

## Effects of perceived job motivating potential on job satisfaction

R.N. Singh<sup>1\*</sup>, Vivek Pandey<sup>2</sup>

### ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine the effects of perceived motivating potential of the job on job satisfaction among employees. In all, 300 employees from some of the organizations were purposively selected for the present study. They were divided into three groups based on their scores on Job Diagnostic Survey and then they were compared on job satisfaction scale. The Hindi version of the both the tools were used in this study. The descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data. The results obtained in the study made it obvious that perceived motivating potential of the job is an immediate and important determinant of job satisfaction among employees. The proposed hypothesis was accepted. The results are thoroughly discussed and interpreted. Besides it, limitation of the study and suggestion for future researches are also underlined.

**Keywords:** *Job motivating potential, Job satisfaction, JDS*

Job satisfaction happens to be a very important factor in determining job performance and other behavioural aspects of employees. As the literature shows, this variable has been studied as an independent and dependent variable both. There may be various correlates of job satisfaction (Taylor, 1911; Caramila, 2018). The motivating potential of the job as perceived by the employees is said to be one of the important correlates of it. The motivating potential of jobs is a type of job enrichment approach to the job which is assumed to enhance the motivation level of employees. This model was proposed by Hackman and Oldham (1980).

### *Job Characteristics*

The characteristics of the job being performed by employees are assumed to be of vital importance in increasing performance, morale, satisfaction and so on. Though, this reality was known to the management and the scholars also since the time industrialization took a revolutionary form, yet as the history reveals, an earliest attempt to design tasks systematically for optimal performance was carried out by Taylor (1911). Taylor pleaded to apply scientific methods to help the employees to maximize the production. He advocated the use of cooperative efforts for increasing outputs in the industries. He argued to reward employees and promote participative climate rather than criticizing and punishing the

<sup>1</sup>Professor of Psychology, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi (U.P), India

<sup>2</sup>Asstt. Professor of Psychology, Sarvajanic PG College, Mrabadshahpur, Jaunpur (U.P.), India

\*Responding Author

Received: October 13, 2020; Revision Received: December 07, 2020; Accepted: December 31, 2020

## Effects of perceived job motivating potential on job satisfaction

employees. Such a managerial attitude is found to be helpful in motivating the employees for the best possible performance (Caramila, 2018).

### ***Job Dimensions***

Hackman and Oldham (1975, 1980) proposed Job Characteristics Model (JCM) which focuses on five factors of the job being important for employee performance. *Skill Variety* – scope of different skills and talents to be used by employees; *Task identity* - degree to which the job requires completion of a whole and identifiable piece of work; *Task significance* - implications of the job for the workers and other people; *Autonomy*- freedom and discretion to employee to perform the job and *Feedback*- information provided to employees about their performance.

### ***Job Satisfaction***

The industrialist, OB experts and also the management give very much importance to job satisfaction, because if there is a state of low job satisfaction among employees, the conditions in the organizations are sure to deteriorate. It can lead to low productivity and other industrial problems including industrial unrest too (Davis, 1981).

According to Locke (1976), job satisfaction may be viewed as the “pleasurable emotional state resulting from the perception of one’s job as fulfilling or allowing the fulfillment of one’s important job values, provided these values are compatible with one’s needs”. Thus, job satisfaction is the favourableness or unfavourableness with which employees view their work (Gruneberg, 1976, Wanous & Lawler III, 1972). It arises from a complex set of circumstances in the same way that motivation does (Robbins et al., 2009; Davis, 1981; Near et al., 1978).

Job satisfaction may be global or specific. Sometimes job satisfaction is referred to as the overall feeling of satisfaction, i.e., satisfaction with the situation as a whole (global satisfaction). At some other point of times, job satisfaction is also defined as a person’s feeling towards specific dimensions of the work environment.

### ***Background of the study***

The factors assumed to be positively associated with job satisfaction can be placed under the heading of job challenges, for example, variety of the job, creativity, difficulty of goals and the use of one’s own skills. Such challenges may have other outcome also (Wanous, 1974). Like challenges, job clarity has also been reported to be associated with job satisfaction (Mitchell & Larson, 1987). Job satisfaction also correlates with opportunities of enhancement in the patterns of wages etc. Besides it, chances of promotion during the job period and some other factors also contribute to job satisfaction (Lawler, 1981; Kumkum, 2019).

