.) and also to find out the motivational measures that influenced their job satisfaction. The study was administered on 100 non-teaching personnel of B.H.U. We have used S-D Employees Inventory questionnaire of Prof. D. M. Pestonjeeto to collect data from university non-teaching staffs. In this study, we have considered five dimensions of the job, i.e., Salary, organizational commitment, promotion, job pressure, and work culture. Descriptive statistics, along with t-test and One-Way ANOVA, was used for data analysis. The findings of this study would assist the administrator and human resource development (H.R.D.) policymakers of the University to understand the needs, expectations as well as employees' perception towards their organization.

Keywords: Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction, Work Culture, Human resource development, and Job Pressure.

I. Introduction

Human resource development is one of the major objectives of any university by the very nature of its constitution, set-up, and organization. According to Azeem and Quddus (2014), "university is that organization which provides higher education in order to contribute the national development." To maintain high quality of the human resource output of the university system, its own human resources ought to be developed on a continuous basis (Gurkoo, 2011). H.R.D. practices contribute to organizational effectiveness through OCTAPACE (openness, collaboration, trust, authenticity, pro-action, autonomy, confrontation, and experiment) and the H.R.D. subsystem (training and development, team-building, performance appraisal, potential appraisal, mentoring, feedback and counseling, etc.). University consists of both teaching and non-teaching staffs. In terms of human anatomy analogues, we can consider the entire university system equivalent to the human body. In such a correlation, the teaching staff may be termed as 'Heart' and non-teaching staff as the 'Central Nervous System' of the main body, which is the university system. Non-teaching personnel contributes their supportive roles in the attainment of the vision, mission, and objectives of any university, college, or school. The non-teaching staff plays a pivotal role by rendering its services in the development and execution of plans of University, which help in achieving the goals and objectives of the University. So it is of utmost importance and also the responsibility of the concerned organization (in present case, the University) to understand the needs, problems, and motivational incentives of their non-teaching personnel. Yapa, Rathnayake, Senanayake, and Premakumar (2014) emphasized the contribution of non-teaching staff in the administration and financial performance of the University.

In general, every individual employee has their own needs and expectations when they join the organization. In this regard, Maslow's motivation theory has given a clear explanation about human needs and wants. They identified five types of human needs i.e., physiological, safety, social, esteem and self-actualization needs, which ultimately influence the functioning of employees. Similarly, according to Herzberg's two-factor theory, Hygiene and Motivational factors affect employees' attitudes at their workplace. Hygiene factors consist of company policy, supervision, interpersonal relations, working conditions, and Salary, and motivational factors include

promotional opportunities, personal growth, recognition, responsibility, and achievement. Herzberg further argued that absence of hygiene factors can create job dissatisfaction, but their presence does not motivate or create satisfaction among employees (Aswathappa, 2007). Alderfer, (1969) attempted to rework Maslow's need hierarchy theory. They grouped human needs into three cores parts viz., existence, relatedness and growth. Vroom's expectancy theory established linkage between employee effort, performance, and reward. The Equity Theory of Adam Stacy is based on the social exchange process. The theory highlight that people are motivated to sustain a fair relationship between their performance and reward in comparison to others (Prasad, 2011).

In the present transformation era, many organizations, as well as Organizational Behaviour (O.B.) experts, are not clear about the ways of motivating a diverse workforce (Aswathappa, 2007). Qureshi et al. (2013) identified that the individual personal factors such as age, gender, marital status, education, experience, job satisfaction, commitment, organizational behavior, and physical environment are directly influenced their performance in the organization. Robbins and Judge (2012) defined job satisfaction as a positive feeling about a job resulting from an evaluation of its characteristics. Jobs require interacting with coworkers and bosses, organizational rules and policies, meeting performance standards, living with less than ideal working conditions, etc. (Wyatt company, 1989). An employee's assessment of his/her satisfaction with the job is thus a complex summation of many discrete elements (Robbins & Judge, 2012). Locke (1976) defined job satisfaction as "a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences." This definition provides a correlation between job satisfaction and the emotional state of the individual. Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969) identified pay, promotions, coworkers, supervision, and work as five facets that influenced job satisfaction. Locke (1976) furthers added a few other facets, such as recognition, working conditions, and company and management (Judge & Klinger, 2008).

