

A Study on Job Satisfaction: Focus on Bankers of Bangladesh

Mohammad Moinul Islam Murad

Lecturer, Department of Management, Bangladesh University of Business & Technology (BUBT).

Nurul Mohammad Zayed

Lecturer, Department of Finance, Bangladesh University of Business & Technology (BUBT).

Abu Zafar Ahmed Mukul

Lecturer, School of Business & Economics, United International University (UIU)

Abstract

Job Satisfaction is a universal issue. Human Resource approach of motivation firmly advocates the notion of job satisfaction with a view to ensuring higher productivity of the employees. Banking industry, as driving force of the economy, is playing crucial role to promote and facilitate growth of country. We here eagerly interest in finding out relative importance of variables what influence the level of satisfaction of the bankers. Job satisfaction is the self-contentment that employees enjoy from the organization through the trade-off between contribution and inducement. The study found that 76.5% of the bankers are satisfied over their jobs and only 9.5% are dissatisfied. The variables responsible for job satisfaction of bankers are Job Status & Security, Management Policy, Pay, Working Condition, Decision making process & Communication Pattern, Supervisor Behavior, Job Nature, Recognition & Promotion. It is evident from the study that Pay, Recognition & Promotion and Working Condition are strongly co-related to over all job satisfaction scoring 0.596, .572 & .562 respectively. Regression model is able to express 59.4% of total variation. Pay and Working condition are the most influencing variables in framing job satisfaction of bankers since coefficient beta scores .298 & .278 respectively. The other two influencing variables are Job security & Status and Promotion & Recognition as coefficient beta scores .216 & .208.

Key words: Human Resource Management, Job Satisfaction, Strategic Asset, Employee Performance.

1.0 Introduction: Writings related to job satisfaction have been increasing markedly from the beginning of 20th century since then business organization started realizing importance of employee's attitude toward job. F W Taylor (1911) firstly focused on employees and their job duties to develop better ways to train workers. The link between work and satisfaction was revealed in 1918 when Edward Thorndike wrote in *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Employee's psychology has a good deal of influence on performance. By 1927, the study of employee's positive or negative reaction to their jobs had fully begun to take hold when Elton Mayo first studied the effect of lighting at the Western Electric Hawthorne Works in Chicago (Bruce & Blackburn, 1992). Hawthorne Studies unveiled that workers respond primarily to the social context of the workplace, including social conditioning, group norms and interpersonal dynamics. Employees are considered today as one of the most important tools (Argyris, 1994) or the most worthy *strategic assets* (Drucker, 1994). According to relationist school, employee's performance is tangent on job satisfaction. This school assumes that manager's concern for workers would lead to increased satisfaction which would in turn result in improved performance. This can strongly be reasoned that today's organizations are more cautious regarding individual and organizational performance because competition makes business brisk. Prahalad (2000) attributes today's business by new competitive landscape, rapid and disruptive changes, and speed of responses. The situation takes knowledgeable employees for better understanding of the environment, for determining the appropriate responses and for transforming the appropriate responses into reality (Haque & Hossain, 2010). However, it is found that satisfied employees exert high performance than dissatisfied employees. A person with high level of job satisfaction holds positive attitude towards the job while a person who is dissatisfied with his or her job holds negative attitude about the job (Robins, 2003). Satisfied employees tend to be committed. On the other hand, dissatisfied employees show absenteeism, soldiering (deliberately working at slow pace), turn over, sabotism etc. To ensure proper utilization of human resource available in the organization, researchers continue research to identify factors and their relative importance for shaping job satisfaction of employees. This study focuses on dynamics of banker's job satisfaction.

2.0 Research Objectives:

The objective of the study is to discover different variables those are shaping job satisfaction of bankers and their relative influence so that management body can capitalize them for getting expected performance from their employees. Specifically. The study will strive to answer the following question-

Research Question: Do they (Job Status Security, Mgt Policy, Pay, Working Condition, Decision making process & Communication Pattern, Supervisor Behavior, Job Nature, Recognition & Promotion) influence Job Satisfaction of the bankers?

