

Analysis of factors affecting job satisfaction of the employees (People work with) in public and private sector

Asi Ratnam Billa

Research Scholars, Centre for Dr. Ambedkar Chair, Acharya Nnagarjuna University, Nagarjuna Nagar. Guntur. Andhra Pradesh, India.

Abstract

In this research, the investigator was interested to make a study analysis of factors affecting job satisfaction of the employees (people work with) in public and private sector of Andhra State Government. Some of the questions raised in the above context are. What is the nature and extent of job satisfaction among government officials? How do they perceive their job satisfaction in regard to nature of people work with? What reasons have been assigned for their satisfactions and dis-satisfactions? What significance is revealed in terms of variables selected? With this end in view the objectives were formulated, Government of Andhra Pradesh is the government for the state of Andhra Pradesh in South India. The Government of Andhra Pradesh is a democratically elected body with the Governor as the constitutional head. In this study, primary data from 300 non gazetted officials of different departments of state government, 300 non gazetted officials of different local body institutions, 300 non gazetted officials of different public sector undertakings were selected using stratified sampling method. The collected data were analysed with the following statistical tools such as: Frequency distribution tables, Simple percentage technique, Mean and Standard deviation, Analysis of variance (ANOVA), Scheffe's Post hoc analysis where significant F values were obtained.

Keywords: Job Satisfaction of the Employees, people work with, Public Sector, Private Sector.

Introduction

Andhra Pradesh is one of the 29 states of India, situated on the south-eastern coast of the country. The state is the eighth largest state in India covering an area of 160,205 km² (61,855 sq mi). As per 2011 census of India, the state is tenth largest by population with 49,386,799 inhabitants. On 2 June 2014, the north-western portion of the state was bifurcated to form a new state of Telangana. In accordance with the Andhra Pradesh Reorganization Act, 2014, Hyderabad will remain the de jure capital of both Andhra Pradesh and Telangana states for a period of time not exceeding 10 years. The new riverfront capital in Guntur district of the state was named as Amaravati, which is under the jurisdiction of APCRDA (Official Portal of Andhra Pradesh).

The state has a coastline of 974 km (605 mi), the second longest among all the states of India after Gujarat. It borders Telangana in the northwest, Chhattisgarh in the north, Odisha in the northeast, Karnataka in the west, Tamil Nadu in the south and the water body of Bay of Bengal in the east. A small enclave of 30 km² (12 sq.mi.) of Yanam, a district of Puducherry, lies south of Kakinada in the Godavari delta to the northeast of the state.

Government of Andhra Pradesh is the government for the state of Andhra Pradesh in South India. It is an elected Government with 175 MLAs elected to the legislative assembly for a 5-year term.

The Government of Andhra Pradesh is a democratically elected body with the Governor as the constitutional head. The Governor who is appointed for a period of five years appoints the Chief Minister and his Council of Ministers. Even though, the Governor remains the Ceremonial Head of the State, the day-to-day running of the Government is taken care of by the

Chief Minister and his Council of Ministers in whom a great deal of legislative powers is vested.

Attitude

In psychology, an attitude is an expression of favour or disfavour toward a person, place, thing, or event. Prominent psychologist Gordon Allport (1983) [3] once described attitudes "the most distinctive and indispensable concept in contemporary social psychology." Attitude can be formed from a person's past and present. This study was to analyse the attitudes of Andhra Pradesh Government employees towards their job satisfaction.