Keeping the above discussion in mind, the author has attempted to identify the impact of demographic variables on employee's job satisfaction and also the motivational measures that influenced their satisfaction level in the organization.

II. Theoretical Framework- Job Satisfaction Theories

Several theories have explained all the facets of job satisfaction. These theories can be broadly categorized into three parts:

1. Job Characteristics Model/ or Situational theories- It was given by Hackman and Oldham (1976). As per this model, intrinsically motivating features of the job will provide higher satisfaction to the employees. There are five intrinsically motivating factors viz., (1) task identity, (2) task significance, (3) skill variety, (4) autonomy, and (5) feedback. It means a job that contains these five core features will provide more satisfaction than jobs that do not contain these features.

2. Dispositional approaches or Person Theory- This theory argued that the personal life of people directly influenced their professional life. Heller's (2002) behavioral theories (i.e., positive affectivity and negative affectivity) have contributed a significant role in understanding this approach. Positive affectivity described personality characteristics in terms of high energy, enthusiastic and pleasurable engagement while negative affectivity related to distressed, not pleasurable engagement and nervousness. Goldberg (1990) classified personality attributes into five components. They are 1) extraversion or surgency, 2) neuroticism or emotional stability, 3) agreeableness, 4) conscientiousness, and 5) openness or culture. Further, Judge, Locke, and Durham (1997) also developed core self-evaluation theory, which has established links between personality attributes and motivation, job satisfaction, and job performance. Core self-evaluation emphasized self-esteem, which generalized

self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability of the individuals. So, it can be inferred that job satisfaction, motivation, and employee performance are closely interrelated with each other.

3. Person situation interactional theory or value-percept model- This model was given by Locke (1976). He argued that an individual's values influence their satisfaction, and it is the outcome of the multiplication of an individual's value with the amount wanted minus the perceived amount of value. He also emphasized the discrepancies between individual desires and their achievement matters only if the job is essential to him (Judge & Klinger, 2008).

III. Literature Review/Earlier Work

Lather and Jain (2005) identified that top-level managers are mainly concerned with self-actualization needs. In contrast, a middle and lower-level manager is concerned with monetary gains, the fulfillment of social needs. Tella, Ayeni, and Popoola (2007) attempted to identify the impact of attitude on job satisfaction. They find out that there is a direct relationship between work motivation, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. Attitude directly influences the job satisfaction of employees.

Both monetary (i.e., pay) and non-monetary (i.e., work recognition) factors influence the performance of non-teaching staff (Chowdhery, Alam, & Ahmed, 2014). Mendoza, Laguardo, and Buenviaje (2014) finds out that factors such as rewards and recognition, leadership style and learning and development, good interpersonal relations, and working conditions influence the satisfaction of non-teaching personnel in the organization. Work environment and culture, authority, interpersonal relationships, and supervision profoundly influenced the job satisfaction of non-teaching personnel in the University (Saji, Tarek, & Mohammad, 2014). Azeem and Quddus (2014) emphasized that inter-personal relations profoundly influenced the job satisfaction of non-teaching personnel of different posts in the organization.

Saari and Judge (2004) mentioned that factors like dispositional, diversified culture and work situation affect employees' attitudes towards their job. Further, they suggested that organizations need to be more concerned with H.R. in terms of employee survey and feedback discussions. All these can be helpful in achieving job satisfaction among employees in the organization. Yapa et. al. (2014) examined the consequence of demographic factors on satisfaction of non academic staff. They found that civil status and age were the most significant factors affecting their job satisfaction whereas; gender and education have no significant influence on job satisfaction. Celik (2011) measured the impact of climate, culture, and management style and supervision on job satisfaction of employees. Trust on management, relationships with peers, training, recognition of work, management policies and practices, and working condition and job security influence employee's satisfaction in the organization (Bisheen, 2012). Arshadi (2010) found that work autonomy provides work motivation and job satisfaction to the employees.

