*IJAS*

# The Study of Employee Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment

Dr. Pooja Sehgal

*Associate Professor, Institute of Management Studies Noida*

***Abstract:** **The main objective of the study is to investigate the effect of employee satisfaction and organizational commitment. Accordingly, this paper attempts to review the articles and research papers based on employee satisfaction and organizational commitment on work at different institutions. In identifying the effect of employee satisfaction and their organizational commitment to work, the researcher incorporated a survey methodology in which the researcher did an in depth analysis into the relevant literature and sources. The analysis of relevant literature and discussion suggest that there is a better co-relation between these two variables namely employee commitment and satisfaction and organizational commitment.**

***Keywords:** **Job satisfaction, Employee commitment, employee–employer relationships, working environment**

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Employee satisfaction and retention are very important issues for an organization. And also it is very essential to people who study the relationship between employee satisfaction and organizational commitment (Syptak et al., 1991). One studies have paid attention to employee satisfaction in a private religious institutions (Schroeder, 2003).

There is an interest in employee satisfaction. Roznowski and Hullin (1992) explained that after an individual is rented, knowledge of the employees' satisfaction becomes the very essential part of data in an organization.

Robbins (1998) explained about the important of job satisfaction. A satisfied workforce gains higher outputs. Employee absenteeism, departure of good employees and incidences of destructive employee behavior are less disruptions for an organization. One of a research has been done in this area. But still there are some major controversies such as what are the main factors are that contribute to employee satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Employee achievement, the work itself, job recognition, advancement and responsibility are gained the employee motivation and satisfaction. These are the intrinsic factors for the employee satisfaction (Hackman and Oldman, 1980; Herzberg, 1957). Some studies highlight wage, policies of the company and administrative as well as supervisory practices are important for employee satisfaction. These factors explained as extrinsic factors (Butler, 1982; Gruenburg, 1980; Herzberg, 1957; Seybolt, 1976).
Linkages have become progressively essential in modern society. Mowday et al. (1982), employee–employer relationships and social linkages are the important things for employee commitment to the organization. The quality of employee and employer relationships is

important for an organization as well as individual and the society. These consequences include both negative and positive consequences. Turnover, low productivity, tardiness, absenteeism and theft influence for negative behaviors. Loyalty,
High productivity, dedication, punctuality and commitment has no impact to positive behavior. Positive behaviors encourage the organization's success (Newstorm and Davis, 1997). Strong linkages are help to the wellbeing of an entity (Tyree, 1996). Wood (1976) emphasizes, ''the health of a higher educational institution depends on the job satisfaction of its employees''. Problems related to job satisfaction and organizational commitments among employees within different types of organizations have been studied broadly by the researches in different countries. Spector (1997) described that job dissatisfaction and poor commitment of employees lead to negative repercussions in an organization. Employees' absenteeism, lack of interest in the work and high employee turnover are few examples. Lack of promotional opportunities, poor working environment, employee relations and unsatisfied supervision are some of the factors that affect job satisfaction of employees. Herzberg (1959) in his motivation theory explained that some of the employees motivated to perform an activity for its own sake and personal rewards. And the other type of employee are motivated to perform an activity to earn a reward or avoid punishment. Large number of researches have been done to find out the factors that influence to the employees satisfaction and organizational commitment. (Oshagbemi 2003; Lu et al.2005; Horton 2006; Chen et al. 2006). Chen et al. (2006) developed a model of six factors to measure the satisfaction of university teachers, namely organization vision, respect, result feedback and motivation, management system, pay and benefits and work environment.

## Purpose of the Study

The employee satisfaction is a crucial factor for the advancement of any organization. Employees' commitment for the development of an organization and the satisfaction of their customers are greatly influenced by the employee satisfaction. Employees are considered as the internal customers of an organization. Hence their satisfaction with the existing working environment of the organization will support to achieve the long term and short term financial and non-financial goals of an organization.
Employee satisfaction has been given the minimum attention in many organizations. Most of the mangers have not recognized the importance of job satisfaction. Therefore, most of the organizations are not gaining the maximum contribution from its employees. There are many factors that affect the dissatisfaction of the employees which cause financial as well as non-financial problems to the organization.
Most of the organization focus and invest to increase their customer satisfaction and pay minimum attention on employee job satisfaction which affect one of the most important factor for the sustainable development of any organization. Continues less attention or less zero investment on human capital development will affect the organization to move away from its main goals and objectives and make them less competitive in the market. Therefore it is important to study and understand how the organizational commitment impact on employee satisfaction. Hence the purpose of this study is to identify the relationship between employee satisfaction and the organizational commitment.

