

THE MOTIVATIONAL FACTORS AND JOB SATISFACTION: A STUDY ON SELECTED PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTOR BANK EMPLOYEES IN KADAPA DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH

S.Md.Azash

Associate Professor, Annamacharya
Institute of Technology and
Sciences, Rajampet, Kadapa District A.P.,
India

Ramesh Safare

Associate Professor, Annamacharya
P.G. College of Management
Studies, Rajampet, Kadapa District A.P.,
India

M.Sudheer Kumar

Associate professor, Rajiv Gandhi Memorial College of Engineering
Technology, Nandyal, Kurnool District A.P., India.

ABSTRACT

Job satisfaction is closely related to the gratification of needs. It is composed of effective cognitive and behavioral elements. These elements vary in their intensity and consistency from one individual to another. Thus, job satisfaction is the satisfaction derived from any pursuit directed by the process of fulfillment of needs.

In this study an investigation is made to study the motivational factors and job satisfaction of selected bank employees. This study is based on Harold Koontz Need-Want-Satisfaction Model and Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory. These researches investigate motivational factors that affect the job satisfaction and weighting of motivational factors which are considered important at work? The collected data are tabulated, coded and analyzed with the help of SPSS (17 version). The principal statistical tools used for data analysis consist of both descriptive and inferential statistics among Mean, Standard Deviation, T-Test were used. The investigation results reveal that there is a significant difference among public and private sector bank employees with regard to various motivational factors.

Keywords: Harold Koontz Need-Want-Satisfaction Model, Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory, Job Satisfaction.

INTRODUCTION:

Satisfaction in work/job to a large extent is the perceived relationship between what one expects and obtains from one's job and how much importance or value attribute to it. If a person receives what he expects from the job, naturally the work he performs gives him pleasure and satisfaction. On the other hand, if a person is unable to fulfill his expectations from the job, dissatisfaction creeps in. Low job satisfaction is a sign of deterioration in the efficiency of work organization. In its sinister forms, it lurks behind wild cat strike, slow downs, absenteeism and employee turnover. It may also be a part of grievances, low productivity, disciplinary problems and other organization difficulties. On the other hand, high job satisfaction of employees is a happy sign for the employer for it is connected with those positive conditions which management wants.

LITERATURE REVIEW:

The term job satisfaction has been given different connotation by different authorities on the subject. (Hoppock, 1935,) was the first industrial psychologist to provide a logical definition to the concept of "job satisfaction". He defined job satisfaction as "any combination of psychological, physiological and environment circumstances that cause a person truthfully to say, "I am satisfied with my job".

According to Smith P.C. et al. job satisfaction refers to "feelings or affective responses to facets of the situation, associated with perceived differences between what is expected and what is experienced". (Smith, 1955.)

According to (Locke, 1976,) "job satisfaction is a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experience"

(Vroom, 1978) Viewed job satisfaction as "the positive orientation of an individual towards all aspects of the work situation"

"The favorableness or unfavorableness with which employees view their work. It results when there is a fit between job characteristics and wants of employees. It expresses the amount congruence between one's expectations of the job and rewards that the job provides" (Davis, 1977).

According to (Blum, 1968) "job satisfaction is the result of many attitudes possessed by an employee. It is a general attitude which is result of many specific attitudes in three areas namely (i) job factors; (ii) individual characteristics; and (iii) group relations outside the job".

Glisson and Durick (1988) reported that worker characteristics predict commitment but play no role in predicting satisfaction and emphasized on job characteristics as determinants of job satisfaction. (Charles Glisson, 1988) Nathan et.al, (1991) revealed that significant interaction, interpersonal relations, opportunity to participate and career discussion affected subordinate satisfaction with the organization (Barry R Nathan, 1991). A U shaped curvilinear association between age and job satisfaction which characterize the form of relationship of the job satisfaction measures (K. Michele Kacmar and Gerald R. Ferris, 1989). Mediated and interactive associations among prior absenteeism, supervisory style, attitudinal variables, personal characteristics and subsequent absenteeism. They revealed that job satisfaction and absenteeism was negatively related (Stephen J Zaccaro, 1991). Role overload, role conflict and non-profitability are negatively and significantly related to job satisfaction (Dhillon, 1991).