3.0 The Hypothesis

Based on previous studies conducted on 'Job Satisfaction' of the Bankers and finding out influencing factors, we are developing following hypothesis in the context of Bangladesh.

Hypothesis 1: *Ho*: Pay does not influence job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 2: *Ho*: Decision making process and communication pattern does not influence job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 3: *Ho*: Supervisor's behavior does not influence job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 4: *Ho*: Job nature does not influence job satisfaction

Hypothesis 5: *Ho*: Working condition does not influence job satisfaction

Hypothesis 6: *Ho*: Management policy does not influence job satisfaction

Hypothesis 7: *Ho*: Recognition & promotion does not influence job satisfaction

Hypothesis 8: *Ho*: Job status & security does not influence job satisfaction

4.0 Research Methodology:

Questionnaire:

Based on the literature review regarding banker's job satisfaction, a nine-item questionnaire was developed considering both intrinsic and extrinsic variables for job satisfaction. A demographic information part was added with the questionnaire such as name, name of the organization, gender, designation and working experience. There were eight questions on explanatory variables and the last question was on over all job satisfaction in interval scale. The questionnaire was prepared following the 5-point Likert scale (1=Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree and 3=Neutral). Theoretically, '3' represents neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with the item. Thus, recording '4' & '5' represent satisfaction, the higher the score, the greater the level of satisfaction. Similarly, recording '1' & '2' represent dissatisfaction, the lower the score, the greater the level of dissatisfaction.

5.0 Literature Review:

Despite having wide research work over the decades and common usages in our daily life, there is still dearth of unanimous definition of what job satisfaction refers to. Different authors have different approaches towards defining job satisfaction. Some of the most commonly cited definitions on job satisfaction are analyzed in the text that follows. Bullock (1952) defined job satisfaction as an attitude which results from a balancing and summation of many specific likes and dislikes experienced in connection with the job. Most acclaimed text book author Ricky W. Griffen defined it as an attitude that reflects the extent to which an individual is gratified by or fulfilled in his or her work. Vroom in his definition on job satisfaction focuses on the role of the employee in the workplace. Thus he defines job satisfaction as affective orientations on the part of individuals toward work roles which they are presently occupying (Vroom, 1964). Job satisfaction represents a combination of positive or negative feelings that workers have towards their work. Job satisfaction represents the extent to which expectations are and match the real awards. Job satisfaction is closely linked to that individual's behavior in the work place (Davis & Nestrom, 1985). According to Smith (1955) it is an employee's judgment of how well his or her job has satisfied his various needs.

Job satisfaction is a worker's sense of achievement and success on the job. It is generally perceived to be directly linked to productivity as well as to personal well-being. Job satisfaction further implies enthusiasm and happiness with one's work. Job satisfaction is the key ingredient that leads to recognition, income, promotion, and the achievement of other goals that lead to a feeling of fulfillment (Kaliski, 2007). Job satisfaction can be defined also as the extent to which a worker is content with the rewards he or she gets out of his ore her job, particularly in terms of intrinsic motivation (Statt, 2004). The term job satisfaction refers to the attitude and feelings people have about their work. Positive and favorable attitudes towards the job indicate job satisfaction. Negative and unfavorable attitudes towards the job indicate job dissatisfaction (Armstrong, 2006). Job satisfaction is the collection of feeling and beliefs that people have about their current job. People's levels of degrees of job satisfaction can range from extreme satisfaction to extreme dissatisfaction. In addition to having attitudes about their jobs as a whole, people also can have attitudes about various aspects of their jobs such as the kind of work they do, their coworkers, supervisors or subordinates and their pay (George & Jones, 2008). Job

satisfaction is a complex and multifaceted concept which can mean different things to different people. Job satisfaction is usually linked with motivation, but the nature of this relationship is not clear. Satisfaction is not the same as motivation. Job satisfaction is more of an attitude, an internal state. It could, for example, be associated with a personal feeling of achievement, either quantitative or qualitative (Mullins, 2005). We consider that job satisfaction represents a feeling that appears as a result of the perception that the job enables the material and psychological needs (Aziri, 2008).

