



## **JOB SATISFACTION DETERMINANTS AND JOB PERFORMANCE IN IT COMPANIES: AN EMPIRICAL RESEARCH OF HYDERABAD CITY**

**Dr.V. N.Santhisree, MBA, Ph.D.**

*Professor & Principal, Manpower Development College, Osmania University.*

### **Abstract**

*This research article aims to “To study the impact of job satisfaction determinants on job performance of IT employees”. The paper applies data reduction using Confirmatory Factor Analysis on a sample of 455 respondents drawn from IT companies in the Hyderabad and condenses a set of 14 job satisfaction items converted into a four key attributes. The present study proposes a model of the impact of key attributes of job satisfaction on job performance. The study found that Training and employee developmental activity, supervision, work itself and promotion are impacting significantly the job performance. Therefore, IT companies should focus on the above factors to job performance of employees. The study investigated the impact of key attributes of job satisfaction on job performance of the IT employees concluded that Training and employee developmental activity had the highest impact on the job performance of the employees’ supervision, motivation followed by promotions.*

**Key words:** *Training and employee developmental activity, Supervision, Work itself, Promotion, Job Satisfaction and Job Performance.*

### **Introduction**

Job satisfaction has been characterized as a pleasurable passionate state coming about because of the evaluation of the person's work; an emotional response to person's work; and a mentality towards it. As job satisfaction is a generally investigated and complex marvel, it follows that there are various meanings of the idea. Job satisfaction can be characterized as a person's complete inclination about their work and the mentalities they have towards different viewpoints or aspects of their work, just as a disposition and discernment that could subsequently impact the level of fit between the individual and the association (Ivancevich and Matteson 2002; Spector 1997). An individual with high job satisfaction seems to hold commonly uplifting perspectives, and one who is disappointed to hold negative mentalities towards their work (Robbins 1993). Spector 1997) discloses that for scientists to comprehend these mentalities, they need to comprehend the perplexing and interrelated features of job satisfaction. An aspect of job satisfaction can be depicted as any piece of a task that produces sensations of satisfaction or dissatisfaction (Spector 1997). This viewpoint can be helpful to associations that wish to distinguish worker maintenance regions in which improvement is conceivable (Saari and Judge 2004; Westlund and Hannon 2008). Job satisfaction is an aftereffect of a person's insight and assessment of their work affected by their own exceptional requirements, qualities and assumptions, which they see as being critical to them (Sempane et al 2002). Consequently, job satisfaction is a bunch of positive or negative sentiments and feelings with which employees see their work. Job satisfaction is an emotional disposition and a sensation of relative like or aversion towards something. An individual has job satisfaction in the event that he prefers his work. Such an individual, clearly, has an uplifting perspective. It is hard to distinguish the specific factor that gives an individual job satisfaction. Job satisfaction commonly alludes to the perspectives of a solitary employee. Truth be told, various elements impact job satisfaction like Training and employee developmental activity, Nature of work, Decision making authority, Scope for drive, Opportunities for headway, Inter-individual connections, working conditions, and so on The principle objective of the investigation is to distinguish the key elements imagine job satisfaction among the employees of chose IT Company.



## Literature Review

Job Satisfaction and Job Performance were the main factors discussed in this study, hence literature was emphasized on providing theoretical background for the study and it facilitates to conceptualize the research context.