Alniaçık, Alniaçık, Akçin, & Erat (2012) showed the linkage between career motivation, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction of employees. The career motivation level in female respondents is higher in comparison to their male counterparts. However, other individual characteristics (age, income level, tenure) did not influence career motivation. The leadership style significantly influenced employee satisfaction as compared to management knowledge and training (Yuliarini, Mat, & Kumar, 2012). Gupta & Hyde (2013) analyzed the effect of demographical variables, such as income, experience, age, gender, on employees' quality of work in a nationalized bank. They identified that income, age, and job experience of employees influenced the quality of work-life, whereas gender does not affect the quality of work-life. Srivastava (2013) attempted to explore the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment and analyzed the effect of trust and locus of control

on job satisfaction and organizational commitment. They identified that there is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment and trust and locus of control positively related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

IV. Objectives

1. To study job satisfaction concerning demographical variables such as age, gender, marital status, educational qualification, nature of the job, longevity/or job tenure among non-teaching employees of the B.H.U.
2. To identify the motivational measures that affect the job satisfaction of non-teaching employees of the B.H.U.

V. Hypotheses

H₀₁: There is no significant difference in job satisfaction with respect to the nature of job among non-teaching employees of B.H.U.

H₀₂: There is no significant difference in job satisfaction with respect to gender among non-teaching employees of B.H.U.

H₀₃: There is no significant difference in job satisfaction with respect to age among non-teaching employees of B.H.U.

H₀₄: There is no significant difference in job satisfaction with respect to the level of position among non-teaching employees of B.H.U.

H₀₅: There is no significant difference in job satisfaction with respect to educational qualifications among non-teaching employees of B.H.U.

H₀₆: There is no significant difference in job satisfaction with respect to marital status among employees of B.H.U.

H₀₇: There is no significant difference in job satisfaction with respect to job experience among non-teaching employees of B.H.U.

VI. Research Methodology

We have used S-D Employees Inventory of Prof. Pestonjee as a tool of psychological investigation of employees' job performance at work place. We made an attempt to find out the environmental factors that affect the job satisfaction as well as employees' motivation at work place.

Nature of Study- Exploratory Research

Universe- Non-Teaching Staffs of B.H.U.

Sampling Unit- Non-Teaching Employees (Group A, B, C, and D) of B.H.U.

Sampling Size- 100 employees

Sampling Techniques- Random Sampling

Tool for Data Collection- S-D Employees Inventory questionnaire of Prof. D. M. Pestonjee

Tool for Data Analysis- Descriptive statistics along with t-test and One-Way Anova

VII. Results and Discussion

The demographic of sampling are presented in Table 1. Based on five dimensions, i.e., Salary, organizational commitment, promotion, job pressure, and work culture, we have attempted to measure the job satisfaction of B.H.U. Employees. The sample of non-Teaching staffs under this study are categorized under three groups, i.e., 1) Group 'B' which include Section Officers/Superintendents and Assistants/Senior Assistants, 2) Group 'C' which include Upper Division Clerks/Office Assistants and

Lower Division Clerks/Junior Assistants and 3) Group' D' which includes peon, gatekeeper, gardener, housekeeper. The nature of jobs is classified into permanent and contractual. Employees with different age groups with different educational qualifications are considered for the study.

The relationship between nature of job and employee's job satisfaction is examined and presented in Table 2. It is evident that employees' salary have significant influence ($t_{(98)}=-4.206$; $p<0.05$) on permanent employees' ($M=5.91$; $sd=0.87$) and contractual employees' ($M=6.65$; $sd=0.88$) job satisfaction. But in terms of organizational commitment, there does not exist significant difference ($t_{(98)}=-0.752$; $p>0.05$) between permanent employees' ($M=9.37$; $sd=0.96$) and contractual employees' ($M=9.54$; $sd=1.30$) job satisfaction. In terms of organization promotion policy also there is no significant difference ($t_{(98)}=-0.705$; $p>0.05$) between permanent employees' ($M=4.25$, $sd=0.81$) and contractual employees' ($M=4.36$; $sd=0.78$). Similarly, in terms of job pressure, no significant difference ($t_{(98)}=1.116$; $p>0.05$) was found between permanent employees' ($M=7.14$; $sd=0.79$) and contractual employees' ($M=6.95$; $sd=0.88$) job satisfaction. In terms of work culture there exist significant difference ($t_{(98)}=-2.191$; $p<0.05$) between permanent employees' ($M=10.89$; $sd=0.98$) and contractual employees' ($M=11.40$; $sd=1.36$) job satisfaction.