## Literature Review

The employee satisfaction is the most acceptable and the most widely used theory than any other theories of motivation (Alexander, 1985; Iredale, 1985; Schroeder, 2003; Srisawat, 1990; Thorn, 1985) explains that the motivation–hygiene theory is preferred over the

alternative theories. Because it becomes a tool of the management and had motivated many empirical and theoretical studies related to employee satisfaction and commitment.

To motivate employees, it is essential to supply one or more satisfiers of Herzberg's. Those satisfiers can be explained as motivators, comprised a sense of achievement, creative or challenging work, advancement opportunities, responsibility and recognition. These factors are helpful to develop and grow employee as a person and professional.

This theory shows that not only hygiene factors to avoid employee dissatisfaction. But it is essential to provide factors intrinsic to work it. There are numerous discussions over issues about the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Few researchers have explained that the employee satisfaction is a predictor of organizational commitment (Dramstad, 2004; Ferris, 1986; Meixner and Bline, 1989; Porter et al., 1974; Price, 1977; Rose, 1991; Williams and Hazer, 1986). Some other studies have explained organizational commitment as a predictor of employee satisfaction (Aranya and Ferris, 1984; Aranya et al., 1984; Bateman and Strasser, 1984; Lachman and Aranya, 1986; McGregor et al., 1989). However these studies have suggested a different causal procedure between employee satisfaction and organizational commitment.

Hygiene Factors - Herzberg stated that hygiene factors relate to the environment in which the task is carried out and do not directly relate to the task. The hygiene factors are the causes of job dissatisfaction on the job and the existence of negative hygiene factors will lead to employee dissatisfaction and unhappiness. However, employee satisfaction will not be attained by improving these factors. Improving hygiene factors is preventing the impediments of Job dissatisfaction. He concluded that it is the presence of job dissatisfaction that makes employees to leave a company (Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman, 1959,). Therefore, this will be the benchmark of evaluating the implementation of hygiene factors.

Motivation Factors - Herzberg stated that the motivation factors relate directly to the task being performed. The motivational factors were the primary cause of job satisfaction and a decline in these factors would not lead to job dissatisfaction. The individual would just go back to the original neutral level (Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman, 1959). Therefore, this will be the benchmark of evaluating the implementation of motivation factors.

The job satisfaction can be define as an employee's affect to their job based on comparing real outcomes with preferred outcomes (Cranny, Smith, and Stone, 1992). In generally it can be recognized as a multifaceted construct. It is included employee feelings about a variety of both internal and external job elements (Howard and Frink, 1996). Porter and Steers (1973) controvert that the extent of employee satisfaction is reflected in the cumulative level of met worker expectations.

There are certain features with preferential values which are expected by the employees from their jobs such as pay, promotion, autonomy etc. The importance of these preferences can be differ across individuals, but when the unfulfilled expectations are accumulated, there is less job satisfaction and then they leave the career (Feilds, 2002) indeed, some interest in employee satisfaction is focused basically on its effect on absenteeism, intentions to quit, employee commitment and real turnover (Agho, Mueller, and Price, 1993). But some studies have explained the variance in turnover is a level of satisfaction. It may be smaller than originally thought (Hom and Griffeth, 1991; Lee, Mitchell, Holtom, McDaniel, and Hill, 1999). One other study presented that employees who changed jobs and moved into a new

job had higher levels of satisfaction in the new job (Riza and Ganzach, 2014). The facets of meaningful work and promotion opportunities can be identified as important predictors of intentions to leave an organization. Mathieu's (1990) test has explained the effects of a variety of antecedents on organizational commitment were mediated by their impact on employee satisfaction (Feilds, 2002).