Job Satisfaction is one of the primary mentalities that can impact human conduct in the work place. Job Satisfaction is how much people feel decidedly or contrarily about their positions (Woods and Weasmer, 2008) and it is by and large perceived as a multi-layered build that incorporates employee sentiments about an assortment of both natural and extraneous occupation components. Along these lines, hierarchical conduct scientists are anxious to break down, comprehend and measure work satisfaction and its ramifications for individuals at work (Woods and Weasmer, 2008). Job satisfaction might be influenced by feeling related character attributes since work satisfaction has been likened with a pleasurable enthusiastic state (Locke, 1976). Character attributes are important for work decision and for being chosen and advanced by the association (Hogan, 1971). Likewise work satisfaction results from an individual's perspective on their work. This depends on workplace conditions like the mindset of seniors/directors, organization arrangements and cycle, working conditions and extra advantages (Gibson et al, 1979). Laborers will have high job satisfaction when they have uplifting outlooks toward such occupation factors like the actual work, acknowledgment and opportunity for progression (DuBrin, 1997). There are five occupation measurements addressing the main viewpoints that influence an employee job satisfaction. These incorporate the actual work, Training and employee developmental activity, advancement openings, oversight and collaborators (Luthans, 2002). Along these lines Training and employee developmental activity, Promotion, Supervision and Work Itself were taken as the components of job satisfaction of this exploration study.

Employees work satisfaction is emphatically connected to the organization's compensation framework (Greenberg and Baron, 1995). The general goal is to compensate individuals reasonably, impartially and reliably as per their worth to the association to additional the accomplishment of the associations vital objectives (Armstrong and Murlis, 1998). A reasonable and equivalent compensation framework would support work satisfaction (Lawler, 1981). Further, he makes statements, for example, rewards and yearly compensation augmentations would more empower employee occupation satisfaction. With the end goal of this examination, Training and employee developmental activity is characterized as the worker Training and employee developmental activity, which is sufficient for their ordinary costs. Consequently, Training and employee developmental activity is the principle marker of the element of installment. Aside from that it covers reward and compensation augments moreover. The worker is happy with the compensation and Training and employee developmental activity is given by the functioning encounters and equivalent to the work done. A few useful examinations have tracked down a solid positive connection between employee installment and job performance (Baron and Armstrong, 1998; Robbins and Decenzo, 2005).

Absence of advancements and other occupation improvements, like preparing, have a more antagonistic impact on work satisfaction than even extreme measures of work or low compensation (Shields and Ward, 2001). An employee's talent enlargement and status would urge them to search out advancements (Locke, 1976). Concerning that, advancements can be considered as a device by the board for expanding employees' inspiration and job satisfaction levels. Position progressions, producing positive good among employees and guaranteeing employer stability had an incredible capability of making worker work satisfaction (Gouws, 1995). It ought to be noticed that the individuals who may get advancements in an unmerited way, maybe through realized associations are probably going to make fractures among the



certified laborers. This thus can make work disappointment. With regards to this examination, advancement is characterized as the reasonable possibility for the worker to get advanced. Progression, resolve, worth and security were considered as the markers of the measurement advancement. Positive advancement perspectives hoist levels of job satisfaction and that will expand the employee job performance (Gouws,1995).

Great management is the way to keeping up high job satisfaction levels. In examples where managers connect with workers in undertakings which include more elevated levels of duty, employees are probably going to feel more esteemed consequently acquiring an idea of accomplishment and achievement (Glicken,2005). As per Trempe et al, (1985) workers who get regard and thought from their seniors are more satisfied than employees who experience in any case. Aside from that employees, for example, specialized groups would anticipate specialized oversight of their work; persistent premise specialized management and backing could produce satisfaction particularly among information laborers in various kinds of associations. For the setting of this examination, oversight can be characterized as how the chief treats the representative as far as acclaim, the representative's acceptable work, looking for the exhortation from the representative, understanding the idea of the representative's work just as giving the representative enough management and simultaneously depicting great a guide to the laborers. In this manner, the management measurement under work satisfaction variable was tried utilizing the markers of oversight of human relations and oversight of specialized relations. A successful boss gives help to staff workers in gathering their own and expert objectives inside the climate of the division and the foundation. This will create employee job satisfaction and result in elite. There are a few reasonable investigations that have tracked down a solid positive connection among management and job performance (Winston and Creamer, 1997).