Now, investigation continues to know what causes satisfaction for the organizational people. Personal factors such as an individual's needs and aspirations determine this attitude, along with group and organizational factors such as relationships with coworkers, supervisors and working conditions, work policies and compensation (Smith, Kendall and Hulin). Hoppock defined job satisfaction as any combination of psychological, physiological and environmental circumstances that cause a person truthfully to say I am satisfied with my job (Hoppock, 1935). According to this approach although job satisfaction is under the influence of many external factors, it remains something internal that has to do with the way how the employee feels. That is, job satisfaction presents a set of factors that cause a feeling of satisfaction. Blum and Naylor (1968) defined it as a general attitude formed as a result of specific job factors, individual characteristics, and relationship outside the job. The most known definition was given by Locke (1976) who defined it as a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experience. Overall or general job satisfaction describes a person's overall affective reaction to the set of work and work-related factors (Cranny, 1992). A satisfied employee is an asset for the organization. Loyalty, commitment, hard working and finally high productivity are the consequences. On the other hand, absenteeism, soldiering, sabotism, favoritism, nepotism etc are the consequences of lack of satisfaction. High levels of job satisfaction may be sign of a good emotional and mental state of employees. The behavior of workers depending on their level of job satisfaction will affect the functioning and activities of the organization's business.

4.0 Analysis:

A total of 250 questionnaires were administered (There were about 100 undergraduate and graduate students in classes and each took responsibility of collecting 1-5 responses from bankers in the Dhaka city only and 200 readable responses were received and inputted into SPSS database for analysis. Some questionnaires were not accepted due to lack of decipher and some respondents finally declined to respond. Approximately 10% of questionnaires were subjected to data manipulation or contacting to respondents for further clarification. However, the response rate is 72% (even excluding both drops out and subject to manipulation questionnaires) which were seemed fair enough for this study. 200 responses are minimal in case of problem solving research though the typical range is 300-500 (Malhotra, 2008 p-318)

Table 1 Name of the top 7 responding banks

Name of the Bank	No. of respondents	%	Cumulative %
Brac Bank	22	11.0	11.0
Southeast Bank	20	10.0	21.0
Exim Bank	22	11.0	32.0
One Bank	20	10.0	42.0
Sonali Bank	26	13.0	55.0
The City Bank	16	8.0	63.0
Dutch Bangla Bank	14	7.0	70.0
Others (25 banks)	60.0	30.0	100.0
Total	200.0	100.0	

Table 1 shows top 7 responding banks including percent of contribution in sample size. It represents both nationalized bank and private banks. Table 2 shows that the sample includes more males (85 percent) than females (15 percent).

Table 2 Gender

Gender	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative (%)
male	170	85.0	85.0
female	30	15.0	100.0
Total	200	100.0	

Table 3 shows the level of experience of respondents in banking. Based on period required to get promotion of different banks, the study categorized experience into four intervals such as 0 to 2, 2-5, 5-10 and 10-above. Two reasons were seemed worthy behind this. First, same position offers same benefits. Second, it sounds meaningful for analysis, not listing all the years.

Table 3 Experience

Experience (in years)	Frequency	%	Cumulative (%)
0-2	26	13.0	13.0
2-5	55	27.5	40.5
5-10	53	26.5	67.0
10-above	66	33.0	100.0
Total	200	100.0	

Table 4 Over all job satisfaction of the Bankers

Satisfaction level	Frequency	%	Cumulative (%)
Strongly dissatisfied	5	2.5	2.5
Dissatisfied	14	7.0	9.5
Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied	28	14.0	23.5
Satisfied	121	60.5	84.0
Strongly satisfied	32	16.0	100.0
Total	200	100.0	