Job Satisfaction

Psychological well-being (PWB) is defined as "the overall effectiveness of an individual's psychological functioning" as related to primary facets of one's life: work, family, community, etc. There are three defining characteristics of PWB. First, it is a phenomenological event, meaning that people are happy when they subjectively believe themselves to be so. Second, well-being involves some emotional conditions. Particularly, psychologically well people are more prone to experience positive emotions and less prone to experience negative emotions. Third, well-being refers to one's life as a whole. It is a global evaluation (Wright, T.A. and Cropanzano, R. (2000)

PWB in the workplace plays an important role in determining job satisfaction and has attracted much research attention in recent years. These studies have focused on the effects of PWB on job satisfaction as well as job performance. Wright, Cropanzano and Bonett (2007) noted that because job satisfaction is specific to one's job, the research that examined job satisfaction had not taken into account aspects of one's life

external to the job. Prior studies had focused only on the work environment as the main determinant of job satisfaction. Ultimately, to better understand job satisfaction (and its close relative, job performance), it is important to take into account an individual's PWB.

Types of Job Satisfaction

1. Factors Influencing Job Satisfaction
2. Difficulties in Motivating Government Employees
3. Prevailing negative attitudes about government and government employees
4. Frequent and abrupt changes in leadership
5. Hard-to-measure achievement
6. An older workforce
7. Strong civil-service rules and employee protections
8. Constraints on the use of financial incentives
9. Strong union influence
10. Public Visibility of Government
11. Different employee motivations

Gazetted and Non-Gazetted Officers in India

Gazetted Officers are Executive/Managerial/Supervisory level ranked public servants in India. Authority for a Gazetted Officer to issue an official stamp comes from the President of India or the Governors of States. To that effect, they are de jure representatives and delegates of the Indian State and the President. The Gazette of India is published on a regular basis by the Directorate of Printing, Department of Publication, Ministry of Urban Development, Government of India. It is an official Central Government or State Government publication, which publishes the appointments or promotions of certain government officials.

Class-I or Group-A (Gazetted)

These officials belong to the managerial or highest class of government servants. Examples - Commissioned officers of the Indian Armed Forces, Officers from GREF, MES, Officers from the All-India Civil Services (IAS, IPS, IFS, etc.) recruited by the Union Public Service Commission, State Civil Service Group-A officers (executive) in the State Governments (Provincial Civil Services/State Civil Services), Patent Examiner in DIPP under Ministry of Commerce and Industry, Senior Scientists in R&D Centres under the Government of India (Department of Space [ISRO], DRDO, Department of Atomic Energy (BARC, Raja Ramanna Centre for Advanced Technology, RRCAT Indore, Heavy Water Board/Plants, IGCAR, AERB), CSIR, Directors, section officer to Government of India and Vice-Chancellors of State/Central Universities and Research Centers.

Class-II or Group-B (Gazetted)

Examples – Group-B officers in State Civil Service, Doctors in State/Central Hospital, Secretary of Gram Panchayat, Assistant Engineers in both State Government Departments and Organizations etc., Assistant Geologist in State Government, Principals of Government High Schools and Colleges (including KVVs and Sainik Schools), Pro-Vice Chancellors and Faculty Deans of Central and State Universities, Police Officers of State Police service and Central Police Organisations recruited at the rank of Deputy Superintendent of Police.

Class-II or Group-B (Non-Gazetted)

Examples Office executives and office supervisors, Senior Stenographers, ASI of Police in State and Central Police services (including IB & CBI), Naib Subedar equivalent in the Armed Forces, Junior Pharmacists, Junior Engineers, Central Excise and Custom Inspectors, Personal Assistants to Group-A and B officers, academic faculty staff members in Central and State universities and Government colleges, Police Inspectors and Sub-Inspectors of Central and State Police departments.

Class-III or Group-C

Public servants in non-supervisory roles, such as, Head clerks/Section heads, Police Head Constables, Typists, Stenographers, Tax Assistants, Telephone operators, Havildar and Naik or equivalent in the Armed Forces, etc.

Class-IV or Group-D

Manual workers (skilled or semi-skilled), such as, Lower Division Clerks, drivers, technicians/mechanics, electricians, canteen staff, etc.