Aspects of the situation of work have been shown to be determinants of employee satisfaction (Arvey, Carter, and Buerkley, 1991). A broad situational factor, job level, is positively related with satisfaction with all aspects of the job. Because higher-level jobs effect to have better working conditions, promotion opportunities, pay, autonomy, supervision and responsibility (Feilds,
2002) found that perceptions that employees have about numerous aspects of their work environment (management climate, job content, reward fairness, employee influence and promotion opportunities) described job satisfaction. This study also indicates different patterns of work satisfaction at different age levels for non-college graduates (U shape), non-elite professionals (downward sloping) and elite professionals (upward sloping). Personal characteristics such as age, gender, education level, and pay grade did not contribute incrementally in explaining the variance in work satisfaction beyond that explained by variables describing the job situation. In Fields (2002) evaluation of alternative confirmatory factor models found that job satisfaction and the personality tendencies of negative and positive affectivity were empirically distinct. Job satisfaction can be describe as a satisfactory favorable emotional state resulting from the administration of one's job, an effective reaction to one's job and an attitude towards one's job (Weiss, 2011). According to this this definition we form attitudes towards our career by considering our feelings, beliefs and our behaviors. Cranny et al. (1992) explained that employee satisfaction is a contribution of cognitive and affective responses to the differential perceptions of employees. (Cranny, Smith, and Stone, 1992) Researchers like Porter and Lawler define job satisfaction as a one-dimensional construct; that is, you are generally satisfied or dissatisfied with your job (Porter and Lawyer, 1968). In contrast, Smith, Kendall and Hulin dispute that job satisfaction is something multidimensional; that means you may be more or less satisfied with your career, your supervisor, pay and the workplace (Smith, Kendall and Hulin, 1985). Two main theories that have always been referred in job satisfaction are Maslow's theory of needs and Herzberg's two factor theory. Maslow's theory has explained five levels of individual needs. They are self - actualization and esteem needs at the top level whilst social, safety and physiological needs at the bottom. This theory has frequently been used to conceptualize employee's motivation based on the different levels of needs. Maslow assumes that some needs are more important than other needs and must be satisfied before the other needs can serve as motivator (Maslow, 1959). However, studies dating back to Herzberg's have shown that workers satisfaction is as a result of motivation factors whereas dissatisfaction are a result of hygiene factors (Herzberg 1957). It is logical that more satisfied workers will tend to add more value to an organization. Unhappy employees will not give 100 percent of their effort for very long (Herzberg 1957) For the organization, job satisfaction of its workers means a work force that is motivated and committed to high quality performance. Increased productivity, the quantity and quality of output per hour worked seem to be a byproduct of improved quality of working life. It is significant to note that there is no conclusive or stable literature on the relationship between job satisfaction and productivity. (Spector, 1997)

## 2. DISCUSSIONS

To understand the causes of employee (dis) satisfaction, Frederick Herzberg (1957) conducted a study that was later revalidated in 2003 by Harvard business school. In the late 1950s, many people considered Frederick Herzberg as a pioneer in motivation theory and he did a research with a group of employees to find out what mode them satisfied and dissatisfied on the job. Based on his findings, Herzberg created a two-dimensional paradigm of factors affecting employee' attitudes about work, intrinsic (Hygiene) and extrinsic (Motivators) factors as : Hygiene Factors Salary, Supervision, Company and Administration policy, Interpersonal relationship, Job security and Working conditions : Motivation Factors Achievement and recognition, Responsibility, Work itself Growth and advancement.These factors are directly influencing for employee job satisfaction and their commitment.

Tansel and Gazioglu (2014) indicate there are four measures of Job satisfaction; they are satisfaction with influence over job, satisfaction with amount of pay, satisfaction with sense of achievement and satisfaction with respect received from supervisors. The survey is rich in individual characteristics and workplace characteristics. A matched Employer-Employee survey and a rich set of questions on work conditions and management-employee relations were included in this research. The results in this research is to support the following propositions. First, the management employee relationships are not much content in large firms. However, there is also evidence that large firms are likely to compensate for their size by providing regular discussions of promotion possibilities, training needs and pay issues. Second we observe lower levels of job satisfaction in larger firms as it is often reported in the literature. Third, the observed lower levels of job satisfaction in the large firms may be due to weak management-employee relationships. As per this study; staffing issues, pay issues, health and safety at work, chances of promotion, training needs, and management-employee relationships are influencing factors for employee job satisfaction and their commitment.

Chen et al.,(2006) has introduced an employee satisfaction model for higher education. That study had used relevant academic literature to establish a satisfactory model for the university teachers in Chin Min Institute of Technology which is a private university situated in middle Taiwan. Using a questionnaire based on the Importance of satisfaction model, 248 teachers were administered the questionnaire, to investigate and analyze their importance of satisfaction level. There are six dimensions in this model. They are organization vision, respect, result feedback and motivation, management system, pay and benefit and work environment.

An individual or an employee who is already satisfied with basic needs will focus on social needs and esteem needs. Accordingly, the college teachers who are already satisfied with physiological and safety or security needs focuses on higher salaries and fair promotion system (Chen, Yang, Shiau, and Wang 2006).Therefore, salaries and promotion system are directly influencing employee's job satisfaction and their commitment.

Humborstad and Perry (2011) employee job attitude were measured using job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Humborstad and Perry (2011) have tested the relationship between perceived practices and Chinese employee service effort. Although it has tested the turnover intention to inspect the mediating role of employee attitudes in this relationship. By this research employee job attitudes were measured by using job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

Humborstad and Perry (2011) have developed a model of the mechanisms of their empowerment that includes the variables of job attitudes. These variables of job attitudes combine employee satisfaction with affective organizational commitment.