Work identification will be affected by several personal-personality, job and organizational variables (Dolke A.M., 1991). Level of job satisfaction (dissatisfaction) as a function of the experience of person within the organization (Baldev R Sharma, 1991). Promotion gap as a significant potential source for job dissatisfaction (Sease, 1992). Age correlated significantly with promotion, experience and job satisfaction (Pandey, 1992). Promotion correlated positively but moderately with experience and positively and significantly with job satisfaction (Cheri Ostroff, 1992). Satisfaction is positively related to productivity and more productive people are more satisfied as a consequence rather than that satisfaction cause productivity (Jeffrey Feffer, 1993).

Job perception of employees will stream from actual condition of work (Johan E. Mathieu, 1993). Simple, routine and unchallenging jobs often lead to high employees' dissatisfaction (Davis, 1957). Job enlargement leads to job satisfaction (Biganne, 1964). Employees with the stronger need for growth react more positively to enrich their job than those who had weak needs (Sims, 1974). Identify factors of job satisfaction of workers (Bose, 1951). Test the applicability of Herzberg's two-factor theory (Lahiri, 1967).

Maintenance factors such as job security, company working conditions etc., were satisfiers and motivation to middle level managers (Sawalapurkar, 1968). Job context and job content factors were not independent of each other as a source of employees satisfaction and dissatisfaction (Chowadary, 1966). Motivation-hygiene theory is applicable to Indian context (S. Saiyaddin, 1970). Motivators contributed significantly more towards satisfaction than hygiene factors in public enterprises, whereas in the case of private sector enterprises motivators contributed significantly more towards the feeling of dissatisfaction than hygiene factors (G., 1972).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN:

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY:

- To find out the motivational factors that affect the job satisfaction of selected private and public sector bank employees.
- To find out important motivational factors which are considered by public and private sector bank employees

HYPOTHESIS OF THE STUDY:

- H1: There is equal preference of achievement as a motivational factor by public and private sector bank employees
- H2: There is equal preference of recognition as a motivational factor by public and private sector bank employees.
- H3: There is equal preference of work itself as a motivational factor by public and private sector bank employees
- H4: There is equal preference of responsibility as a motivational factor by public and private sector bank employees
- H5: There is equal preference of advancement as a motivational factor by public and private sector bank employees
- H6: there is equal preference of interpersonal relations as a motivational factor by public and private sector bank employees
- H7: There is equal preference of supervision a motivational factor by public and private sector bank employees
- H8: There is equal preference of policy of bank as a motivational factor by public and private sector bank employees
- H9: There is equal preference of working conditions as a motivational factor by public and private sector bank employees
- H10: There is equal preference of personal life as a motivational factor by public and private sector bank employees

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK:

The conceptual framework for this study is based on Harold Koontz's Need-Want-Satisfaction model and the Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory. Job satisfaction and dissatisfaction were found to stem from different sources. Certain factors lead to satisfaction when they are present and dissatisfaction when they are absent. In particular, dissatisfaction was associated with condition surrounding the job (e.g., working condition, pay, security, quality of surrounding the job, relation with others) rather than work itself. Satisfaction was associated with the work itself or outcomes directly such as nature of the jobs, achievement in the work, promotion opportunities and chance for personal growth and recognition.

RESEARCH DESIGN:

The study was a project of descriptive nature. The main tool of the research based on self administrated questionnaire. The target population of this research was the selected bank employees in Kadapa District, Andhra Pradesh and stratified random sampling technique were used. The sample size consists of 196 bank employees working in both in public and private banks sector in Kadapa District.

RESEARCH INSTRUMENT RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY:

The self administered questionnaire were used in this study it is divided into two parts, part-I deals with personal characteristics and part-II consists of 23 questions were used to determine how each public and private sector bank employees perceived the ten motivational factors influencing his or her job satisfaction, question number 23 was specially used for the weighting of the importance of the motivational factors and perceived overall job satisfaction. Questionnaire was constructed as a Likert Scale with five choices from highly satisfied to highly dissatisfy. The instrument was tested for validity and reliability by using Cronbach Alpha Coefficient is .74 points of reliability.