Research Problem

Public Administration has always implied Government when 'public' actually means community or people. In the post-colonial, post-independence paradigm of the early 1950s, Public Administration really meant providing service to the people by the State apparatus using the ground rules of justice, ethics and fair-play. This was the intention of the visionary Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, when he established the Indian Institute of Public Administration on March 29, 1954. Based on the recommendations of a survey carried out in 1953 by Dean Paul H. Appleby, a Consultant with the Ford Foundation invited to advise on the subject, by the Government of India. A study title "Analysis of Factors Affecting Job Satisfaction of the Employees People Work with in Public and Private Sector".

Scope of the Study

This study will cover job satisfaction among Non-Gazetted Officials of Andhra State Government. Andhra Pradesh is one of the 29 states of India, situated on the south-eastern coast of the country. The state is the eighth largest state in India covering an area of 160,205 km² (61,855 sq.mi). As per 2011 census of India, the state is tenth largest by population with 49,386,799 inhabitants. On 2nd June 2014, the north-western portion of the state was bifurcated to form a new state of Telangana.

Objectives

This study will primarily aim at finding out the job satisfaction of Non-Gazetted Officials of Andhra State Government with this end, in view the following objectives were formulated:

1. To classify the non-gazetted officials of Andhra State Government consisting of Class-B –NG, Class-C and Class-D into state, local body and PSUs, and find out their job satisfaction levels using Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) authored by Paul E. Spector (1985).
2. To find out the job satisfaction levels of the following specific facets

3. People they work with.
4. To compare the job satisfaction levels on selected facets with the norms set by the author.
5. To find out the differences, if any among different Non-Gazetted Officials different groups, namely, state, local body and PSUs of Andhra State Government.

Hypotheses

In order to serve the above stated objectives, the following hypothesis will be proposed and tested in this study.

1. The total job satisfaction levels of the non-gazetted officials of Andhra Pradesh state government would be par with the levels of standardized norms.
2. There would not be any significant differences among selected groups of non-gazetted officials of Andhra state government on job satisfaction facet, "People Work With".

Sampling

Sampling is a process used in statistical analysis in which a predetermined number of observations will be taken from a larger population. The methodology used to sample from a larger population will depend on the type of analysis being performed, but will include simple random sampling, systematic sampling and observational sampling. The sample should be a representation of the general population. This study is intended to make a survey on the "Analysis of Factors Affecting Job Satisfaction of the Employees People Work with in Public and Private Sector". Since, there are different types of readers, depending upon their necessities and interest, in this study, stratified sampling method was adopted.

Questionnaire

In this study to measure the job satisfaction of the non-gazetted officials, Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) scale authored by Paul E. Spector (1985) is used. This questionnaire is an internationally accepted one for measuring job satisfaction of public employees and being used by a number of researchers. Questionnaire used to evaluate nine dimensions of job satisfaction related to overall satisfaction. This instrument is well established among the other job satisfaction scales.

The questionnaire was framed by using Likert Scale of 6 points scoring system as follows.

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Disagree very much | 1 |
| Disagree moderately | 2 |
| Disagree slightly | 3 |
| Agree Slightly | 4 |
| Agree moderately | 5 |
| Agree very much | 6 |

Statistical Analysis

In this study, primary data from 300 non-gazetted officials of different departments of state government, 300 non-gazetted officials of different local body institutions, 300 non-gazetted officials of different public sector undertakings were selected using stratified sampling method. The collected data were analysed with the following statistical tools such as:

- Frequency distribution tables
- Simple percentage technique
- Mean and Standard deviation
- Analysis of variance (ANOVA)

- Scheffe's Post-hoc analysis where significant F-values were obtained.

Problem Definition and Research Methodology

"Employees are the most important resource in the government and an engaged and satisfied workforce is central to achieving its goals,"

A government is the body which has the authority to formulate and enforce rules, laws and regulations. A government can be local, national, or international and typically refers to a civil government or sovereign state.

In this research, the investigator was interested to make a study on Job satisfaction among Non-Gazetted Officials of Andhra State Government. Some of the questions raised in the above context are. What is the nature and extent of job satisfaction among government officials? How do they perceive their job satisfaction in regard to nature of work, People Work With? What reasons have been assigned for their satisfactions and dis-satisfactions? What significance is revealed in terms of variables selected? With this end in view the following objectives were formulated.