The actual work alludes to the work space of the laborers and their discernment about the actual work that they are liable for. Oxford Advance Learner's Dictionary (1995), characterizes the actual work as "what is finished by someone". Additionally, the actual work likewise alludes to the work space of the specialists and their discernment about the actual work that they are answerable for. Cohen et al. (1999) distinguishes that capacity to use, accomplishment, action, authority, innovativeness, freedom, duty and assortment are simply the principle markers of worker work. And furthermore in his exploration, he referenced that work itself and it's anything but a positive relationship with worker work execution. The work or work will give the worker a pride and duty. The actual work alludes to the work space of the specialists and their discernment about the actual work that they are answerable for. The meaning of the actual work for this examination is the manner by which the representative sees their present work as fun, happy with, testing or regarded by others. Markers tried under the measurement work itself were capacity to usage, accomplishment, movement, authority, inventiveness, freedom, obligation, and assortment. A great deal of early examinations (Cohen, 1999; Randall and Cote, 1991) have discovered that work itself is a significant and persuasive easygoing variable, which has a positive relationship with hierarchical employees work performances.

### **Research Gap**

The literature review reveals that numerous revisions have followed on the relation amongst employee satisfaction and employee performance. (Sailaja. A, 2017) There is research gap about the relation between job satisfaction and job performance. There is an enormous range to make study that investigates by using of structural equation model for predicting the impact of job satisfaction on job performance of employees in Information Technology Industry. (Swetha. G, 2017) had mentioned the following area for further research. They have designated only middle level employees to study the



concept of job satisfaction and job performance. She was recommended creating a study covering all groups of employees predominantly in IT sector by making an allowance for a large sample of respondents.

Afterwards the identification of research gaps, researcher has nominated the topic on structural equation model for predicting the impact of job satisfaction on job performance of employees in Information Technology Industry.

### **Research Problem**

Organizations at this cutthroat epoch, is in a strong intention of hiring of and retaining the most suitable employees. In order to accomplish this purpose, performance evaluation has become a strong necessity for both the employees and employers in different senses. On evaluating employees in consonance with their professional and social aspects, numerous psychological and behavioral features are also to be accounted into. In a competitive business environment prevails all over the globe, this process of evaluation has emerged into a superior dimension of assisting and managing the performance of employees. This approach invariably estimates the worthy contributions of an employee on the whole and thereby acknowledges the imperative relationship of performance with employees' psychological factors like job satisfaction, emotional intelligence, organizational citizenship behavior, work motivation, professional integrity, etc. This research tries to identify the impacts of job satisfaction dimensions on job performance of employees of the IT Industry. It investigates the relationship between the dimensions of job satisfaction and the job performance of the respondents and thereby to cross check whether the former influences the latter in a positive sense or not.

### **Research Objective**

1. To identify the determinants of job satisfaction in IT industry.
2. To measure the impact determinants of job satisfaction on job performance in IT industry.

### **Research Hypothesis**

**Ho1:** There is no significant relationship between employee opined determinants of job satisfaction on job performance.

- **Ho<sub>1.1</sub>:** There is no significant relationship between employee opined Training and employee developmental activity on job performance.
- **Ho<sub>1.2</sub>:** There is no significant relationship between employee opined motivation on job performance.
- **Ho<sub>1.3</sub>:** There is no significant relationship between employee opined working environment on job performance.
- **Ho<sub>1.4</sub>:** There is no significant relationship between employee opined promotion on job performance.

### **Statistical Tools**

- Reliability Test
- Exploratory Factor Analysis
- Multiple Linear Regression



### Research methodology

Purpose of this study was hypothesis testing as this study was conduct to establish and explain the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance. The type of the investigation was correlational since the study has conducted in no contrived settings. The unit of study in this research was an individual. Specifically, IT professionals since the data were gathered from IT employees of a well-recognized IT Companies in Hyderabad city.