DATA ANALYSIS:

In this research both descriptive and inferential statistics were used among them Frequency, per centage, Mean,

Standard Deviation, Minimum and Maximum, T-Test.

FINDING AND IMPLICATIONS:

The results shows that out of 196 respondents 110(56.1%) are public sector bank employees and rest of 86 (43.9%) are private sector employees, with regard to personal characteristics of sample respondents majority of 170 (86.7%) are male, 26(13.3) are female. The mean age of respondents is 38.59 and SD 7.357.the large number of respondents are from sub-staff category 50 %(n=98), clerks are 32.7 %(n=64) and rest of them are managers 17.3%(n=34).the analysis reveals that the mean experience is 7.30 and SD is 3.33. The respondent are in terms of education qualification are grouped in three categories intermediates 52 %(n=102), graduates 43.9% (n=86) and rest of them have post-graduation 4.1 %(n=8).

The table No 1 to 10 reveals t-test for ten motivational factors. The results reveal that achievement as motivational factor are equally perceived by both public and privates sector employees. It is based on (p value .518>0.005) therefore, we can accept the null hypothesis. For recognition as motivational factors (p value .137>0.005) hence, we accept the second null hypothesis, for work itself (p value .501>0.005), accept null hypothesis, responsibility (p value .026>0.005) therefore, null hypothesis is accepted, for advancement (p value .005<0.005) hence, we can reject the null hypothesis both public and private sector bank employees are not equally perceived advancement as a source of motivation to them.

The t-test result for interpersonal relationship (p value .331>0.005) therefore, we can accept the null hypothesis that interpersonal relations is source of satisfaction for both public and private sector employees. For supervision (p value .000<0.005) this result supported the alternative hypothesis supervision is not as a source of satisfaction for them. It is already stated in Herzberg's two-factor theory, the supervision is under hygiene factor it is not a potential source of satisfaction. For bank policy (p value .779>0.005) null hypothesis is accepted, working conditions (p value .001<0.005) therefore, null hypothesis is rejected this finding is not supported two-factor theory working conditions are also have a considerable influence on job satisfaction, for personal life (p value .479>0.005) therefore, null hypothesis is accepted all the above said t-test are carried out at 5% significance levels.

Table No1: Independent Sample T Test For Achievement As Motivation Factor

Motivational Factor		Leven's Test of Equality of Variances		T Test For Equality Of Means					Group Statistics		
		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig.(2-Tailed)	Mean Difference	Std.Error Difference	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Achievement	Equal Variance Assumed	.327	.568	.648	194	.518	.10507	.16216	4.5818 4.4767	1.11192 1.14508	.10602 .12348
	Equal Variance Not Assume			.646	180.164	.519	.10507	.16275			

Table No. 2: Independent Sample T Test For Recognition As Motivation Factor

Motivational Factor		Leven's Test Of Equality Of Variances		T Test For Equality Of Means					Group Statistics		
		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig.(2-Tailed)	Mean Difference	Std.Error Difference	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Recognition	Equal Variance Assumed	2.22	.138	-1.79	194	.074	-.39387	.21896	3.5364 3.9302	1.43787 1.62184	.13710 .17489

	Equal Variance Not Assumed			-1.77	171.1	.078	-.39387	.22222			
--	-------------------------------------	--	--	-------	-------	------	---------	--------	--	--	--

Table No. 3: Independent Sample T Test For Work Itself As Motivation Factor

Motivational factor		Leven's test of equality of variances		T test for equality of means					Group statistics		
		f	Sig.	t	df	Sig.(2- tailed)	Mean difference	Std.Error Difference	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
work itself	Equal variance assumed	.455	.501	-.516	194	.606	-.12702	.23377	3.8909 4.0116	1.67192 1.56050	.15941 .16827
	Equal variance not assume			-.521	187.96	.603	-.12702	.23179			

Table No. 4: Independent Sample T Test For Responsibility As Motivation Factor

Motivational Factor		Leven's test of equality of variances		T test for equality of means					Group statistics		
		f	Sig.	t	df	Sig.(2- tailed)	Mean difference	Std.Error Difference	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Responsibility	Equal variance assumed	5.005	.026	-1.258	194	.210	-28584	.22722	3.6909 3.9767	1.65205 1.47908	.15752 .15949
	Equal variance not assume			-1.275	190.4	.204	-28584	.22416			