Employee empowerment gives employees greater autonomy and responsibility in handling daily activities (Haas, 2010). It allows employees to solve problem themselves (Humborstad and Perry, 2011). Researches in the West suggest to stimulate the untapped human resources to empower employees (Spreitzer, 2008). Empowerment efforts in China need to be linked with the creation of positive attitudes for it to deliver the desired output for an organization. Positive attitudes can be created through wider communication on empowerment efforts, and stronger organizational and supervisor support (Sut, Wong and Chad 2011) Positive attitudes create pleasant working environment. In this situations can see supervisors are parsing and acknowledging employees. Therefore, the above factors can be introduced as influencing factors for employee job satisfaction and their commitment.

Cho and Park (2011) investigated the role of trust within one US federal agency, the Federal Administration, by examining the relationship among several managerial practices, trust and employee attitudes including employee satisfaction and organizational commitment. Trust is very essential for employee job satisfaction and their commitment. Cho and Park (2011) has identified three types of trusts. Basically, they have divided into two as fallows; Vertical Trustsand Horizontal trust. Verticaltrust means Trust in management andTrust in supervisors. Horizontal trusts mean Trust in co-workers.

Trust in management has a larger effect in commitment than the other two forms. Trust in management is substantially associated with employee satisfaction and organizational commitment. Having trustworthy supervisors increase thee supervisor employee satisfaction but it does not increase commitment. Because employee consider supervisor as separate from the organizations. Trust in co-workers is positively related to satisfaction and commitment.

However, compared to trust in management, trust in co-workers is weekly related to satisfaction and commitment. Trust in management, trust in supervisor and trust in co-workers are influencing factors for employee job satisfaction and their commitment.

Bjerke, Ind and Paoli (2007) have explained that the aesthetic environment in work places creates positive feelings and the removal of existing nice environment would create dissatisfaction.

This correlates with Herzberg's argument (Herzberg, 1957) that environment and working conditions influence people's dissatisfaction with their work, whereas people are seldom made satisfied by a good environment – that relies primarily on the job itself. Employees working with business clients are happier when the workplace have aesthetic feature (Bjerke, Ind, and Paoli 2007).

According to Bjerke, Ind and Paoli (2007).a strong organizational culture contributes to strengthened feelings of identity among employees. The clearer the company values are defined and explained, the stronger the sense of being a part of the organization. The degree is determined by the length of time an employee work for a company, the importance of their job, the quality of employee working environment and the quality of the colleagues. Bjerke, Ind and Paoli (2007) has identified pleasant working environment, nice colleagues, and varied job tasks as motivational – and satisfaction factors. The analysis of the interviews explained that employee satisfaction seemed good. There could be an impact of physical environment on the satisfaction employees. But they didn't think that people were so aware of the influential power of art, design and architecture.

In general, respondents believed that a nice environment created positive feelings among them and several respondents agreed that if the unique art, design and architecture at Telenor was "removed" or changed, dissatisfaction could well increase. This tie in with Herzberg's argument (Herzberg, 1957) that environment and working conditions influence people's dissatisfaction with their work, whereas people are seldom made satisfied by a good

environment – that relies primarily on the job itself.

Several of those working with business clients mentioned a sense of pride also because of the art, design, and architecture, particularly when they had customer meetings at the company site, and when they took customers on a tour to show art, design, and architecture.

When employees identify themselves with the culture, the working environment will have a tendency to become more pleasant and this again may increase morale. Telenor says that employees seem to identify with the company and its culture, the internal co-operation may become better and new ideas welcomed. Employees who are allowed to work with a greater freedom and flexibility are more creative than the employees with less freedom and flexibility. The open space office leads to greater creativity because of the possibility to exchange ideas and thoughts with colleagues.

Nicholas and Paoli (2007) suggest that there could be a link between physical environments, creativity, and the provision of service quality. If this explained that the environment contributes to performance improvement and to a change in motivation. Physical environment motivate them to provide a better service quality to customers. A strong organizational culture leads to stronger employee performance.

Brown and Sargeant (2007) has stated age, education, gender, Occupational area and tenure, salary and fringe benefits, organizational policy and administration are influential factors for employee job satisfaction and their commitment. Brown and Sargeant(2007) found the longer employees stayed at their institution, the higher the levels of organizational commitment and employee satisfaction.