Near, Rice and Hunt (1980) found relationship between objective conditions of work and extra work and subjective views of extra work conditions. Their findings seem to support to spillover thesis. Near et al (1978) also have stated that the relationship between work and non-work factors is not so simple, as there are some interacting factors such as objective condition of the extra work environment, reactions of employees to extra work load (life satisfaction). Wright (1990) found relationship between participation in decision making and job satisfaction, since it facilitates performance of employees. Singh and Dewani (1983) obtained positive correlation between job satisfaction and position of the employee in the hierarchy of the organization.

## Effects of perceived job motivating potential on job satisfaction

Rahman and Nurullah (2014) obtained high motivating potential among the employees of private sectors banks as compared to the employees of public sector banks. This suggests that the management must consider the other possible correlates also likely to be responsible for increasing job satisfaction. The performance efficiency of any organization depends to a great extent on the job characteristics and if the management dares to ignore, it may be fatal for their organization as regards its efficiency (Mohiuddin, 2008; Luthan, 2011). Martin (2017) has also advocated the significance of job characteristics in motivating the employees for increased performance.

### *Present Study*

The review as presented previously suggests that JCM model can exert motivational effects on job satisfaction among employees depending on the perceived motivating potential of the job being performed by them. But, studies as mentioned above have generally not applied JCM model to ascertain its effects on job satisfaction as measured in this study in particular and in other organizations in general. The sample of the area of the study, types of the organizations covered in the present study and the tools used in this study have generally not been used in previous studies.

In view of the above, this study was conducted to examine the effect of job characteristics as measured with JCM approach to job satisfaction. The JCM model no doubt, has been widely used as the catalyst for enhancing job satisfaction among employees. But, as the review reveals, this model of job enrichment has generally not been used in our context, especially on the participants as covered in the present study. Thus, an attempt was made to determine the effects of motivating potentials of the job on job satisfaction among employees.

## **METHODOLOGY**

### *Objective*

To examine the effects of perceived motivating potential (MPS) of the job on job satisfaction among employees

### *Hypothesis*

Perceived motivating potential (MPS) of the job would exert differential effects on job satisfaction among employees.

### *Design*

It is a comparative study. Three groups based on the scores of employees on job descriptive survey (JDS) were constituted. (Low, Moderate & High motivating potential groups). These groups were compared on job satisfaction scale to determine the impact of JCM on job satisfaction among employees. Thus, this study tapped MPS (Motivating Potential score) of the job as the independent variable and job satisfaction was measured as the dependent variable.

### *Sample*

Sample of the present study comprised Class-III employees of nationalized banks, Life Insurance Corporation of India, hospital nurses, technical workers and teachers. In all, 300 employees were purposively selected for testing. They belonged to Jaunpur, Allahabad and Varanasi districts in Uttar Pradesh. The sample comprised 183 male and 117 female participants. The range of their personal details are age 28-56 yrs, education 10-17 yrs, work experience 2-26 yrs, income Rs. 4000 -1800, number of dependents 1-4, married 267 and unmarried 37.

## Effects of perceived job motivating potential on job satisfaction

### *Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria*

The unwilling employees were not included in the study. The participants between the age ranges 28-56 years only were recruited for testing. They possessed normal health and had no major health related problems. The employees not meeting the above criteria were excluded. All the participants were regular employees with at least two years experience.

### *Tools*

**The Job Descriptive Survey** (Hackman and Oldham, 1975): It provides motivating potential score (MPS), which represents a summary score indicating how motivating a job is for the employees. The following formula is used to compute the M.P.S.

$(MPS = (Skill\ variety + Task\ Identity + Task\ significance) \times Autonomy \times Feedback / 3)$ .

The scores obtained by the participants are inserted in the above formula (the numbers 1 through 7) to calculate their MPS. It is a reliable ( $r=0.81$ ) as well as a valid measure of MPS as reported by Hockman and Oldham themselves.

**Job Satisfaction Scale (Singh, 1997)**, a Hindi version of 'An Index of Job Satisfaction' (Brayfield & Rathey, 1951) was used to measure job satisfaction. It has 18 items and out of 18 items, 9 items are positively worded being scored as 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1 for completely agree, agree, undecided, disagree and completely disagree respectively. The negative items are scored in reverse order. The larger the total score, the higher job satisfaction and vice-versa. Its reliability is 0.86 and validity is 0.88.

### *Procedure*

The participants were administered the selected tools to realize the objectives of the study. They were taken in full confidence and warm rapport was established before starting the testing. They were seen off with warm gestures after the testing was over.