Table 4 shows frequency of over all job satisfaction of the bankers. It represents 60.5% respondents are satisfied on their job. Only 10% respondents responded as dissatisfied which is little alarming for any industry. On the other hand, 16% scored as strongly satisfied on their jobs. 14% responses show neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics for Independent and Dependent Variables

Name of Variables	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
Pay	3.65	1.011	0.072
Decision making process & communication pattern	3.66	0.792	0.056
Supervisor's behavior	3.76	1.091	0.077
Job nature	3.44	0.939	0.066
Working condition	3.88	0.900	0.064
Management policy	3.60	0.977	0.069
Recognition & promotion	3.34	1.105	0.078
Job status & security	3.72	0.924	0.065
Overall job satisfaction	3.80	0.878	0.062

Table 5 shows the mean, standard deviation and Standard Error of Mean of nine job related variables that were asked. It seems that respondents are satisfied with their job. The mean for all variables is above 3.50 where 3.1 to 4 represent as satisfied range. The over all job satisfaction is 3.80 which is fair enough. A relatively small standard errors ranging from 0.056 to 0.078 indicate that the sample mean of different job related variables is very close to those of the population means.

Table 6 Product moment correlations among independent variables

	Pay	Decision making & Communication	Supervisor Behavior	Job Nature	Working Condition	Mgt Policy	Recognition Promotion
Decision making process and Communication Pattern	.340**	1					
Supervisor Behavior	.263**	.293**	1				
Job Nature	.334**	.360**	.445**	1			
Working Condition	.395**	.316**	.410**	.438**	1		
Mgt Policy	.419**	.527**	.286**	.423**	.438**	1	
Recognition Promotion	.450**	.416**	.612**	.466**	.385**	.425**	1
Job Status & Security	.321**	.318**	.546**	.628**	.383**	.313**	.571**

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 6 shows the Product Moment Correlation among the independent variables. Though correlation among different independent variables is found to be statistically significant, they are not found strong enough to cause any multicollinearity problem. Besides, the Average Inter-Item Correlation is found to be $r_{ij} = .411$ which is again low enough to conclude that there is any multicollinearity problem. This table also shows that Job Status & Security is highly correlated with Job Nature (that is, nature of task done by employees or position held influences their status in the society and thereby Job Security) and Recognition & Promotion is with Supervisor's Behavior (this is, promotion based on performance happens if supervisor rightly recognizes subordinate's work). On the other hand, the least correlation is between supervisor's behavior and pay (because, pay structure is not developed by supervisors)

Table 7 Product moment correlation between dependent and independent variables

	Pay	Decision making & Communication	Supervisor Behavior	Job Nature	Working Condition	Mgt Policy	Recognition Promotion	Job Status Security
Order	1	6	8	7	3	5	2	4
Overall Job Satisfaction	.596**	.468**	.385**	.405*	.562**	.484**	.572**	.503**

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 7 shows Product Moment Correlation between job satisfaction and all independent variables. It seems that correlation between 'Pay' and 'Job Satisfaction' is the highest (0.596) while other variables influencing job satisfaction are not controlled. It means 'Pay' contributes to the most satisfaction of the bankers. Recognition and Promotion which also leads to high 'Pay' scores 0.572, the second highest variable influencing banker's job satisfaction. Working Condition and Job Status & Security hold third and fourth position. The least influencing variable to banker's job satisfaction is Supervisor's Behavior scoring to 0.385. In other way, we can view that Supervisor's Behavior coupled with Job Nature may little tend to job dissatisfaction of bankers. Of course, one has to remember the fact that correlation does not necessarily imply causal relationship, the latter being presented by regression analysis. All these correlations are found statistically significant at 0.01 level.

