

Determinants of Job Satisfaction: A Study of Haryana Power Sector

OPEN ACCESS

Volume: 9

Special Issue: 1

Month: March

Year: 2022

P-ISSN: 2321-4643

E-ISSN: 2581-9402

Impact Factor: 3.122

Received: 17.01.2022

Accepted: 06.03.2022

Published: 19.03.2022

Citation:

Sunita. “Determinants of Job Satisfaction: A Study of Haryana Power Sector.” *Shanlax International Journal of Management*, vol. 9, no. S1, 2022, pp. 10–19.

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.34293/management.v9iS1-Mar.4886>

Sunita

Research Scholar, Department of Commerce
Chaudhary Devi Lal University, Sirsa, Haryana

Abstract

The Hawthorne studies were the first research plan to attempt to enumerate employee's attitudes and correlate attitude with overall work competencies. In the mid-1930, two years after the Hawthorne studies were accomplished; Hoppock (1935) published the first rigorous study about job satisfaction. This critical study addressed job satisfaction from a much more complex. The main objective of this study is to identify the determinants of job satisfaction among the employees in the Haryana power sector and compare the level of job satisfaction between the employees of DHBVNL (Dakshin Haryana Bijali Vitran Nigam Limited) and HVPNL (Haryana Vidut Prasaran Nigam Limited). The data is collected from 50 employees working in the Haryana Power Sector with the help of a questionnaire developed on 7 points Likert scale via email as well as office visits. The data is analyzed by employing Descriptive Statistics and an Independent Sample T-test. This paper finds out the major determinants contributing to the higher level of job satisfaction and also the least satisfying determinants. This study also reveals a considerable difference in the level of job satisfaction amongst employees of HVPNL and DHBVNL only towards two variables out of a total of 30 studied variables and towards the remaining variables, there is no significant difference in the level of job satisfaction among the employees of DHBVNL and HVPNL.

Keywords: Job Satisfaction, Employees, Haryana Power Sector, DHBVNL, HVPNL

Introduction

Research on job satisfaction began sincerely in the early 1930s and was greatly influenced both by the economic and employment crises of the depression and by the new developments in attitude measurement.

Interestingly, research published within the 1930s showed an interest in additional different aspects of labor experience than what's captured by the construct of job satisfaction. After that, research conducted at Kimberley Clark, Kornhauser, and Sharp (1932) laid the inspiration for what was to return by using questionnaires to ask about the facet of job satisfaction and relating that facets to the aspects of the performance of interest to management. The assessment of labor attitude became the first vehicle for studying work experience, questionnaires became the first method, facet measurement became the first content, and organizational effectiveness became the primary reason for the research. Satisfaction became the major way of capture worker experiences and therefore the research then mostly targets the predictors and performance correlate of satisfaction, how best to life satisfaction, and the development of theories of satisfaction formation.

Hoppock (1935), curious about the important consequences of the depression, focused his attention on the social implications as against the organizational implications of job dissatisfaction.

The years of 1940s and 1950s were the era of empirical efforts to list the various work environment feature and personal characteristics that predict different levels of labor satisfaction. There were also continued empirical efforts to reveal the power of satisfaction to predict job performance in its various forms.

A. Concept and Definitions of Job Satisfaction

Human Resources (HR) is measured to be the most precious asset in any organization. HR is the most significant support of economic, social, and cultural developments. In developing countries, a large segment of the population is depressed about getting a good job to satisfy their needs. According to Fisher and Hana (1931), Job satisfaction is an innermost factor that can be measured as an effecting alteration with jobs and employment situations. So, if the job is enjoyable for a person, they would be satisfied with their job. In contrast, if a person doesn't have desirable job satisfaction, they wouldn't enjoy their work and would like to alteration their job.