Wang and O'Reilly (2010) examined the relationships among dispositional sources of value preferences and personality attributes, organizational commitment and satisfaction. He has identified four types of models for employee job satisfaction and their commitment. They are; Direct effects of dispositions on organizational commitment, direct effects of dispositions on organizational satisfaction, direct effects of dispositions on organizational satisfaction, which in turn explains organizational commitment and Mediation effects of organizational satisfaction on the relationship between dispositions and organizational commitment.

Wang and O'Reilly (2010) has focused on two types of organizational commitment: instrumental commitment and normative commitment (Caldwell, Chatman and O'Relly, 1990) The instrumental commitment focuses on reward-based incentives of the organization and the nature of an exchange relationship between the individual and the organization, while the normative commitment refers to individuals' commitment to the organization because of the internal factors of the organization. These might include for example, the norms, values and culture that characterize the organization, which are shared by individuals and the organization.

The models of direct effect of disposition on organizational commitment as well as the mediation effect of organizational satisfaction on the relationship between disposition and organizational commitment.

Piketon Research and Extension Center -1998: James R. Lindner, a researcher and extension Associate of The Ohio State University conducted a research study on employees' satisfaction at Piketon Research and Extensions center (Linder.1998).

The employees were requested to rank the importance of the following ten factors of Herzberg's theory. They are job security, sympathetic help with personal problems, personal loyalty to employees, interesting work, good working conditions, tactful discipline, good wages, promotions and growth in the organization, feeling of being in on things, and full appreciation of work done. The research design of this study employed a descriptive survey method. The target population of this study included employees at the Piketon Research and

Extension Center and Enterprise Center (centers). The centers are in Piketon, Ohio. The ranked order of factors were Interesting work –motivation factor, good wages – hygiene factor, full appreciation of work done
– motivation factor, job securitt - hygiene factor, working condition - hygiene factor, promotion and growth - motivation factor, responsibility - motivation factor, personal loyalty to employees - hygiene factor, supervision - hygiene factor and interpersonal
- hygiene factor.

Canada 2003: Employees satisfaction research was conducted in twelve different studies in Canada (Ouedraogo and Leclerc, 2013). The sample of the studies were a wide cross-section of different industries and job classes, and included lower level supervisor. The findings from this study reviewed that the top two motivators leading to employee satisfaction were achievement, and recognition for the achievement. These are the motivation factors. The top two de-motivators leading to employee dissatisfaction were bureaucratic and unfair company policies and administration, and poor supervision. These are the hygiene factors (Ouedraogo and Leclerc, 2013). The findings are in line with Herzberg's findings on factors that satisfy and dissatisfy employees (Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman, 1959). It is essential to note that an average wage did not lead to employee satisfaction. And also it is not lead to job dissatisfaction. An inadequate wage however resulted in employee dissatisfaction.

Herzberg's Research: Herzberg conducted an employee satisfaction research study on 200 Pittsburgh engineers and accountants in the 1940's.Herzberg's research used a pioneering approach, based on open questioning that was explorative approach and very few assumptions to gather and analyze details. Herzberg's combined this approach with open interviews in order to get more meaningful results than the conventional practice of asking closed (basically yes/no) or multiple-choice or extent-based questions. In his studies, he discovered that the factors that produced job satisfaction were separate and distinct from those that lead to employee dissatisfaction. However, the extrinsic factors (motivators) were the primary cause of employee satisfaction and the intrinsic factors were the causes of dissatisfaction on the job. He concluded that it is the presence of employee dissatisfaction and unhappiness that makes employees to leave a company (Herzberg, 1957).

**The conclusion and future research direction**
Internal factors have an effect on job satisfaction and employee commitment. The focus is on factors that management can control to improve employee satisfaction and commitment. The job satisfaction survey should be conducted from time to time. In the future surveys can also focus on "External factors that have an effect on job satisfaction and employee commitment".

## 3. REFERENCES

[1]     Agho, A., Muceller, C., & Price, J. (1993). Determinants of Employee Job Satisfaction: An Empirical Test of a Causal Model. Human Relations, 46(8), 1007-1027.
[2]     Alexander, H. B. (1985). Job Motivation of Seventh-day Adventist Administrators in North America. Loma Linda University, Loma Linda.
[3]     Aranya, N., & Ferris, K. (1984). A reexamination of accountant ants' organizational professional conflict. The Accounting Review, 1-15.
[4]     Arvey, D., Carter, G. W., & Buerkley, D. K. (1991). Job satisfaction: dispositional

and situational influences. USA: Industrial Relation Center.

[5]     Bateman, T. S., & Strasser, S. (1984). A longitudinal analysis of the antecedents of organizational commitment. Academy of Management Journal, 95–112.