Table No5: Independent Sample T Test For Advancement As Motivation Factor

Motivational Factor		Leven's Test of Equality of Variances		T Test For Equality Of Means					Group statistics		
		f	Sig.	t	df	Sig.(2- tailed)	Mean difference	Std.Error Difference	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Advancement	Equal variance assumed	7.923	.005	1.794	194	.074	.35201	.19620	4.3636 4.0116	1.21706 1.53005	.11604 .16499

	Equal variance not assume			1.745	159.465	.083	.35201	.20171			
--	------------------------------------	--	--	-------	---------	------	--------	--------	--	--	--

Table No 6: Independent Sample T Test For Interpersonal Relations As Motivation Factor

Motivational Factor		Leven's test of equality of variances		T test for equality of means					Group statistics		
		f	Sig.	t	df	Sig.(2- tailed)	Mean difference	Std.Error Difference	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Interpersonal Relations	Equal variance assumed	.949	.331	-.560	194	.576	-.12304	.21959	4.1909 4.3140	1.57093 1.46538	.14978 .15802
	Equal variance not assume			-.565	188.007	.573	-.12304	.21772			

Table No7: Independent Sample T Test For Recognition As Motivation Factor

Motivational Factor		Leven's test of equality of variances		T test for equality of means					Group statistics		
		f	Sig.	t	df	Sig.(2- tailed)	Mean difference	Std.Error Difference	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Supervision	Equal variance assumed	26.167	.000	-4.233	194	.000	-.98922	.23371	3.3364 4.3256	1.76758 1.41788	.16853 .15289
	Equal variance not assume			-4.347	193.860	.000	-.98922	.22755			

Table No 8: Independent Sample T Test For Policy As Motivation Factor

Motivational Factor		Leven's Test Of Equality Of Variances		T Test For Equality Of Means					Group Statistics		
		f	Sig.	t	df	Sig.(2- tailed)	Mean difference	Std.Error Difference	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Policy	Equal Variance Assumed								4.0818 4.1860	1.42798 1.40178	.13615 .15116
	Equal Variance Not Assume										

Table No 9: Independent Sample T Test For Working Conditions As Motivation Factor

Motivational Factor		Leven's Test Of Equality Of Variances		T Test For Equality Of Means					Group Statistics		
		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig.(2-Tailed)	Mean Difference	Std.Error Difference	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Working Conditions	Equal Variance Assumed	12.005	.001	.434	194	.665	.09091	.20953	4.0909 4.0000	1.29605 1.63779	.12357 .17661
	Equal Variance Not Assume			.422	158.902	.674	.09091	.21555			

Table No10: Independent Sample T Test For Personal Life As Motivation Factor

Motivational Factor		Leven's Test Of Equality Of Variances		T Test For Equality Of Means					Group Statistics		
		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-Tailed)	Mean Difference	Std.Error Difference	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Personal Life	Equal Variance Assumed	.504	.479	-.469	194	.640	-.10825	.23094	4.0545 4.1628	1.63020 1.57077	.15543 .16938
	Equal Variance Not Assumed			-.471	185.727	.638	-.10825	.22989			

Table No 11 shows that weighting of important motivational factors perceived by the public sector bank employees achievement(4.5818),advancement(4.3636),interpersonal relations(4.1909),working conditions (4.0909),policy (4.0818),personal life (4.0545),work itself (3.8909),responsibility(3.6909),recognition (3.5364)and supervision (3.3364) this results shows that there is mix of both motivational and hygiene factors are sources of job satisfaction as well as job dissatisfaction.

Table No 12 reveals the important motivational factors perceived by private sector bank employees achievement (4.4767),interpersonal relations(4.3140),supervision (4.3256),policy (4.1860),personal life (4.1628),advancement(4.0116),work itself (4.0116), working conditions (4.0000) ,responsibility (3.9767),and recognition (3.9302).