According to Hoppock (1935), job satisfaction is a compound and multidimensional concept that is related to psychological, physical, and social factors. The term job satisfaction refers to the attitudes and thoughts people have about their job. Significant attitudes towards the job indicate job satisfaction. Insignificant attitudes towards the job indicate job dissatisfaction (Armstrong M., 2006). Job satisfaction is an entire set of feelings as well as emotions that find out the performance of the organization at the workplace. It is one of the most vital components determining the satisfaction of employees. It is one of the topics that have been discussed over the past several years.

According to different studies, it is one of the essential features which determine the physiological, emotional, psychological, and overall environmental conditions that affect the employees as a whole and they have a considerably strong influence on performance in the organization (Agbozo, Owusu, Hoedoafia, & Atakorah, 2017). Referring to the above definitions, it seems that job satisfaction is a positive appearance that each individual has on his place and his vision of the job.

B. Theoretical Review on Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction theories are abundant. Early studies in the context of work-related attitudes were started before the First World War I and aggressively followed in the UK, Europe, and America. Employment occurrence has been considered since the beginning of human social life. Every researcher has spoken about this issue. Job satisfaction is an important factor in career success and increases efficiency as well as personal satisfaction.

According to Maslow (1943), mainly members of our society who is ordinary and partly satisfied in their basic needs are partially unsatisfied in all their basic needs at the same time. McGregor (1957) contrasted the predictable views of "management job in harness human power" which he called Theory X with a "latest theory of management" which he called Theory Y. Theory X is based on predictable assumptions about worker inspiration such as those represents in the works of Taylor. Conversely, Theory Y is based on the appreciation that people need opportunities at work to satisfy not only lower-level needs for wages and honest working conditions but also high-level social and ego needs. Vroom (1964) suggested that people will be motivated when they expect that their efforts will result in desirable outcomes. He assumed motivation is a mental and cognitive process because the individual perception of events is equally important and in some cases, more important than the objective or actual state of affairs. McClland (1985) found that some important needs differ from individual to individual; (1) the need for achievement, (2) the need for power, and (3)

the need for affiliation. Herzberg (2003) suggested that the factors that produce job satisfaction and motivation are different from the factors that lead to dissatisfaction. The satisfaction of lower-level needs, which he called Hygiene or extrinsic factors, does not lead to motivation; it only needs the absence of dissatisfaction. In other words, factors such as pay or working conditions, interpersonal relations, supervision, security, and status can cause dissatisfaction, but satisfying these needs will not lead to motivation. On the other hand, Motivation or intrinsic factors are associated with the nature of work itself- achievement, recognition, challenging work, responsibility, and growth.

C. Haryana Power Sector

Haryana Power sector comprised four publicly-owned Corporations via HVPNL, UHBVNL, HPGCL, and DHBVNL after which unbundling of the HSEB in 1998. HSEB (Haryana State Electricity Board) was responsible for power production, transmission, allocation in the State. The Haryana power sector was restructured on August 14, 1998. The Haryana State Electricity Board (HSEB) was restructured initially into two publicly owned Corporations namely Haryana Vidut Prasaran Nigam Ltd. (HVPNL) and accountable for the operation and preservation of the State’s own power generating stations. Simultaneously, a self-governing regulatory body i.e. Haryana Electricity Regulatory Commission (HERC), was established to assist and counsel the State Govt. on the development of the power sector, to control the power utilities, and take suitable measures to balance the interest of different stakeholders in the power sector, namely electricity consumers, power entities and generation companies, etc.

HVPNL was further restructured on July 1, 1999, by separating two more Corporations, namely Dakshin Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Ltd. and Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Ltd. with the accountability of distribution and retail supply of power within their control. While UHBVNL is accountable for Panchkula, Ambala, Yamunanagar, Kurukshetra, Kaithal, Karnal, Panipat, Sonapat, Rohtak, Jhajjar, and Jind districts, DHBVN caters to Hisar, Fatehabad, Bhiwani, Sirsa, Faridabad, Gurgaon, Mewat, Rewari, and Narnaul districts(dhbvn.org.in).