Based on the above discussion, it can be inferred that the Salary and work culture are two main motivation measures that influence the permanent and contractual employee's job satisfaction in the University (in this case, B.H.U.). These findings are also supported by SHRM Report (2012). The above mentioned report revealed that recognition, praise, awards and incentives enhanced the morale, productivity and competitiveness of employees. Employee's relationships with coworkers are also important to their success in the workplace. Co-operative organizational culture facilitates employees in the accomplishment of their work goals and makes work more enjoyable, and ultimately it enhances employees' job satisfaction and their engagement. Based on the findings of this study, our first hypotheses are rejected.

In Table (3) examined gender effect on employee's job satisfaction has been examined and presented. There is no significant difference present ($t_{(98)}=-0.502$; $p>0.05$) between male ($M=6.21$; $sd=0.94$) and female ($M=6.33$; $sd=1.01$) in terms of salary on their job satisfaction. Similarly, in terms of organizational commitment, there does not exist significant difference ($t_{(98)}=0.753$; $p>0.05$) between male ($M=9.49$; $sd=1.18$) and female ($M=9.28$; $sd=0.84$) on their job satisfaction. In terms of promotion, there does not exist significant difference ($t_{(98)}=0.398$; $p>0.05$) between male ($M=4.31$; $sd=0.80$) and female ($M=4.23$; $sd=0.76$) on their job satisfaction. The job pressure do not in part any significant difference ($t_{(98)}=-0.216$; $p>0.05$) between male ($M=7.05$; $sd=0.86$) and female ($M=7.09$; $sd=0.76$) on their job satisfaction. The work culture also do not reflect any significant difference ($t_{(98)}=-1.341$; $p>0.05$) between male ($M=11.03$; $sd=1.24$) and female ($M=11.42$; $sd=0.92$) on their job satisfaction.

Thus, based on these results, our second hypothesis is accepted. This finding is also supported by the Rastand Tourani (2012) study, which reveals that gender has no significant effect on their job satisfaction.

The effect of employee's age on their job satisfaction is shown in Table 4. We can observe here that there does not exist a significant difference in terms of Salary ($F=2.136$; $p>0.05$) between the different age groups of employees. There also does not exist significant difference ($F=0.343$; $p>0.05$) between different age group of employees in terms of organizational commitment. The promotion policy ($F=1.825$; $p>0.05$) and job pressure ($F=0.901$; $p>0.05$) do not significantly influence employee satisfaction at different age groups. Yet, in terms of work culture, there exist significant difference ($F=2.823$; $p<0.05$) in satisfaction of employees at different age group. So based on

these results, our third hypotheses stand rejected as employees' age influences work culture in the organization and hence the overall job satisfaction of employees.

The relationship between an employee's post and their job satisfaction is summarized in Table 5. The table shows that in terms of Salary ($F=7.347$; $p<0.05$), and work culture ($F=3.487$; $p<0.05$), there exist a significant difference between employees' posts and their job satisfaction. Yet, in terms of organizational commitment ($F=1.101$; $p>0.05$), promotion policy ($F=0.094$; $p>0.05$), and job pressure ($F=0.028$; $p>0.05$) there does not exist significant difference between employees posts and their job satisfaction. So based on these results, we reject our fourth hypothesis as the employee's post affects their job satisfaction in terms of Salary and work culture.

The effect employee's educational qualification on their job satisfaction is examined in Table 6. The table depicts that in terms of salary ($F=1.722$; $p>0.05$), organizational commitment ($F=0.751$; $p>0.05$), job pressure ($F=1.301$; $p>0.05$), and work culture ($F=1.594$; $p>0.05$), employee's educational qualification does not impart significant difference on their satisfaction level. Nevertheless, organizational promotion policy provides a significant difference ($F=2.525$; $p<0.05$) on employee's qualifications and their job satisfaction. Hence fifth hypotheses stand rejected as educational qualification does influence the job satisfaction of employees.