Table 8 Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.771 ^a	.594	.577	.571

a. Predictors: (Constant), Job Status Security, Mgt Policy, Pay, Working Condition, Decision making process & Communication Pattern, Supervisor Behavior, Job Nature, Recognition & Promotion

b. Dependent Variable: Over all Job Satisfaction

Table 8 shows whether independent variables i.e. Job Status Security, Mgt Policy, Pay, Working Condition, Decision making process & Communication Pattern, Supervisor Behavior, Job Nature, Recognition & Promotion

are capable of influencing the dependent variable ‘Job Satisfaction’. The computed value of F ($F = 34.989$, $df = 8, 191$) shows that the model is statistically significant and it is highly likely that at least one of the independent variables is capable of influencing the level of job satisfaction (table 9). It is also conspicuous that the model explains as much as 57.7% of the variation of the ‘Job Satisfaction’ (Adjusted R square = 0.577)

Table 9

ANOVA ^b					
Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	91.179	8	11.397	34.989	.000 ^a
Residual	62.216	191	.326		
Total	153.395	199			
a. Predictors: (Constant), Job Status Security, Mgt Policy, Pay, Working Condition, Decision making process & Communication, Supervisor Behavior, Job Nature, Recognition & Promotion					
b. Dependent Variable: Overall Job Satisfaction					

Table 10 shows, the Standardized Beta Coefficient of ‘Pay’ ($t = 5.385$, $p = 0.000$), ‘Working Condition’ ($t = 4.900$, $p = 0.000$) is found to be statistically significant and positive (beta = 0.298 & 0.278). For ‘Job Status & Security’ and ‘Recognition & Promotion’, the Standardized Beta Coefficient is also found to be statistically significant and positive. [For ‘Job Status & Security’, beta = 0.216, $t = 3.241$ and $p = 0.001$; for ‘Recognition and Promotion’, beta = 0.208, $t = 3.055$ and $p = 0.003$]

Table 10 Coefficients^a

Independent Variables	Standardized Coefficients (Beta)	t	p
Pay	.298	5.385	.000
Decision making process & Comm.	.144	2.551	.012
Supervisor Behavior	-.070	-1.110	.269
Job Nature	-.099	-1.548	.123
Working Condition	.278	4.900	.000
Management Policy	.068	1.121	.264
Recognition & Promotion	.208	3.055	.003
Job Status & Security	.216	3.241	.001

a. Dependent Variable: Over all Job Satisfaction

The above results imply that ‘Pay’, ‘Working Condition’, ‘Job Status and Security’ and ‘Recognition & Promotion’ directly affect the level of job satisfaction to increase. It is also evident from the above table that ‘Pay’ has the most domination in framing ‘Job Satisfaction’ of the bankers and ‘Recognition & Promotion’ has the least among four explanatory variables. Based on the principle that is if p-value is smaller than the significance level, H_0 is rejected; we are able to reject $H_0 1$, $H_0 5$, $H_0 7$ and $H_0 8$ at 0.01 level of significance. For Management Policy, Decision making process & Communication Pattern, Supervisor Behavior and Job Nature, the standardized Beta Coefficients over ‘Job Satisfaction’ is found statistically insignificant. Based on the p-value result, we fail to reject $H_0 2$, $H_0 3$, $H_0 4$ and $H_0 6$. Therefore, we conclude that these above-mentioned four variables do not have any *direct effect* over the level of job satisfaction to either increase or decrease. They might have indirect effect on job satisfaction.

5.0 Findings and Discussion:

This paper has studied the variables responsible for shaping job satisfaction of the bankers in the context of Bangladesh. The correlation between independent variables (Job Status Security, Management Policy, Pay, Working Condition, and Decision making process & Communication Pattern, Supervisor Behavior, Job Nature, Recognition & Promotion) and dependent variable over all Job Satisfaction was found to be statistically significant at 0.01 levels (Table 6). For estimation purpose, Multiple Regression Model (Table 10) was run and it was found that ‘Pay’, ‘Working Condition’, ‘Job Status and Security’ and ‘Recognition and Promotion’ play statistically significant role in influencing the level of job satisfaction and thereby can be interpreted as factors determining the levels of ‘Job Satisfaction’. The P-value of table 10 reveals that these above four factors can be used to estimate the level of job satisfaction. It appears that ‘Pay’ is relatively more important than any other factors (Beta = 0.298). Table 8 shows that the model is capable of explaining about 59.4% of the total variation

of job satisfaction. The rest of the variation may be explained by other important facets of job satisfaction. Task significance, skill variety, task identity, autonomy, feedback could be named as some other common and important sources (Oldham and Hackman, 1974).