[6]     Bjerke, R., Ind, N., & Paoli, D. (2007). The impact of aesthetics on employee satisfaction and motivation. EuroMed Journal of Business, 2, 57-73.

[7]     Brown, D., & Marcel A Sergeant. (2007). Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, and Religios Commitment of Full-Time University Employees. Journal of Research on Christian Education, 16(2), 211-241

[8]     Butler, A. J. (1982). Job satisfaction and dissatisfaction among public school transportation supervisors in Michigan according to the theory of Frederick. Dissertation Abstracts International, 43 (3466).

[9]     Caldwell, D. F., Chatman, J., & O'Reilly, C. (1990). Building organizational commitment: Amulti-firm study. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 17(2), 245-261.

[10]    Chen S, Yang C, Shiau J, Wang H (2006) The development of an employee satisfaction model for higher education. TQM Mag 18(5):484–500.

[11]    Cho, Y. j., & Hanjun Paark. (2011) Explo the relationship among Trust, Employee satisfaction, and organizational commitment.

[12]    Public management Review, 511-573.

[13]    Comm, C. L., & Mathaisel, D. (2000). Assessing employee satisfaction in service firms: an example in higher education, The Journal of Business and Economic Studies, 23-53

[14]    Cranny, C., Smith, P., & Stone, E. (1992). Job satisfaction: how people feel about their jobs and how it affects their performance. New York: Lexington.

[15]    Dramstad, A. S. (2004). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment among teachers in Norway: A comparative study of selected schools from public and private educational systems. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Andrews University, Berrien Springs.

[16]    Feilds, D. L. (2002). Taking the measure of work: A guide to validated scales for organizational research and diagnosis.

[17]    Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

[18]    Ferris, K. R. (1986) A comparison of two organizational commitment scale. Personnel Psychology, 36, 87-98

[19]    Gruenberg, B. (1980). The unhappy worker: An analysis of educational and occupational differences in the determinates of job satisfaction. American Journal of Sociology, 86, 247-271

[20]    Hass, M.R. (2010). The double-edged swords of autonomy and external knowledge: analysing team effectiveness in a. The Academy of Management Journal, 53,989-1008.

[21]    Hackman, J. R., & Oldman, G. (1980). Work Design. Wesley: Addison.

[22]    Herzberg, F. (1957). One more time: How do you motivate your employees? Hartvard Business Review, 659(5), 113-118, 170.Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1959).The motivation to work.New York: John Wiley & Sons.

[23]    Herzberg, F., Mausne, B., Peterson, R., & Capwell, D. (1987). Job attitudes: Review of research and opinion. New York: Garland Publishing.

[24]    Hom, P W., & Griffeth, R. (1991). Structural Equations Modelling Test of a Turnover Theory. Journal of Applied Psychology, 76,350-366.

[25]    Horton S (2006) High aspirations: differences in employee satisfaction between

university faculty and staff. ARQOL 1(3):315– 322

[26] Howard, J. I., & Frink, D. (1996). The effects of organizational restructure on employee satisfaction. Group and organization Management, 21(3), 278-303.

[27] Humborstad, S. I., & Perry, C. (2011). Employee empowerment, job satisfaction and organizational commitment: An in depth empirical investigation. Chinese Management Studies, 5(3), 325-344.

[28] Iredale, D. J. (1985). Analysis of the factors affecting job satisfaction among educational administrators employed by the Seventh- day Adventist church in Australia. Andrews University, Berrien Springs.

[29] Lachman, R., & Aranya, N. (1986). Evaluation of alternative models of commitments and job attitudes of professionals. Journal of Ocupational Behaviour, 7, 227-243.

[30] Lee, T. W. , Mitchell, T., Holtom, B.l McDaniel, L., & Hill, J. (1999). The Unfolding Model of Voluntary Turnover: a replication and extension. Academy of Management Journal, 42(4), 450-462.

[31] Lindner, J.R. (1998). Understandig employee motivation. Journal of Extension, 36(3), 1-2.

[32] Lu H, while A, Barriball K (2005) Job satisfaction among nurses: a literature review. Int J Nurs Stud 42(2):211–227 Maslows, A.H. (1959). Motivation and Personality (3ed ed.). Harper and Row.

[33] Mathieus, J.E., & Zajac, D. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates and consequences of organizational commitment. Psychological Bulletin, 108, 171-194.

[34] McGregor, C. C., Killough, L., & Brown, R. (1989). An investigation of organizational professional conflict management accounting. Journal of Management Accounting Research, 9, 104-118.

[35] Meixner, W. F., & Bline, D. (1989). Professional and job-related attitudes and the behaviors they influence among government accountants. Auditing, and Accountability Journal, 2, 8-20.