The effect of the employee's marital status on their job satisfaction is presented in Table 7. The table reveals that in terms of salary ($F=0.269$; $p>0.05$), organizational commitment ($F=0.463$; $p>0.05$), promotion policy ($F=1.382$; $p>0.05$), job pressure ($F=0.470$; $p>0.05$) and work culture ($F=0.467$; $p>0.05$), the employee's marital status does not create significant difference on their job satisfaction. So based on the above results, the sixth hypothesis cannot be rejected.

The effect of employee's longevity of job (job tenure) on their job satisfaction is summarized in Table 8. The table shows that longevity of job imparts significant difference in terms of Salary ($F=3.322$; $P<0.05$) and work culture ($F=2.853$; $p<0.05$) on employees' job satisfaction. However, employee's longevity of job does not have a significant influence on their job satisfaction in terms of organizational commitment ($F=0.107$; $p>0.05$), promotion ($F=0.858$; $p>0.05$), and work pressure ($F=0.951$; $p>0.05$). So the seventh hypothesis can be rejected as the longevity of the job does influence job satisfaction.

VIII. Conclusion

This study has identified that employees' personal characteristics such as age, gender, marital status, qualification, etc. directly influenced their job satisfaction. In addition to the above personal factors of employees, the nature of job and longevity of job also influence their satisfaction in the organization. The present study revealed that gender and marital status of employees' have no significant effect on their job satisfaction. However, employees' post, nature of the job (permanent or contractual), and longevity of job/job duration affect their Salary and work culture. The employees' age only affects their work culture in the organization. Moreover, the employees' educational qualification influenced their promotion in the organization.

IX. Limitations and Scope for Future Study

In the present study, only one university has been taken as a population. The future work could cover more than one university, and such a result will help us to test further the significant outcomes of this study and our general understanding regarding the job satisfaction of non-academic employees at Universities. The future academic endeavor might make use of the present study as a stepping stone for exploratory and confirmatory research towards a complete understanding of job satisfaction of non-teaching staff of universities and colleges.

X Acknowledgements

The author expresses sincere gratitude towards the cooperation shown by the non-teaching staff of B.H.U. in answering the questioner, which has helped to complete this study successfully.

XI. References

- Aswathappa, K. (2007). *Organizational Behaviour- Text, Cases, and Games*. Himalaya Publishing House, Mumbai.
- Arshadi, N. (2010). Basic Need Satisfaction, Work Motivation, and Job Performance in an Industrial Company in Iran. *Procedia Social and Behavioural Sciences* (5), 1267-1272.
- Almaçık, Ü., Almaçık, E., Akçin, K., & Erat, S. (2012). Relationships between career motivation, affective commitment and job satisfaction. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 58, 355-362.
- Azeem, M. A. & Quddus, M. A. (2014). Job Satisfaction among Non-Teaching Employees of Universities in India- A Comparative Study. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 6(4).
- Bisheen, A. S. (2012). *A Study of Job Satisfaction among Non-Teaching Staff of Punjabi University Patiala*. A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the M.B.A., Punjabi University, Patiala, India.
- Celik, M. (2011). *A Theoretical Approach to the Job Satisfaction*. *Polish Journal of Management*, 4.
- Chowdhery, M. S., Alam, Z. & Ahmed, S. (2014). Understanding Employee Motivation: The Case of Non-Teaching Staff of a Public University. *British Journal of Marketing Studies*, 2(6), 17-24.
- Gupta, B., & Hyde, AM., (2013). Demographical Study on Quality of Work Life in Nationalized Banks. *Vision. The Journal of Business Perspective*, 17(3), 223-231.
- Gurkoo, F. A., (2011). *Human Resource Development in Universities*. Alfa Publication, New Delhi, India.
- Goldberg, L. R., (1990). An alternative" description of personality": the big-five factor structure. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 59(6), 1216.
- Heller, D. J., (2002). The confounding role of personality and trait affectivity in the relationship between job and life satisfaction. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 815-835.
- Hulin, C. L., & Judge, T. A., (2003). Job attitudes. In W. C. Borman, D. R. ligen, & R. J. Klimoski (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology: industrial and organizational psychology*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, 255-276.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R., (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16, 250-279.
- Judge, T. A., & Klinger, R., (2008). Job satisfaction: Subjective well-being at work. *The science of subjective well-being*, 393-413.
- Judge, T. A., Locke, E. A., & Durham, C. C., (1997). The dispositional causes of job satisfaction: A core evaluations approach. *Research in organizational behaviour*, 19, 151- 188.
- Lather, A. S., & Jain, S., (2005). *Motivation and Job Satisfaction- A Study of Associates of Public and Private Sector*. *Delhi Business Review*, 6(1).