D. Problem Statement

The foremost and principal component of the organization is its employees. They are measured to be the backbone of any organization. This study typically comprises job satisfaction. Job satisfaction has a direct link with the personnel of any organization. Job satisfaction is also associated with the productivity and success of an organization. The Haryana power sector focuses on providing satisfaction to its employees who are likely to achieve the targets and higher status of the organization. The major concentration of the study is to identify the determinants of job satisfaction in the Haryana power sector. This study will also identify the most satisfying and least satisfying determinants of job satisfaction in the Haryana power sector and the reasons behind the dissatisfaction of the employees.

Literature Review

Durst and DeSantis (1997) analyzed the determinants of job satisfaction. The data were collected through the interview method from 1039 respondents. The data were analyzed by employing Descriptive Statistics and Multiple Regression Analysis. The result showed that for Federal- level employees, experience gained, friendly co-workers, and perception of supervisor competence had a significant and positive impact on job satisfaction. At state-level employees, age, promotion opportunities and experience gained had a significant impact on job satisfaction. At the local level employees, pleasant surroundings, job security, perception regarding supervisors had a significant impact on job satisfaction.

Ellickson and Logsdon (2001) examined the determinants of job satisfaction. The data were collected through a questionnaire from 1227 employees. The data were analyzed by employing Descriptive Statistics, Correlation Analysis, and Ordinary Least Square Regression Analysis. The result showed that Adequate Work equipment, resources, training opportunities, supervision, pay and benefit, promotional opportunities, and equitable workload had a significant and positive impact on employee's job satisfaction. But physical workspace and perception of safety had no significant impact on job satisfaction.

Mansoor et al., (2011) examined the impact of job stress on employee's job satisfaction. The data were collected through a questionnaire method from 134 employees and analyzed by employing Descriptive Statistics and Regression Analysis. The result found that job stress was negatively related to employee's job satisfaction. Job stress considered by workload, conflict at the workplace, and physical environment negatively affect employee's job satisfaction.

Garcia, Bonavia, and Losilla (2011) analyzed working conditions as determinants of job satisfaction. The data were collected through a questionnaire from 1553 employees. The data were analyzed by employing a Latent Structural Model with Maximum Likelihood for parameter estimation with a structural equation program. Findings revealed that emotional demands, job insecurity, and quantitative demand negatively affect job satisfaction and influence at work, development & meaning, social support, role clarity, quality of leadership predictability and esteem had a positive impact on employee's job satisfaction.

Qasim, Cheema, and Syed (2012) founded which factors were contributing to the highest level of job satisfaction and identified the most satisfying and least satisfying factors of job satisfaction. The data were collected through a close-ended questionnaire from 40 employees. The data were analyzed by employing ANOVA, Correlation Analysis, and Regression Analysis. Results indicated that among four factors (work environment, remuneration, promotion, and fairness of treatment), the work environment had the highest magnitude that was contributing to a higher level of job satisfaction. The work environment was the most significant factor in maintaining employees satisfied in the business world. Remuneration, promotion, and fairness had insignificant impacts on job satisfaction.

Yeh Jen- Hsiu (2015) examined how job demand, job resources, and job insecurity influence job satisfaction. The total sample size was 1666 respondents and the data were collected through a questionnaire and were analyzed by employing Descriptive Statistics. The findings indicated that job resources such as earnings, job content, and workplace relations increase job satisfaction more than job demands such as working hours, workloads, work, and family conflict decrease job satisfaction. Job demand, job resources, and job insecurity play a significant role in job satisfaction.

Rahman, Akter, and Khan (2017) investigated the factors that affect job satisfaction. The data were collected through a survey questionnaire from 318 employees. The data were analyzed by employing the Multiple Regression and Hierarchical Regression Model. The findings revealed that motivational and hygiene factors had significant effects on job satisfaction. The findings also showed that employee's relationships at work with supervisors/peers, acknowledgment of their work, career development, career growth, rewards, working conditions had a positive impact on employee's job satisfaction.