6.0 Conclusion:

The objective of the study was to discover factors affecting level of job satisfaction of bankers in the field of Bangladesh. The empirical results indicate that there exist significant positive Product Moment Correlations, although not very high between listed eight variables and Job Satisfaction. The Multiple Regression Analysis shows that 'Pay', 'Working Condition', 'Job Status and Security' and 'Recognition and Promotion' have direct positive influence over the 'Level of Job Satisfaction' but others do not have. The model developed by this study indicates that management of bank should consider 'Pay' and 'Working Condition' as most important and 'Job Status and Security' and 'Recognition & Promotion' as important while designing the job. Since Banking job is quite stressful and risky job, it is highly required to have quality job from employees. For ensuring quality job performance, manager should be more sensible and cautious to the employees so that they are satisfied with their jobs. The above four important causal factors should be first priority for managers while designing jobs for bankers in the Bangladesh.

7.0 Reference:

- Armstrong, M. (2006). *A Handbook of Human resource Management Practice*, Tenth Edition, Kogan Page Publishing, London, p. 264
- Argyris, C. (1994, July/August). *Good Communication that block learning*. Harvard Business Review, 77-85
- Aziri B. (2011), *Job Satisfaction: A Literature Review*, Management Research and Practice, Vol. 3 Issue 4, pp: 3-4
- Blum, M. L and Naylor, J.C. (1968), *Industrial psychology: Its theoretical and social foundations*. New York: Harper and Row, pp-8-12
- Bruce, W.M. & Blackburn, J.W. (1992). *Balancing job satisfaction and performance: A guide for human resource professionals*. Westport, Conn.: Quorum Books, 4-23.
- Bullock, R. P. (1952), *Social factors related to job satisfaction*, Research Monograph No. 70, Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research, Columbus.
- Cranny, C.J., Smith, P. C. and Stone, E.F. (1992). *Job Satisfaction: How people feel about their job and how it affects their performance*, New York: Lexington Books
- Davis, K. and Nestrom, J.W. (1985). *Human Behavior at work: Organizational Behavior*, 7 editions, McGraw Hill, New York, p.109
- Drucker, P. F. (1994). *Managing in turbulence time*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann Ltd.
- Griffen, R. W. Text book: *Management*, 5th edition, published by Houghton Mifflin Company, 1997, P - 456
- George, J.M. and Jones, G.R. (2008). *Understanding and Managing Organizational behavior*, Fifth Edition, Pearson/Prentice Hall, New Jersey, p. 78
- Hackman, J. R. and Oldham, G. R. (1975). Development of the job diagnostic survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60, 159-170
- Hoppock, R. (1935). *Job Satisfaction*, Harper and Brothers, New York, p. 47
- Kaliski, B.S. (2007). *Encyclopedia of Business and Finance*, Second edition, Thompson Gale, Detroit, p. 446
- Locke, E.A. (1976). The nature and cause of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Chicago, IL: Rand McNally. (p-1300).
- Malhotra N. K. (2008) *Marketing Research: an applied orientation* (4th ed.). Pearson Education Inc. p-318
- Prahalad, C. K. (2000) Changes in the competitive battlefield. In T. Dickson (Ed), *Mastering Strategy*. Edinburgh: Pearson Education Limited. (pp. 75-80)
- Robins, Stephen P. (2003) *Organizational Behavior*. (10th ed.) New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India, p 78-79
- Smith, P. C. (1955). The prediction of individual difference in susceptibility to industrial monotony. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 39, 322-329.
- Statt, D. (2004). *The Routledge Dictionary of Business Management*, Third edition, Routledge Publishing, Detroit, p. 78
- Taylor, F. (1911). *Principals of Scientific Management*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Vroom, V.H. (1964). *Work and motivation*, John Wiley and Sons, New York, p.99