Table No11: Important Motivational Factors Perceived By Public Sector Employees (N=110)

S.No	Motivational factors	Mean	Std.Deviation	Rank
1	Achievement	4.5818	1.11192	1
2	Recognition	3.5364	1.43787	9
3	Work It Self	3.8909	1.67192	7
4	Responsibility	3.6909	1.65205	8
5	Advancement	4.3636	4.3636	2
6	Interpersonal Relations	4.1909	1.57093	3
7	Supervision	3.3364	1.76758	10
8	Policy	4.0818	1.42798	5
9	Working Conditions	4.0909	1.29605	4
10	Personal Life	4.0545	1.63020	6

Table No 12: Important Motivational Factors Perceived By Private Sector Employees (N=86)

S.No	Motivational Factor	Mean	Std.Deviation	Rank
1	Achievement	4.4767	1.14508	1
2	Recognition	3.9302	1.62184	9

3	Work It Self	4.0116	1.56050	6
4	Responsibility	3.9767	1.47908	8
5	Advancement	4.0116	1.53005	6
6	Interpersonal Relations	4.3140	1.46538	2
7	Supervision	4.3256	1.41788	3
8	Policy	4.1860	1.40178	4
9	Working Conditions	4.0000	1.63779	7
10	Personal Life	4.1628	1.57077	5

CONCLUSION:

Job satisfaction is a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experience. In this study an investigation is carried out to test the Hypothesis of Herzberg's two-factor theory. The results found that job satisfaction is caused by both motivation and hygiene factors. the important motivational factors perceived by public sector employees are achievement(4.5818) , advancement(4.3636), interpersonal relations(4.1909) , working conditions (4.0909), policy (4.0818), personal life (4.0545).the perceived important motivational factors by private sector bank employees are achievement (4.4767),interpersonal relations(4.3140),supervision(4.3256),policy(4.1860).

REFERENCES:

- [1] Blum, M. A. (1968). " Industrial Psychology: Its Theoretical and Social Foundations",. New York: Harper and R.N.,.
- [2] Davis, K. (1977). " Human Behaviour Work: Organisational Behaviour",. New Delhi,: Tata Mcgraw Hill.
- [3] Hoppock, R. (1935,). " Job Satisfaction",. New York,: Harper& Row.
- [4] Locke, E. (1976,). 'The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction',In M.D. Dunnette. 'Hand Book of Industrial and Organisational Psychology', .
- [5] Smith, H. (1955,). " Psuchology of Industrial Behaviour",. New York: Mcgraw Hill, .
- [6] Vroom, V. (1978). "Work and Motivation',.
- [7] Barry R Nathan, A. M. (1991). Interpersonal Relations as a Context for The Effect of Appraisal Interviews on The Performance and Satisfaction- A Longitudinal Survey ",. Academy of Managemnt Journal, , 34 (2), 352-369.
- [8] Biganne, J. A. (1964). "Job Enlargement: A Case Study:. Research Series No.25 .
- [9] Bose, S. (1951). " Man And His Work". Indian Journal of Psychology , 26, 1-20.
- [10] Charles Glisson, M. D. (1988). " Predictors of Job Satisaction and Organisational Commitment In Human Service in Organisation". Administrative Science Quaterly, , 33 (1), 282-296.
- [11] Cheri Ostroff. (1992). " The Relationship Between Job Satisfaction,Attitudes and Performance-An Organisational Level Anlysis ",. Journal of Applied Psychology,L , 77 (6), 963-974.
- [12] Chowadary, P. L. (1966). "Perceived Importance of Job Factors by Technical and Non-Technical Employees",. Personal Psychology , 19, 287-296.
- [13] Davis, C. A. (1957). "The Design and Productivity: A New Approach",. Personnel, , 3, 377-395.
- [14] Dhillon, P. K. (1991). " Moderate Effect on The Occupational Stress-Job Satisfaction Relationship",Productivity,. Lii (4), 584-590.
- [15] Dolke A.M. (1991). " Personal-Personality,Job And Organisational Correlates of Work Identification",. Indian Journal of Social Work , Lii (4), 621-633.
- [16] G., P. D. (1972, July). " Study of Job Satisfaction of Indian Executives",. Indian Journal of Industrial Relations , 185-205.