Vigan and Giaugue (2018) examined job satisfaction in the public sector. The data were collected through a questionnaire from 458 employees and were analyzed by employing Descriptive Statistics. The findings revealed that features related to the working environment were the major determinants of job satisfaction in the public sector. Individual characteristics and intrinsic characteristics of work had a significant impact on job satisfaction.

Sittisomwaleerak (2020) examined the influence of the workplace environment on job satisfaction. The data were collected through a questionnaire from 226 people and analyzed by employing Descriptive Statistics and Regression Analysis. The results showed that the workplace environment had the strongest impact on the employees’ job satisfaction. Job empowerment and employees recognition also had a significant impact on employee’s job satisfaction.

Kumar (2020) analyzed the influence of demographic factors and work environment on job satisfaction among police personnel. The data were collected through a questionnaire from 6041 employees. The data were analyzed by employing Descriptive Statistics, Correlation Analysis, and Ordinary Least Square Regression Analysis. Results indicated that age, gender, and rank had a positive impact on job satisfaction but educational qualification negatively affects employee’s job satisfaction. In organizational characteristics, supervisor support, formalization, instrumental communication, organization support, procedural justice in performance evaluation, and inputs in decision making had a great impact on job satisfaction. But promotional opportunities negatively affect job satisfaction.

Research Objectives

The objectives of the study are as follows;

- To identify the variables of job satisfaction among the employees in the Haryana Power Sector.
- To compare the level of job satisfaction among the employees of HVPNL and DHBVNL.

Research Hypothesis

H_0 : There is no significant difference in the level of job satisfaction among the employees of HVPNL and DHBVNL.

Research Methodology

A descriptive research design is used for the study. The study used primary as well as secondary sources for collecting data. The primary source of data collection done with the help of administration of structured questionnaire developed on 7 points Likert scale as “Strongly disagree” “Disagree” “Somewhat disagree” “Undecided” “Somewhat agree” “Agree” “Strongly Agree” via email, as well as office visits and secondary sources, are journals, books, or internet source. The study is carried out in the Haryana power sector. A total of 50 employees are randomly selected from the Haryana power sector out of which 25 are from HVPNL and 25 from DHBVNL.

The data are transcribed in the statistical package for social science (SPSS) and analyzed by employing Descriptive Statistics, and an Independent Sample T-test.

Analysis and Interpretation

The first objective of the study is to identify the variables of job satisfaction in the Haryana Power sector. This study identifies the variable through frequency, percentage, rank, etc.

Table 1 The Determinants of Job Satisfaction

Sr. no.	Job Satisfaction Dimension	ED	D	SWD	UN	SWS	S	ES	Rank
1.	Nature of work assigned to you.	2.0%	10.2%	8.2%	6.1%	32.1%	38.8%	2.1%	3.5
2.	Allotted duty hours & working conditions.	20.4%	20.4%	6.1%	2.0%	24.5%	22.4%	4.1%	25.5