- Locke, E. A., (1976). The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1297-1343.
- Mendoza, R. O., Laguador, J. M., & Buenviaje, M. G., (2014). Organizational Satisfaction and Work Engagement among Non-teaching Personnel of an Asian University. *Asian Journal of Management Sciences and Economics* 1(1).
- Prasad, L. M., (2011). *Organizational Behaviour*. Sultan Chand & Sons, New Delhi.
- Qureshi, M. I., Bashir, S., Saleem A., Javed A., Saadat U. R., & Safdar M. Z., (2013). Analysis of Various Determinants Which Affect on Job Performance: (A Case Study on Private and Public Universities Employees of DI Khan). *Gomal University Journal of Research*, 29(1).
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A., (2012). *Organizational Behaviour*. Dorling Kindersley (India) Pvt. Ltd.
- Rast, S., & Tourani, A., (2012). Evaluation of Employees' Job Satisfaction and Role of Gender Difference: An Empirical Study at Airline Industry in Iran. *International Journal of Business and Social Science* 3(7).
- Saari, L. M., & Judge, T. A., (2004). *Employee Attitude and Job Satisfaction*. Wiley Periodicals, Inc. 43(4).
- Saji, G., Tarek T, A., & Mohammad, I. T., (2014). Employee Satisfaction amongst Non-teaching Staff in Higher Educational Institution in Saudi Arabia: A Case Study of Salman Bin Abdul Aziz University. *MAGNT Research Report*
- Srivastava, S., (2013). Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment Relationship: Effect of Personality Variables. *Vision- The Journal of Business Perspective*, 17(2).
- Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L., (1969). The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Tella, A., Ayeni, C.O., & Popoola, S.O., (2007). Work Motivation, job satisfaction and organizational commitment of Library personnel in Academic and Research Libraries in O.Y.O. State Nigeria. *Practice of Library and philosophy*.
- Yuliarini, S., Mat N.K.N., & Kumar, P., (2012). Factors Affecting Employee Satisfaction among non-teaching staff in higher educational institutions in Malaysia. *American Journal of Economics*, 93-96.
- Yapa, P. M. S. P., Rathnayake, R. M., Senanayake, G. & Premakumar, P., (2014). Effect of Demographic Factors on Job Satisfaction of Non-Academic Staff in Universities. *Reshaping Management and Economic Thinking through Integrating Eco- Friendly and Ethical Practices Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Management and Economics, Faculty of Management and Finance, University of Ruhuna, Sri Lanka*.
- Wyatt Company (1989). National Work America Study Identified 12 dimensions of satisfaction: work organization, working conditions, communications, job performance and performance review, coworkers, supervision, company management, pay, benefits, career development and training, job content and satisfaction and company image and change.

Table (1) Demographic of Sample

Variable	Group	N	Percentage
Age (in Year)	20-29	14	14
	30-39	35	35
	40-49	18	18
	50-59	29	29
	60-69	4	4
Gender	Male	79	79
	Female	21	21
Post held in the organization	Registrar, assistant registrar, departmental officers	20	20
	Senior assistant, senior officer, clerks etc.	59	59
	Peon, gatekeeper, housekeeper, electricians, mali.	21	21
Educational qualification	Uneducated	1	1
	Up to 8 th standard	4	4
	Up to 10 th standard	6	6
	Up to 12 th standard	5	5
	Graduate	32	32
	Post-graduate	44	44
Marital status	Unmarried	15	15
	Married	84	84
	Divorce	-	-
	Widow	1	1
Longevity of job	0-10 years	46	46
	11-20years	21	21
	21-30years	19	19
	31-40years	12	12
	41-50years	2	2
Job nature	Permanent	56	56
	Contractual	44	44