Research Methodology

Government of Andhra Pradesh is the government for the state of Andhra Pradesh in South India. The Government of Andhra Pradesh is a democratically elected body with the Governor as the constitutional head. The Governor who is appointed for a period of five years appoints the Chief Minister and his Council of Ministers. Even though the Governor remains the ceremonial head of the state, the day-to-day running of the government is taken care of by the Chief Minister and his council of ministers in whom a great deal of legislative powers is vested. The Andhra Pradesh Government Employees consists of:

- 1) State Government Employees
- 2) Local Bodies Employees, and
- 3) Public Sector Units (PSU) employees. According to the Employee Census 2006, there were about 6.06 lakh state government employees, 3.39 local bodies' employees and 2.53 lakh PSU employees.

Analysis of Data on Job Satisfaction

In psychology, an attitude is an expression of favour or disfavor toward a person, place, and is termed as the most distinctive and indispensable concept in contemporary social psychology. Attitude can be formed from a person's past and present. Attitudes are simply measures of how much we like or dislike various things. They represent evaluations and preferences. In fact effects that occur after people post with new situations. Thus, attitudes are considered as an intra-psychic state of readiness to activity and also a manifest social relation showing itself in certain acts of behaviour. How much one like or dislike something has much to do with determining his / her behaviour towards it.

Analysis on Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction of the non gazetted officials of Andhra Pradesh, working in state government, local bodies and PSUs were assessed using Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) authored by Paul E. Spector (1985). The collected scores were converted into standard scores as suggested by the author and analysed

under 9 dimensions. The results of this study are presented under these nine dimensions of job satisfaction.

Job Satisfaction With Regard To People Work With

Job satisfaction levels of the non gazetted officials of Andhra state consisting of state government, local body and PSUs

employees were obtained through four statements, each of which has 6 options to response. The obtained responses were converted into standard scores and table 4.29 shows the frequency distribution of job satisfaction with regard to People work with of non gazetted officials of Andhra State.

Table 1: Frequency Distribution for Job Satisfaction Dimension – People Work with among Non Gazetted Officials of Andhra State

| Statement Nos. | Non Gazetted Officials of | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|--------------|--------|------|--------|-------|--------|
| | State Govt | | Local Bodies | | PSUs | | Total | |
| | No. | % | No | % | No | % | No | % |
| Stt. No. 7 | I like the people I work with. | | | | | | | |
| Disagree Very Much | 3 | 1.00 | 2 | 0.67 | 1 | 0.33 | 6 | 0.67 |
| Disagree Moderately | 29 | 9.67 | 29 | 9.67 | 14 | 4.67 | 72 | 8.00 |
| Disagree Lightly | 187 | 62.33 | 156 | 52.00 | 158 | 52.67 | 501 | 55.67 |
| Agree Slightly | 47 | 15.67 | 76 | 25.33 | 84 | 28.00 | 207 | 23.00 |
| Agree Moderately | 31 | 10.33 | 35 | 11.67 | 41 | 13.67 | 107 | 11.89 |
| Agree Very Much | 3 | 1.00 | 2 | 0.67 | 2 | 0.67 | 7 | 0.78 |
| Total | 300 | 100.00 | 300 | 100.00 | 300 | 100.00 | 900 | 100.00 |
| Stt. No 16 | I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with. | | | | | | | |
| Disagree Very Much | 5 | 1.67 | 1 | 0.33 | | | 6 | 0.67 |
| Disagree Moderately | 50 | 16.67 | 29 | 9.67 | 17 | 5.67 | 96 | 10.67 |
| Disagree Lightly | 159 | 53.00 | 143 | 47.67 | 169 | 56.33 | 471 | 52.33 |
| Agree Slightly | 52 | 17.33 | 99 | 33.00 | 86 | 28.67 | 237 | 26.33 |
| Agree Moderately | 34 | 11.33 | 28 | 9.33 | 28 | 9.33 | 90 | 10.00 |
| Agree Very Much | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Stt. No. 25 | I enjoy my coworkers. | | | | | | | |
| Disagree Very Much | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Disagree Moderately | 32 | 10.67 | 84 | 28.00 | 10 | 3.33 | 126 | 14.00 |
| Disagree Lightly | 181 | 60.33 | 164 | 54.67 | 181 | 60.33 | 526 | 58.44 |
| Agree Slightly | 55 | 18.33 | 33 | 11.00 | 78 | 26.00 | 166 | 18.44 |
| Agree Moderately | 32 | 10.67 | 19 | 6.33 | 31 | 10.33 | 82 | 9.11 |
| Agree Very Much | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Stt. No. 34 | There is too much bickering and fighting at work. | | | | | | | |
| Disagree Very Much | 20 | 6.67 | 20 | 6.67 | 9 | 3.00 | 49 | 5.44 |
| Disagree Moderately | 37 | 12.33 | 38 | 12.67 | 36 | 12.00 | 111 | 12.33 |
| Disagree Lightly | 98 | 32.67 | 30 | 43.33 | 101 | 33.67 | 329 | 36.56 |
| Agree Slightly | 113 | 37.67 | 109 | 36.33 | 130 | 43.33 | 352 | 39.11 |
| Agree Moderately | 30 | 10.00 | 2 | 0.67 | 23 | 7.67 | 55 | 6.11 |
| Agree Very Much | 2 | 0.67 | 1 | 0.33 | 1 | 0.33 | 4 | 0.44 |