3.	Delegation of duties and responsibilities.	8.2%	8.2%	8.2%	2.0%	22.4%	44.9%	6.1%	5
4.	Clarity of role and responsibilities.	6.1%	10.2%	6.1%	6.1%	30.6%	32.7%	8.2%	6.5
5.	Timely availability of information.	6.1%	6.1%	18.4%	4.1%	30.6%	28.6%	6.1%	16
6.	Adequacy of supporting staff.	20.4%	6.1%	6.1%	4.1%	26.5%	28.6%	8.2%	14.5
7.	Operating rules & procedures.	4.1%	8.2%	14.3%	4.1%	42.9%	20.4%	6.1%	11.5
8.	Conflict & grievance handling procedures are easy and time-bound.	2.0%	12.2%	16.3%	10.2%	20.4%	28.6%	10.2%	20.5
9.	Timely promotion.	24.5%	22.4%	8.2%	18.2%	10.2%	12.2%	4.1%	29
10.	Adequacy of delegated financial power to complete work at the site.	22.4%	16.3%	16.3%	12.2%	14.3%	16.3%	2.0%	27.5
11.	Offered management & Administrative support.	10.2%	14.3%	14.3%	2.0%	32.7%	18.4%	8.2%	19
12.	Offered cooperation and coordination between division and subdivisions.	6.1%	6.1%	14.3%	2.0%	26.5%	36.7%	8.2%	9
13.	Digitalization at the workplace.	4.1%	6.1%	14.3%	2.0%	32.7%	36.7%	4.1%	3.5
14.	Provided social networking opportunities.	2.0%	26.5%	4.1%	10.2%	26.5%	26.5%	4.1%	22
15.	Offered social security measures.	10.2%	16.3%	10.2%	12.2%	14.3%	32.7%	4.1%	25.5
16.	Location of work.								
	4.1%	10.2%	6.1%	8.2%	28.6%	32.7%	10.2%	6.5	
17.	Provided hygiene at the workplace.	2.0%	18.4%	6.1%	4.1%	34.7%	24.5%	10.2%	11.5
18.	Given respect to employees.	2.0%	10.2%	4.1%	10.2%	24.5%	34.7%	14.3%	3.5
19.	Occupational prestige & image.	2.0%	16.3%	6.1%	6.1%	30.6%	38.8%	2.0%	13
20.	Flexibility in work.	2.0%	14.3%	6.1%	6.1%	30.6%	38.8%	2.0%	9
21.	Provided opportunity to learn new skills & abilities.	8.2%	14.3%	10.2%	6.1%	26.5%	30.6%	4.1%	17.5

22.	Provided safety equipment to perform work.	4.1%	8.2%	8.2%	8.2%	36.7%	24.5%	10.2%	9
23.	Provided opportunities to learn new skills & abilities.	6.1%	18.4%	10.2%	4.1%	26.5%	24.5%	10.2%	17.5
24.	Provided opportunities to utilize your skill and knowledge.	6.1%	12.2%	14.3%	4.1%	28.6%	26.5%	8.2%	14.5
25.	Challenges and risks associated with work.	2.0%	6.1%	8.2%	8.2%	24.5%	34.7%	16.3%	1st
26.	Feedback time of performance.	6.1%	12.2%	8.2%	14.3%	32.7%	20.4%	6.1%	20.5
27.	Given the recognition of work accomplished.	4.1%	22.4%	14.3%	4.1%	34.7%	16.3%	4.1%	23
28.	Conditions of residential accommodation.	28.6%	18.4%	6.1%	6.1%	24.5%	10.2%	6.1%	27.5
29.	Condition of office premises.	6.1%	24.5%	10.2%	6.1%	22.4%	20.4%	10.2%	24
30.	Contribution of a department to corporate social responsibility.	4.1%	12.2%	6.1%	4.1%	32.7%	36.7%	4.1%	3.5

Source: Questionnaire,

Table -1 depict the Percentages and Ranks of all the determinants of job satisfaction. 75.5% of employees are highly satisfied with the variable challenges and risk associated with the work followed by the contribution of department to corporate social responsibility, digitalization at the workplace, given respect to employees, and nature of work assigned to you, etc. 55.1% of employees are least satisfied/ dissatisfied with the timely promotion, adequacy of delegated financial power followed by the condition of residential accommodations.

The second objective of the study is to compare the level of job satisfaction among the employees of DHBVN and HVPNL. The job satisfaction level is analyzed with the help of the mean, S.D, and p-value of the T-test.