The study was conducted with the help of self-administered questionnaires which prepared according to the measures of above mentioned dimensions. Five point Likert scale was used to weight from strongly disagree to strongly agree and the questionnaires were distributed personally, mailed to the respondents, and electronically distributed. Total IT employees working in the mentioned company was the population of this research study. There were 455 IT employees working in this organization and 286 employees were selected to the sample by using simple random sampling technique (lottery method). The questionnaire method was chosen for data collection purpose assuming anonymity of the respondents. The collected data was analyzed by statistical data analysis package, SPSS version 20.0

### Data Analysis & Results

#### Reliability Test

**Table: 1. Case Processing Summary**

|   |                       | N   | %     |
|---|-----------------------|-----|-------|
| Cases   | Valid                 | 455 | 100.0 |
|   | Excluded <sup>a</sup> | 0   | .0    |
|   | Total                 | 455 | 100.0 |
| a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure. |                       |     |       |

**Table: 2. Reliability Statistics**

| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
|------------------|------------|
| 0.860            | 16         |

The internal consistency of the questionnaire of 16 questions with a value of the Cronbach's Alpha is 0.860, which shows that data is 86.0 per cent reliable and valid.

#### Exploratory Factor Analysis

**Table: 3. KMO and Bartlett's Test**

| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy. |                    | 0.851    |
|--|--------------------|----------|
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity                    | Approx. Chi-Square | 2714.973 |
|  | Df                 | 120      |
|  | Sig.               | 0.000    |

Before proceeding for factor analysis the eligibility of the data has to be tested by conducting KMO-Bartlett's test. This test is a measure of sampling adequacy and multivariate normality among variables. The KMO value in this study is  $0.851 > 0.5$  which says that the sample taken is adequate. Bartlett's Test of Sphericity value is  $0.000 < 0.05$ , indicate multi normality among variables. Hence Factor Analysis is considered as an appropriate technique for further analysis of the data.



### Eigen Values

The initial components are the numbers of the variables used in the Factor Analysis. However, not all the 16 variables will be retained. In the present research, only the 4 factors will be extracted by combining the relevant variables. The Eigenvalues are the variances of the factors. The total column contains the Eigenvalue. The first factor will always account for the most variance and hence have the highest Eigenvalues. The next factor will account for as much of the leftover variance as it can and the same will continue till the last factor. The percentage of variance represents the per cent of total variance accounted for by each factor and the cumulative percentage gives the cumulative percentage of variance account by the present and the preceding factors. In the present research, the first 4 factors explain 62.150 per cent of the variance. The rotation sums of the squared loading represent the distribution of the variance after the varimax rotation with Kaiser Normalization. The varimax rotation tries to maximize the variance of each of the factor.

**Table: 4. Total Variance Explained**

| Component | Initial Eigenvalues |               |              | Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings |               |              | Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings |               |              |
|-----------|---------------------|---------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|--------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|--------------|
|           | Total               | % of Variance | Cumulative % | Total                               | % of Variance | Cumulative % | Total                             | % of Variance | Cumulative % |
| 1         | 5.303               | 33.145        | 33.145       | 5.303                               | 33.145        | 33.145       | 3.015                             | 18.844        | 18.844       |
| 2         | 1.967               | 12.294        | 45.439       | 1.967                               | 12.294        | 45.439       | 2.724                             | 17.026        | 35.871       |
| 3         | 1.483               | 9.269         | 54.708       | 1.483                               | 9.269         | 54.708       | 2.205                             | 13.780        | 49.651       |
| 4         | 1.191               | 7.442         | 62.150       | 1.191                               | 7.442         | 62.150       | 2.000                             | 12.499        | 62.150       |
| 5         | .910                | 5.685         | 67.835       |                                     |               |              |                                   |               |              |
| 6         | .810                | 5.065         | 72.900       |                                     |               |              |                                   |               |              |
| 7         | .613                | 3.831         | 76.732       |                                     |               |              |                                   |               |              |
| 8         | .559                | 3.494         | 80.226       |                                     |               |              |                                   |               |              |
| 9         | .514                | 3.214         | 83.440       |                                     |               |              |                                   |               |              |
| 10        | .480                | 3.003         | 86.443       |                                     |               |              |                                   |               |              |
| 11        | .434                | 2.714         | 89.157       |                                     |               |              |                                   |               |              |
| 12        | .417                | 2.605         | 91.762       |                                     |               |              |                                   |               |              |
| 13        | .396                | 2.473         | 94.235       |                                     |               |              |                                   |               |              |
| 14        | .353                | 2.209         | 96.443       |                                     |               |              |                                   |               |              |
| 15        | .315                | 1.969         | 98.412       |                                     |               |              |                                   |               |              |
| 16        | .254                | 1.588         | 100.000      |                                     |               |              |                                   |               |              |