[36] Mowday, R. T., Porter, L.W. &Sreers, R.M. (1982) Employee organization linkages:The psychology of commitment, absenteeism and turnover. New York: Academic Press.

[37] Newstorm, J. W., & Davis, K. 91997). Organizational behavior at Work (10ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill.

[38] Nicholas, R. B., & Paoli, D. D. (2007). The impact of aesthetics on employee satisfaction and motivation. EuroMed Journal of Business, 2(1), 57-73.

[39] Oshagbemi T (2003) Personal correlates of job satisfaction: empirical evidence from UK universities. Int J Soc Econ 3020(12):1210–1232

[40] Ouedraogo, A., & Leclerc, A. (2013). Job Satisfaction and Organizational Performance: Evidence from Canadian Credit Union. Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict, 35-50.

[41] Porter, L. W. , & LAwler, E. (1968). Managerial Attitudes and Performance. Homewood: Irwin-Dorsey.

[42] Porter, L. W., Mowday, R., & Bouliam, P. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. Journal of Allied Psychology, 59, 603-609.

[43] Porter, L., & Steers, R. (1973). Organizational, Work, and Personal Factors in Employee Turnover and Absenteeism.

[44] Psychological Bulletin, 80 (2), 151-176.

[45]    Price, J. L.,(1977). The study of turnover. Administrative Science Quarterly, 23, 351-353.

[46]    Riza, S. D., & Ganzach, Y. (2014). Job Satisfaction over Time: A Longitudinal Study of the Differential Roles of Age and Tenure. Journal of Management, 1-22.

[47]    Robbins, S. P. (1998). Organizational behavior: Concepts, controversies, applications. Upper Saddle River.

[48]    Rose, R. W. (1991). Comparison of employee turnover in food and beverage and other departments in hotel properties. Texas Women's University.

[49]    Roznowski , M. , & Hullin , C. ( 1992 ). The scientific merit of valid measures of general constructs with special reference to job satisfaction and job withdrawal. In Cranny, C., Smith, P., & Stone, E. (1992). Job satisfaction: how people feel about their jobs and how it affects their performance. New York: Lexington

[50]    Smith, & E. F. Stone (Eds.), Job satisfaction (pp. 123 – 163). New York: Lexington Books

[51]    Schroeder, R. (2003). The level of job satisfaction and its relationship to organizational and religious commitment among the workers of Andrews University. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Andrews University.

[52]    Seybolt, J. (1976). Work satisfaction as a function of the person-environment interaction. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 17, 66-75.

[53]    Smith, P.C. Kendall, L., & Hulin, C. (1985). The Received Job Description Index. Chicago: Rand McNally.

[54]    Spector, P. E. (1997). Job satisfaction, applications, assessment, causes and consequences (Vol. 3), SAGE publications. Spector, P. E. (1997). Job satisfaction, applications, assessment, causes and consequences (Vol. 3), SAGE publications.

[55]    Schroeder, R. (2003). The level of job satisfaction and its relationship to organizational and religious commitment among the workers of Andrews University. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Andrews University.

[56]    Spreitzer, G.M. (2008), ''Taking stock: a review of more than twenty years of research on empowerment at work'', in Barling, J. and Cooper, C.L. (Eds), The Sage Handbook of Organizational Behavior, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.

[57]    Srisawat, S. (1990). Job satisfaction of Seventh - day Adventist employees in Thailand. According to the Herzberg motivation- hygiene theory. Loma Lind University. Loma Linda.

[58]    Sut, I., Wong, H., & Chad P. (2011). (Humborstad & Perry, 2011), Chinese Management Studies, 5(3), 325 – 344

[59]    Syptak, M. J., Marshall, D. W., & Wilmer, D. (1991 October). Job satisfaction: Putting theory into practice.Family Management,1–8.

[60]    Tansel, A., & Gazioglu, S. (2014). Management-employee relations, firm size and job satisfaction. International Journal of Manpower, 35(8), 1260-1275.

[61]    Thom, J. S. (1985). Job motivation and satisfaction of Seventh - day Adventist higher education employees. Loma Linda University. Loma Linda.

[62]    Tyree, T.R. (1996). Conceptualization and measuring commitment to higher school teaching. The Journal of EducationalResearch, 89, 295-304.

[63]    Wang, Y., & O'Reilly, C. A. (2010). Dispositions, organizational commitment and satisfaction: A longitudinal study of MBA graduates. Total Quality Management & Business Excellence, 21(8), 829-847

[64]    Weiss, W. H. (2011). Building morale, motivating, and empowering employees. Supervision,72(9), 23-26.