Table 2 The Level of Job Satisfaction with Statistical Significance

Job satisfaction Dimension	Organization’s Name	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig. (2-tailed)
Nature of work assigned to you.	DHBVN	25	4.84	1.67	.847
	HVPNL	25	4.76	1.20	
Allotted duties hours & Working conditions.	DHBVN	25	2.92	1.95	.002*
	HVPNL	25	4.64	1.82	

Delegation of duties and responsibility.	DHBVN	25	4.44	2.14	.109
	HVPNL	25	5.24	1.16	
Clarity of role and responsibility.	DHBVN	25	4.56	2.00	.361
	HVPNL	25	5.00	1.29	
Timely availability of information.	DHBVN	25	4.36	1.86	.274
	HVPNL	25	4.88	1.42	
Adequacy of supportive staff.	DHBVN	25	4.52	1.91	.610
	HVPNL	25	4.76	1.33	
Operating rule & procedure.	DHBVN	25	4.40	1.73	.313
	HVPNL	25	4.84	1.28	
Conflict & grievance handling procedures.	DHBVN	25	4.84	1.74	.401
	HVPNL	25	4.44	1.58	
Timely promotion.	DHBVN	25	2.92	1.77	.213
	HVPNL	25	3.60	2.02	
Adequacy of delegated financial power to complete work at the site.	DHBVN	25	3.48	1.91	.707
	HVPNL	25	3.28	1.81	
Offered management & administrative support.	DHBVN	25	4.60	1.80	.173
	HVPNL	25	3.88	1.87	
Offered cooperation and coordination between division and subdivision.	DHBVN	25	5.20	1.58	.109
	HVPNL	25	4.44	1.70	
Digitalization at the workplace.	DHBVN	25	5.12	1.56	.165
	HVPNL	25	4.52	1.44	
Provided social networking opportunities.	DHBVN	25	4.60	1.89	.254
	HVPNL	25	4.04	1.51	
Offered social security measures.	DHBVN	25	4.32	1.97	.710
	HVPNL	25	4.12	1.81	
Location of work.	DHBVN	25	4.72	1.72	.606
	HVPNL	25	4.96	1.54	
Provided Hygiene at the workplace.	DHBVN	25	4.44	1.85	.319
	HVPNL	25	4.92	1.49	
Given respect to employees.	DHBVN	25	4.92	1.82	.475
	HVPNL	25	5.24	1.26	
Occupational prestige & image.	DHBVN	25	4.60	1.93	.366
	HVPNL	25	5.04	1.42	
Flexibility in work.	DHBVN	25	4.96	1.59	.362
	HVPNL	25	4.56	1.47	
Provided opportunities to perform a variety of work.	DHBVN	25	4.72	1.74	.208
	HVPNL	25	4.08	1.80	

Provided safety equipment to perform work.	DHBVN	25	5.00	1.77	.421
	HVPNL	25	4.64	1.31	
Provided opportunities to learn new skills & abilities.	DHBVN	25	4.08	1.99	.172
	HVPNL	25	4.80	1.65	
Provided opportunities to utilize your skill and knowledge.	DHBVN	25	4.16	1.86	.148
	HVPNL	25	4.88	1.58	
Challenges and risks associated with work.	DHBVN	25	5.40	1.38	.307
	HVPNL	25	4.96	1.61	
Feedback time of performance.	DHBVN	25	4.36	1.68	.735
	HVPNL	25	4.52	1.63	
Given the recognition of work accomplished.	DHBVN	25	3.84	1.77	.244
	HVPNL	25	4.40	1.58	
Condition of residential accommodation.	DHBVN	25	3.00	1.97	.174
	HVPNL	25	3.80	2.12	
Condition of office premises.	DHBVN	25	4.12	2.06	.883
	HVPNL	25	4.20	1.73	
Contribution of the department to corporate social responsibility.	DHBVN	25	5.20	1.55	.046*
	HVPNL	25	4.36	1.55	

Source: Questionnaire, *F value significant at $P < 0.05$

Table 2 depicts the mean, S.D, and P-value of all the dimensions of job satisfaction. All mean values are more than 3 for both organizations except the mean values of allotted duties hours & working conditions; timely promotion variables (2.92) in DHBVN. Statistically, the employees of HVPNL and DHBVN are indifferent towards all the variables of job satisfaction except allotted duties hours & Working conditions with a p-value of 0.02 and the contribution of the department to corporate social responsibility with a p-value of 0.046.