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

On the basis of Varimax Rotation with Kaiser Normalization, 4 factors have been extracted. Each factor is constituted of all those variables that have factor loadings greater than 0.5. 14 variables were clubbed into 4 factors. 4 factors were extracted from the 14 variables used in the study. These 4 extracted factors explained 62.150 per cent of the variability in determinants of Job Satisfaction.

### Rotated Component Matrix

The Rotated Component Matrix represents the rotated factor loadings, which are the correlations between the variables and the factors. The factor column represents the rotated factors that have been extracted out of the total factor. These are the core factors, which have been used as the final factor after data reduction.



**Table: 5. Rotated Component Matrix**

| Factor No | Variable Covered   | Factor Loading Value | Name of the Factor                           |
|-----------|--|----------------------|--|
| 1         | Sponsorship by the company for various trainings and conferences.  | .773                 | Training and employee developmental activity |
|           | Amount of freedom to decide how to do my work assigned.  | .772                 |  |
|           | The way the work competence is recognized.   | .721                 |  |
|           | Due recognition given to the development of employees.   | .687                 |  |
| 2         | Employees' acquaintance with the changing procedures and regulations of the company through refresher / Orientation courses. | .824                 | Promotion                                    |
|           | Opportunities for Promotion / Career advancement with clarity of rules and regulations.                                      | .779                 |  |
|           | Nature of work assigned.   | .758                 |  |
|           | Inter-personal relationship.   | .594                 |  |
| 3         | Challenges in the job.   | .729                 | Working environment                          |
|           | Conducive working environment.   | .723                 |  |
|           | Superior –subordinate relationship.  | .673                 |  |
| 4         | The adjustability and suitability of work timings.   | .767                 | Motivation                                   |
|           | Opportunities to use my skills and abilities.  | .735                 |  |
|           | Participation in decision-making.  | .587                 |  |

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.  
 Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.  
 a. Rotation converged in 6 iterations.

**Multiple Linear Regressions**

In order to access the impact of independent variables on job performance as a dependent variable, enter a method of multiple regressions was applied.

**Table: 6. Model Summary<sup>b</sup>**

| Model | R                 | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Durbin-Watson |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|---------------|
| 1     | .737 <sup>a</sup> | .544     | .539              | .636                       | 1.628         |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Training and employee developmental activity, Promotion, Motivation, Working environment.  
 b. Dependent Variable: Job Performance.

**The regression table 6: summarizes the model performance through the following statistics.**

- **R:** R represents the multiple correlations co-efficient with the range lies between -1 and +1. Since the R-value is 0.737 means that there is a high positive relationship between the determinants of job satisfaction and job performance of IT employees.



- **R Square:**  $R^2$  represents the coefficient of determination which lies between 0 and 1. Since the R square value is 0.544 i.e. 54.4 per cent of the explained variation is there in the job satisfaction determinants.
- **Durbin-Watson statistic:** From the above table 6 the Durbin-Watson statistic value is 1.628. It is closer to the standard value 2. So, that the assumption has almost certainly been met.