Table (2) Nature of job and employee's job satisfaction

Dimensions of job satisfaction	Permanent job		Contractual job		t-value	Sign. 2-tailed
	Mean	S. D.	Mean	S. D.		
Salary	5.91	0.87	6.65	0.88	-4.206	0.000
Organizational commitment	9.37	0.96	9.54	1.30	-0.752	0.454
Promotion	4.25	0.81	4.36	0.78	-0.705	0.482
Job pressure	7.14	0.79	6.95	0.88	1.116	0.267
Work culture	10.89	0.98	11.40	1.36	-2.191	0.031
Total Scores	37.57	2.26	38.93	3.23	-2.473	0.015

Table (3) Gender and employee's job satisfaction

Dimensions of job satisfaction	Male		Female		t-value	Sign. 2-tailed
	Mean	S. D.	Mean	S. D.		
Salary	6.21	0.94	6.33	1.01	-0.502	0.617
Organizational commitment	9.49	1.18	9.28	0.84	0.753	0.453
Promotion	4.31	0.80	4.23	0.76	0.398	0.691
Job pressure	7.05	.86	7.09	0.76	-0.216	0.830
Work culture	11.03	1.24	11.42	0.92	-1.341	0.183
Total Score	38.11	2.93	38.38	2.24	-0.387	0.700

Table (4) Employee's age and their job satisfaction

Dimensions of job satisfaction	Employee's age group	Mean	S. D.	F Value	Sign.
Salary	20-29	6.50	1.01	2.136	0.082
	30-39	6.48	1.03		
	40-49	6.22	1.00		
	50-59	5.89	0.72		
	60-69	5.75	0.50		
Organizational commitment	20-29	9.35	1.21	0.343	0.848
	30-39	9.42	1.24		
	40-49	9.72	1.07		
	50-59	9.37	1.04		
	60-69	9.25	0.50		
Promotion	20-29	4.64	0.84	1.825	0.130
	30-39	4.11	0.71		
	40-49	4.44	0.78		
	50-59	4.34	0.81		
	60-69	3.75	0.95		
Job pressure	20-29	6.78	1.05	0.901	0.467
	30-39	7.00	0.90		
	40-49	7.05	0.80		
	50-59	7.27	0.70		
	60-69	7.00	0.00		
Work culture	20-29	10.78	1.36	2.823	0.029
	30-39	11.45	1.33		
	40-49	11.44	0.78		
	50-59	10.82	1.00		
	60-69	10.00	0.816		
Total Score	20-29	38.07	3.51	1.363	0.253
	30-39	38.48	2.91		
	40-49	38.88	2.69		
	50-59	37.72	2.35		
	60-69	35.75	1.25		

Table (5) Employee's organizational post and their job satisfaction

Dimensions of job satisfaction	Employee's post	Mean	S. D.	F -Value	Sign.
Salary	Group B	5.55	0.75	7.374	0.001
	Group C	6.40	0.96		
	Group D	6.42	0.81		
Organizational commitment	Group B	9.45	0.75	1.101	0.337
	Group C	9.33	1.16		
	Group D	9.76	1.26		
Promotion	Group B	4.35	0.81	0.094	0.910
	Group C	4.27	0.78		
	Group D	4.33	0.85		
Job pressure	Group B	7.10	0.64	0.028	0.972
	Group C	7.05	0.89		
	Group D	7.04	0.86		
Work culture	Group B	11.00	0.79	3.487	0.034
	Group C	10.94	1.23		
	Group D	11.71	1.23		
Total score	Group B	37.45	1.66	2.489	0.088
	Group C	38.01	2.83		
	Group D	39.28	3.30		