Analysis of results on Job satisfaction dimension People work with on statement No. 7 “I like the people I work with.” was agreed slightly by 15.67% of state officials, and moderately agreed by 10.33%, while 62.33% disagree slightly, and 9.67% disagree moderately. The responses of local body officials proved that 25.33% agreed slightly and 11.67% agreed moderately, while 52.00% disagree slightly and 9.67% were disagree moderately. However, the responses of PSUs officials proved that 28.00% agree slightly, and 13.67% agree moderately, while 52.67% disagree slightly and 4.67% moderately disagree to this statement.

For statement No. 1 “I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with.” was agreed slightly by 17.333% of state officials, and moderately agreed by 11.33, while 53.00% disagreed slightly and 16.67% disagreed moderately. The responses of local body officials proved that 33.00% agreed slightly and 9.33% agreed moderately, while 47.67% disagree slightly and 9.67% were disagree moderately. However, the responses of PSUs officials proved that 28.67% agree slightly, and 9.33% agree moderately, while 56.33% expressed disagree slightly and 5.67% disagree moderately.

Job satisfaction dimension “People work with” on statement

No. 2 “I enjoy my coworkers: was disagreed slightly by 60.33% of state officials, and disagree moderately by 10.67%, while 18.33% agreed slightly and 10.67% agreed moderately. The responses of local body officials proved that 54.67% disagreed slightly and 28.00% disagreed moderately, while 11.00% agree slightly and 6.33% disagree moderately. The responses of PSUs officials proved that 60.33% disagree slightly, and 3.33% disagree moderately, while 26.00% agree slightly and 10.33% agree moderately.

For statement No. 3 “There is too much bickering and fighting at work.” was agreed slightly by 37.67% of state officials, and moderately agreed by 10.00%, while 32.67% disagreed slightly, and 12.33% disagreed moderately. The responses of local body officials proved that 36.33% agreed slightly, while 43.33% disagree slightly and 12.67% were disagree moderately. However, the responses of PSUs officials proved that 43.33% agree slightly, and 7.67% agree moderately, while 33.67% expressed disagree slightly and 12.00% disagree moderately. The results proved that there were differences among state, local body and PSUs non gazetted officials on job satisfaction dimension “People work with”. The descriptive statistics on the scores of overall total of this dimension is presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics for Job Satisfaction Dimension – People Work with among Non Gazetted Officials of Andhra State

| Groups | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Minimum | Maximum |
|--------------|-----|-------|----------------|---------|---------|
| State | 300 | 13.11 | 1.19 | 9 | 15 |
| Local Bodies | 300 | 12.89 | 1.20 | 10 | 16 |
| PSUs | 300 | 13.79 | 1.18 | 10 | 17 |
| Total | 900 | 13.26 | 1.25 | 9 | 17 |