**Table: 7. ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

| Model |            | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F       | Sig.              |
|-------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|---------|-------------------|
| 1     | Regression | 216.718        | 4   | 54.180      | 133.949 | .000 <sup>b</sup> |
|       | Residual   | 182.016        | 450 | .404        |         |                   |
|       | Total      | 398.734        | 454 |             |         |                   |

a. Dependent Variable: Job Performance.  
 b. Predictors: (Constant), Training and employee developmental activity, Promotion, Motivation, Working environment.

The ANOVA (Table 7) reveals that the F statistics of the regression model is statically significant at 0.05 levels implying the goodness of fit of the regression equation. (Model is statistically significant).

**Table: 8. Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

| Model |  | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | T     | Sig. |
|-------|--|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|-------|------|
|       |  | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |       |      |
|       | (Constant)                                   | .642                        | .139       |                           | 4.632 | .000 |
|       | Training and employee developmental activity | .213                        | .035       | .236                      | 6.047 | .000 |
|       | Work-Itself                                  | .224                        | .033       | .274                      | 6.880 | .000 |
|       | Working environment                          | .252                        | .034       | .289                      | 7.323 | .000 |
|       | Promotion                                    | .155                        | .032       | .168                      | 4.783 | .000 |

a. Dependent Variable: Job Performance.

Table 8 denotes standardized regression coefficients which show the strength of impact and its positive/negative direction. It also comprises of t and significant values to validate the hypothesis framed to measure the significant impact of determinants of job satisfaction on job performance of IT employees.

**The multiple regression equation of this model is:**

$$Y = 0.236 (\text{Training and employee developmental activity}) + 0.274 (\text{Work – Itself}) + 0.289 (\text{Working environment}) + 0.168 (\text{Promotion}) + 0.642 (\text{Constant})$$





***H<sub>01.1</sub>*: There is no significant relationship between employee opined Training and employee developmental activity on job performance.**

Table 8, shows Beta value as 0.236 which indicates positive impact of Training and employee developmental activity on job performance. Since t, value is 6.047 and sig. value is 0.000 which is less than 0.05 hence Training and employee developmental activity has a significant impact on job performance of IT professionals. Hence, null hypothesis  $H_{01.1}$ : stating that there is no significant relationship between employee opined Training and employee developmental activity on job performance is rejected.

***H<sub>01.2</sub>*: There is no significant relationship between employee opined motivation on job performance.**

Table 8, shows Beta value as 0.274 which indicates positive impact of motivation on job performance. Since t, value is 6.880 and sig. value is 0.001 which is less than 0.05 hence motivation has a significant impact on job performance of IT professionals. Hence, null hypothesis  $H_{01.2}$ : stating that there is no significant relationship between employee opined motivation on job performance is rejected.

***H<sub>01.3</sub>*: There is no significant relationship between employee opined working environment on job performance.**

Table 8, shows Beta value as 0.289 which indicates positive impact of working environment on job performance. Since t, value is 7.323 and sig. value is 0.000 which is less than 0.05 hence working environment has a significant impact on job performance of IT professionals. Hence, null hypothesis  $H_{01.3}$ : stating that there is no significant relationship between employee opined working environment on job performance is rejected.

***H<sub>01.4</sub>*: There is no significant relationship between employee opined promotion on job performance.**

Table 8, shows Beta value as 0.168 which indicates positive impact of promotion on job performance. Since t, value is 4.783 and sig. value is 0.001 which is less than 0.05 hence promotion has a significant impact on job performance of IT professionals. Hence, null hypothesis  $H_{01.4}$ : stating that there is no significant relationship between employee opined promotion on job performance is rejected.

**Suggestions**

1. There was a positive concern from the higher officials of the organization for initiating the mentorship program which can take care of improving the satisfaction level of employees. It was also found that the confidence level of the employees who were subjected to the mentoring program was below expectation. More mentoring program can be put forwarded by the employer to up skill the employees, re-engineer their capabilities, efficiency and moral which will further help in building up a Healthy organization.
2. When employees are engrossed in their work and they have an emotions attached with their organization, their work. Task or the work given should neither be burden nor get monotonous an individual should enjoy his / her work.
3. It is always said when an employee is involved in decision making he feel motivated and start getting connected with the organization which future impact positively on his performances.