Table (6) Educational qualification and employees job satisfaction

Dimensions of job satisfaction	Educational qualification	Mean	S. D.	F-Value	Sign.
Salary	Uneducated	8.00	.	1.722	0.124
	Up to 8 th standard	6.00	0.00		
	Up to 10 th standard	5.83	0.75		
	Up to 12 th standard	6.60	1.14		
	Graduate	6.18	0.82		
	Post-graduate	6.38	0.99		
	Ph.D.	5.62	1.18		
Organizational commitment	Uneducated	10.00	-	0.751	0.610
	Up to 8 th standard	9.50	0.57		
	Up to 10 th standard	9.50	0.54		
	Up to 12 th standard	10.40	1.67		
	Graduate	9.31	1.11		
	Post-graduate	9.45	1.17		
	Ph.D.	9.25	1.03		
Promotion	Uneducated	5.00	-	2.525	0.026
	Up to 8 th standard	4.00	0.81		
	Up to 10 th standard	3.50	0.54		
	Up to 12 th standard	4.80	1.09		
	Graduate	4.18	0.82		
	Post-graduate	4.50	0.73		
	Ph.D.	4.00	0.53		
Job pressure	Uneducated	6.00	-	1.301	0.264
	Up to 8 th standard	7.50	0.57		
	Up to 10 th standard	7.50	0.54		
	Up to 12 th standard	6.60	1.14		
	Graduate	7.18	0.82		
	Post-graduate	6.93	0.87		

	Ph.D.	7.12	0.64		
Work culture	Uneducated	12.00	-	1.594	0.158
	Up to 8 th standard	11.25	.50		
	Up to 10 th standard	10.33	1.50		
	Up to 12 th standard	12.40	1.51		
	Graduate	11.06	1.07		
	Post-graduate	11.06	1.22		
	Ph.D.	11.25	0.88		
Total score	Uneducated	41.00	-	1.440	0.208
	Up to 8 th standard	38.25	1.50		
	Up to 10 th standard	36.66	1.86		
	Up to 12 th standard	40.80	4.65		
	Graduate	37.93	2.81		
	Post-graduate	38.34	2.81		
	Ph.D.	37.25	1.38		

Table (7) Employee's marital status and their job satisfaction

Dimensions of job satisfaction	Marital status	Mean	S. D.	F-Value	Sign.
Salary	Unmarried	6.4000	0.91026	0.269	0.765
	Married	6.21	0.97		
	Widow	6.00	-		
Organizational commitment	Unmarried	9.66	1.34	0.463	0.631
	Married	9.40	1.08		
	Widow	10.00	-		
Promotion	Unmarried	4.26	0.79	1.382	0.256
	Married	4.32	0.79		
	Widow	3.00	-		
Job pressure	Unmarried	6.86	1.06	0.470	0.626
	Married	7.09	0.80		
	Widow	7.00	-		
Work culture	Unmarried	10.93	1.16	0.467	0.628
	Married	11.14	1.20		
	Widow	12.00	-		
Total score of job satisfaction	Unmarried	38.13	2.77	0.003	0.997
	Married	38.17	2.83		
	Widow	38.00	-		

Table (8) Employee's job experience and their job satisfaction

Dimensions of job satisfaction	Job duration/longevity of job	Mean	S. D.	F-Value	Sign.
Salary	0-10	6.50	1.04	3.322	0.014
	11-20	6.33	0.73		
	21-30	6.00	0.94		
	31-40	5.50	0.52		
	41-50	6.00	0.00		
Organizational commitment	0-10	9.50	1.31	0.107	0.980
	11-20	9.42	1.02		
	21-30	9.42	1.07		
	31-40	9.41	0.66		
	41-50	9.00	0.00		
Promotion	0-10	4.34	0.82	0.858	0.492
	11-20	4.14	0.57		
	21-30	4.42	0.83		
	31-40	4.33	0.98		
	41-50	3.50	0.70		
Job pressure	0-10	6.91	0.98	0.951	0.438
	11-20	7.04	0.66		
	21-30	7.31	0.67		
	31-40	7.25	0.75		
	41-50	7.00	0.00		
Work culture	0-10	11.28	1.36	2.853	0.028
	11-20	11.14	0.85		
	21-30	11.36	1.11		
	31-40	10.33	0.65		
	41-50	9.50	0.70		
Total score of job satisfaction	0-10	38.54	3.34	1.652	0.168
	11-20	38.09	1.97		
	21-30	38.52	2.50		
	31-40	36.83	1.64		
	41-50	35.00	1.41		