The overall total for “People Work with” dimension of job satisfaction responses mean scores of state officials was 13.11 with standard deviation ± 1.19 , local body officials was 12.89 with standard deviation ± 1.20 and PSUs officials was 13.79 with standard deviation ± 1.18 putting the total average scores of 13.26 with standard deviation ± 1.25 .

The mean values on people work with of non gazetted officials presented in Table 4.30 is illustrated through a bar diagram for better understanding of the results.




Fig 1: Mean Values on People Work with Dimension among State, Local Body and PSU Non gazetted Officials

To test the statistical significance of the differences, the data collected were subjected using statistical tool, ANOVA and results presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Differences in Job Satisfaction on People Work with Dimension among Selected Non Gazetted Officials of Andhra Pradesh

| | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | Obtained F | Level of Significance |
|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|------------|-----------------------|
| Between Groups | 130.60 | 2 | 65.30 | 46.21 | 0.000 |
| Within Groups | 1267.52 | 897 | 1.41 | | |
| Total | 1398.12 | 899 | | | |

* Significant

The results presented in Table 3 proved that the mean scores of responses among state, local body and PSUs officials were differed significantly as the obtained F value 46.21 was significant at 0.000, which was more than the required significant level of 0.05.

Since significant results were obtained, the results were further subjected to post hoc analysis using Scheffe’s confidence interval and the results presented in Table 4.

Table 4: Multiple Comparison of Paired Means of State, Local Body and PSU Non Gazetted Officials on Job Satisfaction Dimension People Work with

| State | Local Body | PSU | MD | Sig. Level |
|-------|------------|-------|-------|------------|
| 13.11 | 12.89 | | 0.62* | 0.00 |
| 13.11 | | 13.79 | 0.16 | 0.44 |
| | 12.89 | 13.79 | 0.78* | 0.00 |

* Significant

The results presented in Table 4 proved that there were significant differences between state and local body officials with MD: 0.62 and PSU and local body officials with MD 0.78 as the obtained significant levels of 0.000 were greater than the required significant level of 0.05. The results further proved that there was no significant differences between state and PSU officials as the obtained MD 0.16 with significant level of 0.44 was less than the required 0.05 level.

Discussions on Hypothesis

1. There would not be any significant differences among selected groups of non gazetted officials of Andhra state government on job satisfaction facet, “People they work with”.
2. Table 1 shows the frequency distribution of the responses on 4 statements analysed for job satisfaction facet people work with, Table 2 showed the descriptive statistics on this dimension. For this facet of job satisfaction the norms fixed were 17.3 with standard deviation ± 2.1 . The results of this study proved that the overall scores of operating policies and procedures among Non gazetted officials of Andhra State was 13.26 with standard deviation ± 1.25 . These comparisons proved that the subjects exhibited lesser job satisfaction on people work with facet than the norms fixed. And the formulated hypothesis No. 1 that the job satisfaction levels would be at par with levels of standardized norms was rejected.
3. The results presented in Table 3 proved that there was significant difference in the mean scores of responses among state, local body and PSUs officials as the obtained F value was significant at 0.000. The post hoc test results proved that the proved that there were significant differences between state and local body officials with MD: 0.62 and PSU and local body officials with MD 0.78 as the obtained significant levels of 0.000 were greater than the required significant level of 0.05. The results further proved that there was no significant difference between state and PSU officials as the obtained MD 0.16 with significant level of 0.44 was less than the required 0.05 level. And the formulated hypothesis No. 8 that there would not be any significant differences among selected groups of non gazetted

officials of Andhra state government on job satisfaction facet, people work with and procedures was rejected and alternate hypothesis that there would be differences among them was accepted at 0.05 level.