## **RESULTS**

The results obtained in this study are presented in table-1 and table-2, Table-1 shows that the mean scores of low motivating potential group (LMPG), moderate motivating potential group (MMPG) and high motivating potential group (HMPG) on job satisfaction scale are 59.50, 62.54 and 58.92 respectively. The differential effects of MPS on job satisfaction are seen here, but the results are not according to the expectations. It was expected that HMPG would score higher than the other two groups on job satisfaction scale, but in reality, it did not happen so.

**Table No. -1: MPS based employee groups and job satisfaction**

MPS based groups	M	SD	SE <sub>m</sub>
Low MPSG	59.50	6.50	0.83
Moderate MPSG	62.54	3.36	0.43
High MPSG	58.92	6.93	0.89

**Table No. 2: Significance of difference between means of three MPS based employee groups on Job Satisfaction**

Groups Compared	t	P
Low vs Mod. MPSG	4.75	0.01
Low vs High MPSG	3.85	0.01
Mod vs High MPSG	3.69	0.01

## Effects of perceived job motivating potential on job satisfaction

The scores of three groups of employees on job satisfaction scale were subjected to ANOVA and F-ratio (10.26) was found to be significant at 0.01 level, suggesting that perceived motivating potential of the job exerts differential effects on job satisfaction. One thing needs to be noted in this context that high motivating potential group (HMPG) scored slightly low than the moderate and low motivating potential group, thus it is not according to the expectation. Further, for inter groups comparisons, t-test was used and results are presented in table-2. It is evident from this table that all the t-ratios are significant ( $P < 0.01$  level), establishing the differential effects of job motivating potential (MPS) on job satisfaction among employees. Although the differential effect of motivating potential of the job is observable, but the results with reference to HMPG are not according to expectations.

### DISCUSSION

It was hypothesized that perceived motivating potential of the job would exert differential effects on job satisfaction among employees. Although the F-ratio is statistically significant and the hypothesis is accepted, but the obtained differential effects are not strictly in accordance with the proposed hypothesis. It was expected that higher the level of perceived motivating potential of job (MPS), higher would be the level of job satisfaction among employees and vice-versa. But it was not found to be so. The high motivating potential group (HMPG) perceived its job possessing the high level of motivating potential, but exhibited low level of job satisfaction as compared to the other two groups (MMPG & LMPG). It is not according to the assumption of the present study. It seems, as if this group values some other aspects of job more than only the motivating potential, which might have led to relatively decreased job satisfaction in HMPG of employees (Kumum, Singh & Rajpoot, 2019).

Job satisfaction has a number of correlates (Near et al., 1980, Campbell et al. 1976; Andrews & Witney, 1974; Writght, 1990). It has been reported that various job characteristics strongly associate with job satisfaction and employees value some other job aspects also (Davis, 1981; Singh & Bhardwaj, 2007; Robbins, 2009). As regards the results of the present study, the results are not in accordance with the assumptions of this study. It seems as if, some other factors moderated the effects of motivating potential (MPS) of the job and thus, reduced the level of job satisfaction among HMPG of employees (Kumkum et.al., 2019; Pandey, 2000).

In some other studies also motivating potential of the job has been found to be highly relevant in improving job satisfaction and the management must be sensitive to it to maintain the efficiency of their organization (Rahman & Nurullah; 2014). The job context must be made employee friendly for realizing the desired organizational goals and ignoring this aspect is not advisable (Luthan, 2011; Mohiuddin, 2008 & Martin, 2017). It has been reported that feeling the job being meaningful and significant, leads to identification with the job, which in turn motivates the employees for higher performance (Singh et al 2019; Pandey, 2000).

The role of job flexibility, organizational hierarchy, work conditions etc. should also be given due attention for better results (Singh & Bhardwaj, 2007; Kumkum et al, 2019). It seems as if, there is a need of enhancing organizational commitment and improving work conditions to strengthen the attitude of job satisfaction. Such a planning can contribute to enhancing job satisfaction and other employee related behaviours also (Susanty, 2013).

### CONCLUSION

This study was conducted to evaluate the effects of perceived motivating potential of jobs on job satisfaction among employees. Though the differential effects of perceived motivating potential were observed in this study, but, the effects were not found to be as straight as it was assumed to be, as the HMPG scored lowest mean on job satisfaction scale as compared to the two other groups (LMPG & MMPG). The management should be attentive to the fact that nature of the job is not the only factor which influences job satisfaction of employees; rather other relevant factors should also be identified and enriched for enhancing job satisfaction.