## Conclusion

This study discovered that the level of job satisfaction dimensions (Training and employee developmental activity, promotion, supervision and work itself) of the IT employees were satisfied with the job they performed and also there were positive correlations exist between the job performance and each of the four job satisfaction dimensions. There can be a lot of factors that can create a performance drop of the IT employees. Some of them can be organizational commitment, job involvement, work environment conditions, work ethics, proper skills set, hygiene and Motivation al factors, etc. Among those various factors that influence the job performance, the job satisfaction dimensions of this study (Training and employee developmental activity, promotion, supervision and motivation) affect the job performance of IT employees. Thus, it should Training and employee developmental activity considerable attention to the IT employees' job satisfaction and a change in satisfaction dimension brings a significant change to the job performance.

## References

1. Armstrong, M. & Baron, A. (1998) Performance management: the new realities. London: Institute of Personnel and Development.
2. Cohen, D., & Vandello, J. (1999). Patterns of individualism and collectivism across the United States. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 279-292.
3. DuBrin, A. (1997). *Fundamentals of Organizational Behavior*, South-Western College Publishing. 44 - 45.
4. DuBrin, A. (1997). *Fundamentals of Organizational Behavior*, South-Western College Publishing. 44-45.
5. Gibson, J., Ivancevich, J., & Donnelly, J. (1979). *Organizations* (3rd Ed). Business Publications Inc, 61 – 67
6. Gouws, A. (1995). The relationship between motivation and job satisfaction of a group of information specialists. Rand Afrikaans University, Johannesburg.
7. Greenberg, J., & Baron, R. (1995). *Behavior in organizations*, 5th ed. Prentice-Hall.
8. Hogan, R. (1971). Personality Characteristics of Highly Rated Policemen, *Personnel Psychology*, 24, 679-686.
9. Ivancevich, J. & Matteson, M. 2002. *Organizational Behavior and Management* (6th edition). New York: McGraw-Hill.
10. Lawler, E. (1981). Training and employee developmental activity and Organization Development. Addison-Wesley.
11. Locke, E. (1976). Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction. In *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology in MD Dunnette, Rand McNally.*, (1297–1349).
12. Luthans, F. (2002). *Organizational Behavior* (9th Ed), McGraw-Hill Companies Inc. 224 – 230.
13. Robbins, S. (1993), “Organizational Behavior: Concepts, Controversies, and Applications”, Prentice Hall, New Jersey, 6th edition.
14. Robbins, S.P., & Decenzo, D.A. (2005). *Fundamentals of Human Resource Management*. Jon Willey & Sons Inc, 2nd Ed.
15. Saari, L. & Judge, T. (2004), “Employee attitudes and job satisfaction”, *Human Resource Management*. 43(4), 395-407.
16. Sempane, M., Rieger, H. & Roodt, G. (2002), “Job satisfaction in relation to organizational culture”, *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*. 28 (2), 23-30.
17. Shields, M., & Ward, M. (2001). Improving nurse retention in the National Health Service in England: the impact of job satisfaction on intention to quit. *Journal of Health Economics*.



18. Spector, P. (1997), "Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes and Consequences. California, Sage publications".
19. Trempe, J., Rigny, A.J., & Haccoun, R. R. (1985). Subordinate satisfaction with male and female managers: Role of perceived Working environment influence. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol 70(1), 44-47.
20. Westlund, S. & Hannon, J. (2008), "Retaining talent: assessing job satisfaction facets most significantly related to IT developer turnover intentions", *Journal of Information Technology Management*.19 (4), 1-15.
21. Winston, R.B. & Creamer, D.G. (1997) *Improving Practices in Student Affairs*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
22. Woods, A. M., & Weasmer, J. (2002). Maintaining job satisfaction: Engaging professionals as active participants. *The Clearing House*. 75(4), 186-189.