Findings

Job satisfaction with regard to people work with proved lesser satisfaction of non gazetted officials of Andhra state than the norms determined. Comparisons among the groups proved that state officials were more satisfied than local body officials and PSU officials were found to more satisfied than local body officials. And there was no significant difference between state and PSU officials though PSU officials were found to be more satisfied. And these differences were significant at 0.05 level.

Conclusions

Within the limitations and delimitations of the study, the following conclusions were drawn.

1. It was concluded that comparing to standardized norms for job satisfaction facets, the facets were found to be more satisfied than norms among non gazetted officials of Andhra state.
2. It was concluded that comparing to standardized norms for job satisfaction facets, the facets were found to be lesser satisfied than norms among non gazetted officials of Andhra state.
3. People work with.
4. It was concluded that state and PSU officials were significantly more satisfied than local body officials on job satisfaction facets, people work with.
5. It was concluded that local body officials were found to be least satisfied on all the facets of job satisfaction.

Reference

1. Alice Crow, Lester Crow D. Educational psychology, New Delhi: Eurasia Publishing House Pvt Ltd., 1969, 247.
2. Allport GW. Attitudes in C.Murchinson(ed), A Hand Book of Social Psychology, Worcester, Mass: Clark University Press, 1983, 168.
3. Burgoon JK, Buller DB, Woodall WG. Nonverbal Communication, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1996.
4. Farace RV, Monge PR, Russell HM. Communicating and organizing. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1977.
5. Gladys M. Scott Research Methods in Health Physical Education and Recreation, Washington: AAHPER, 1999, 338.
6. Herzberg F. Work and the Nature of Man. Cleveland, World Publishing Company, 1966.
7. Hoppock R. Job satisfaction. Oxford, England: Harper, 1935.
8. Hulin CL, Judge TA. Job attit Udes. In W. C. Borman, D. R. ligen, & R. J. Klimoski (Eds.), Handbook of psychology: Industrial and organizational psychology. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, 2003, 255-276.
9. Jack Rabin W. Bartley Hildreth, and Gerard J. Miller. Handbook of Public Administration. Eds: Marcel Dekker, NY, 1989, 3.
10. John W. Best Research in Education (Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice Hall, Inc.), 1989, 133.
11. Latham GP, Budworth MH. The study of work motivation in the 20th century." In L. L. Koppes (Ed.) Historical

- perspectives in industrial and organizational psychology. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2007, 353-381.
12. Locke EA, Lathan GP. Theory of goal setting and task performance. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1990, 248-250.
13. Locke EA. The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M.D. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976, 1297-1349.
14. Maslow A. Motivation and Personality, New York, Harper, 1995.
15. Mitchell TR, Lasan JR. People in Organisation, 3rd ed, New York: McGraw Hill, 1987.
16. Newcombe TM. Special Psychology, New York: Nevery Hall, 1950, 28.
17. Schultz Duane P. Schultz, Sydney Ellen Psychology and work today: an introduction to industrial and organizational psychology (10th ed. ed.). Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 2010, 71.
18. Shankarlal Bhatt C. L and People of Indian States and Union Territories. Gyan Publishing House 2006; 2:15.
19. Sharma MP, Sadana BL, Harpreet Kaur, Kitab Mahal. Public Adminsitration in Theory and Practice, 47th Edn, 2011.
20. Singhal NS. Modern Educational Testing (New Delhi: Sterling Publishers, Pvt Ltd.), 1975, 35.
21. Spector PE. Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes and consequences. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE, 1997.
22. Venkateswarlu K. Personnel Factors Influencing Selection and Performance of Sports, Madras, YMCA College of Physical Education, 1972, 6.