### Implications

Since the findings of the present study do not present a straight relationship between motivating potential of the job and job satisfaction, so it is suggested that management should be additionally careful for enhancing the level of satisfaction among their employees. They should also pay due attention to other aspect of the job content and context for realizing the objectives of organizational efficiency and employees well-being.

### Limitation and Suggestion

This study was conducted in a particular area of Jaunpur, Allahabad and Varanasi districts in eastern U.P. This may limit the generalizability of the findings. It was a comparative study between three groups of employees formed on the basis of their perceived motivating potential of the job being performed by them. The correlational studies need to be conducted for more comprehensive findings and other aspects of behaviour of employees such, as job involvement, organizational commitment, organizational culture, leadership, career development prospects, and organizational citizenship behaviour etc should also be covered in future studies to ascertain their relationships with job satisfaction.

### REFERENCES

- Brayfield, A. H. & Rathey, H.F. (1951). An Index of Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 35 (5), 307-311.
- Caramela, S. (2018). *Management theory of Frederick Taylor*. Business.com.
- Davis, K. (1981). *Human behaviour at work*. Tata McGraw Hill.
- Gruneberg, M.M. (1976). *Job satisfaction*. John Wiley, N.Y.
- Hackman J.R. and Oldham G.R. (1975). Development and Diagnostic Server, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 159-170.
- Hockman J.R. and Oldham, G. R. (1980). *Work Redesign*. Reading M.A. Adisan, Wesley.
- Kumkum Singh, R.N. Singh, R.P. Rajpoot, Y. (2019). Role of job flexibility in job satisfaction, OCB, and Subjective well-being among travel and tourism employees. *Indian Journal of Human Relations*, 51(1), 148-155.
- Lawler E.E.-III (1981) *Pay and Organization Development*. Reading M.A. Addison Wesley.
- Locks F.A. (1976). The nature and cause of job satisfaction. In M.D. Dunnette (Ed) *Hand book of industrial and organizational Psychology*. 1297-1349, Chicago Rand McNally.
- Luthan, F. (2011). *Organizational Behaviour*. An evidence-based approach McGraw Hill.
- Martin (2017). *Understanding the job characteristics model* (including job enrichment). Home Magazine.
- Mitchell, T.R. & Larson J.R. Jr (1987). *People in Organizations: An Introduction to organization behaviour*. McGraw Hill Inc. International, New York.
- Mohiuddin, K. (2008). Job satisfaction of public sector industrial managers in Bangladesh. *Journal of Social Science & Business Studies*, 16, 165.

## Effects of perceived job motivating potential on job satisfaction

- Near, J. P. et al., (1978). Work and extra-work correlates of lives and job satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, June 248-264.
- Pandey, V. (2000). Impacts of job characteristics and group effectiveness on employees' attitudes. Ph.D. Thesis (Psychology), V.B.S. Purvanchal University, Jaunpur.
- Rahman, Md. H. & Nurullah, S.M. (2014). A comparative study of motivating potential score of employees of public and private sector banks. *Global Journal of Management & Business*, 14(4-A).
- Robbins, S.P., Judge, T.A. & Singhi, S. (2009). *Organizational Behaviour*. Pearson, Prentice Hall.
- Singh, J. G. & Dewani, A. (1983). Job satisfaction among bank employees. *Indian Psychological Review* 24(2), 22-25.
- Singh, R.N. (1997). Job satisfaction Scale (Hindi Version), GSGS, Varanasi.
- Singh, R.N. & Bhardwaj, S. S. (2007). Effects of organizational hierarchies on job satisfaction. *Indian Psychological Review*, 69, 235-238.
- Singh, R. P., Singh, R. N., Kumkum, & Singh, Y.R. (2019). Job design, work performance and turn over intention among managers of Indian Cole Industry. *Indian Journal of Human Relations*, 53 (1), 137-147.
- Susanty, A. (2013). Employee job performance. The effect of attitude towards work, organizational commitment and job satisfaction. *Journal Teknik Industri*, 15(1).
- Taylor, F. (1911). *The Principles of scientific management*. Harper & Brother.
- Wanous, J.P. and Lawler 111 (1972). Measurement and meaning of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, April 95-105.
- Wanous, J.P. (1974), Individual differences and reaction to job characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59, 612-616.

### **Acknowledgement**

The author appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

### **Conflict of Interest**

The author declared no conflict of interest.

**How to cite this article:** Singh R.N. & Pandey V. (2020). Effects of perceived job motivating potential on job satisfaction. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 8(4), 996-1002. DIP:18.01.117/20200804, DOI:10.25215/0804.117