[65] Williams, L. J., & Hazer, J, (1986). Antecedents and consequences of satisfaction and commitment in models: A reanalysis using latent variable structural equation methods. Journal of Applied Psychology, 71, 219-231.

[66] Wood, O. R. (1976). A research project: Measuring job satisfaction of the community college staff. Community College Review, 3(3), 54-56.

[67] Rajawat, A.S., Upadhyay, P., Upadhyay, A. (2021). Novel Deep Learning Model for Uncertainty Prediction in Mobile Computing. In: Arai, K., Kapoor, S., Bhatia, R. (eds) Intelligent Systems and Applications. IntelliSys 2020. Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing, vol 1250. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-55180-3_49

[68] A. S. Rajawat, O. Mohammed and P. Bedi, "FDLM: Fusion Deep Learning Model for Classifying Obstructive Sleep Apnea and Type 2 Diabetes," 2020 Fourth International Conference on I-SMAC (IoT in Social, Mobile, Analytics and Cloud) (I-SMAC), Palladam, India, 2020, pp. 835-839, doi: 10.1109/I-SMAC49090.2020.9243553.

[69] A. Singh Rajawat and S. Jain, "Fusion Deep Learning Based on Back Propagation Neural Network for Personalization," 2nd International Conference on Data, Engineering and Applications (IDEA), Bhopal, India, 2020, pp. 1-7, doi: 10.1109/IDEA49133.2020.9170693.

[70] K. Barhanpurkar, A. S. Rajawat, P. Bedi and O. Mohammed, "Detection of Sleep Apnea & Cancer Mutual Symptoms Using Deep Learning Techniques," 2020 Fourth International Conference on I-SMAC (IoT in Social, Mobile, Analytics and Cloud) (I-SMAC), Palladam, India, 2020, pp. 821-828, doi: 10.1109/I-SMAC49090.2020.9243488.

[71] Rajawat, A.S., Upadhyay, P., Upadhyay, A. (2021). Novel Deep Learning Model for Uncertainty Prediction in Mobile Computing. In: Arai, K., Kapoor, S., Bhatia, R. (eds) Intelligent Systems and Applications. IntelliSys 2020. Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing, vol 1250. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-55180-3_49

[72] Chetan Chauhan, Ravindra Gupta and Kshitij Pathak. Article: Survey of Methods of Solving TSP along with its Implementation using Dynamic Programming Approach. International Journal of Computer Applications 52(4):12-19, August 2012.

[73] Chauhan, Chetan & Gupta, Ravindra & Pathak, Kshitij. (2012). TSP Solver using Constructive Method of Heuristic Approach. International Journal of Computer Applications. 53. 33-38. 10.5120/8387-1993.

[74] C. Chauhan and M. K. Ramaiya, "Advanced Model for Improving IoT Security Using Blockchain Technology," 2022 4th International Conference on Smart Systems and Inventive Technology (ICSSIT), Tirunelveli, India, 2022, pp. 83-89, doi: 10.1109/ICSSIT53264.2022.9716268.

[75] S. Srivastava and R. Kumar, "Indirect method to measure software quality using CK-OO suite," 2013 International Conference on Intelligent Systems and Signal Processing (ISSP), 2013, pp. 47-51, doi: 10.1109/ISSP.2013.6526872.

[76] Ram Kumar, Gunja Varshney , Tourism Crisis Evaluation Using Fuzzy Artificial Neural network, International Journal of Soft Computing and Engineering (IJSCE) ISSN: 2231-2307, Volume-1, Issue-NCAI2011, June 2011

[77] Ram Kumar, Jasvinder Pal Singh, Gaurav Srivastava, "A Survey Paper on Altered Fingerprint Identification & Classification" International Journal of Electronics Communication and Computer Engineering Volume 3, Issue 5, ISSN (Online): 2249–071X, ISSN (Print): 2278– 4209

[78]    Kumar, R., Singh, J.P., Srivastava, G. (2014). Altered Fingerprint Identification and Classification Using SP Detection and Fuzzy Classification. In: , et al. Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Soft Computing for Problem Solving (SocProS 2012), December 28-30, 2012. Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing, vol 236. Springer, New Delhi. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-81-322-1602-5_139

[79]    Kumar, Ram and Sonaje, Vaibhav P and Jadhav, Vandana and Kolpyakwar, Anirudha Anil and Ranjan, Mritunjay K and Solunke, Hiralal and Ghonge, Mangesh and Ghonge, Mangesh, Internet Of Things Security For Industrial Applications Using Computational Intelligence (August 11, 2022). Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4187998 or http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4187998