Finding and Conclusion

The main objective of this study is to identify the variables of job satisfaction and compare the level of job satisfaction among the employees of DHBVN and HVPNL. Based on percentage and rank method, This study reveals that challenges and risks associated with work, digitalization at the workplace, given respect to employees, nature of work assigned to you are the variables from which employees are highly satisfied and timely promotion, adequacy of delegated financial power to complete work, condition of residential accommodation are the variables from which employees are highly dissatisfied. Based on the mean, S.D, and independent T-test, this study finds a total of 30 variables out of which 2 variables (allotted duties hours & working conditions, contribution of department to corporate social responsibility) have a significant difference in the level of job satisfaction among the employees of DHBVN and HVPNL. It is concluded that employees of HVPNL are satisfied on all 30 variables while DHBVN employees are satisfied on 28 variables. The rate of satisfaction is higher in the HVPNL than in DHBVN.

References

1. dhbvn.org.in.
2. Abdolshah, M., Khatibi, S. A., & Moghimi, M. (2018). Factor influencing job satisfaction of banking sector employees. (The case study: Asgariyeh and MehrIran bank in Qazvin and Alborz, Iran). *Journal of Central Banking Theory and Practices.*, 207-222.
3. Agbozo, G. K., Owusu, I. S., Hoedoafia, M. A., & Atakorah, Y. B. (2017). The effect of work environment on job satisfaction: Evidence from the banking sector in Ghana. *Journal of Human Resource Management.*, 5 (1), 12-18.
4. Armstrong, M. (2006). *Human Resource Management Practices: A Guide To People Management*. Kogan Page Ltd.
5. Durst, S. L., & DeSantis, V. S. (1997). Determinants of job satisfaction among Federal, State, and Local Government employees. *State and Local Government Review.*, 29 (1), 7-16.
6. Ellickson, M. C., & Logsdon, K. (2001). Determinants of job satisfaction of Municipal Government employees. *State and Local Government Review*, 33 (3), 173-184.
7. Kumar, T. V. (2020). The influence of demographic factors and work environment on job satisfaction among police personal: An empirical study. *International Criminal Justice Review.*, 1-25.
8. Mansoor, M., Fida, S., Nasir, S., & Ahmad, Z. (2011). The impact of job stress on employees job satisfaction: A study of telecommunication sector of Pakistan. *Journal of Business Study Quarterly.*, 2 (3), 50-56.
9. Marin-Garcia, J. A., Bonavia, T., & Losilla, J. M. (2011). Exploring working condition as determinants of job satisfaction: An empirical test among Catalonia service workers. *Service Industries Journal.*, 31 (12), 2051-2066.
10. Nahavandi, A., Denhardt, R. B., Denhardt, J. V., & Aristigueta, M. P. (2015). *Organizational Behavior*. Greater Noida: SAGE publication India Pvt. Ltd.
11. Qasim, S., Cheema, F.-E.-A., & Syed, N. A. (2012). Exploring factors affecting employee's job satisfaction at work. *Journal of Management and Social Science.*, 8 (1), 31-39.
12. Rahman, K. U., Akhter, W., & Khan, S. U. (2017). Factors affecting employees job satisfaction: A comparative study of conventional and Islamic insurance. *Cogent Business & Management*, 1-15.
13. Sittisom, W. (2020). Factors affecting job satisfaction of employees in Pharmaceutical Industry: A case study of Thailand. *A Multifaceted Review-Journal in The Field of Pharmacy.* , 125-133.
14. Vigan, F. A., & Giauque, D. (2018). Job satisfaction African public administration: A systematic review. *International Review of Administrative Science.*, 84 (3), 596-610.
15. Yeh, H.-J. (2015). Job Demand, Job Resource, and Job satisfaction in East Asia. *Social Indicators Research.*, 121 (1), 47-60.