

## **Structural and Contextual Determinants of Job Satisfaction Among Industrial Workers**

**Dr. C. Somahekher**

*Professor, Department of Sociology, Jnanabharathi, Bangalore.  
and*

**Dr. S.L. Hiremath**

*Professor, Former Registrar of Central University of Gujarat. and Gulbaga University, Kalaburgi.*

---

### **Abstract:**

*Industrial workers who are satisfied with their job, workplace, and personal life are likely to perform their duties efficiently and tend to be productive in any workplace setting. Job Satisfaction refers to employees' positive attitudes towards their jobs. The present study was carried out to investigate and ascertain empirically the factors that contribute to worker satisfaction in the manufacturing industry in a backward region of Gulbarga in the State Karnataka. The main thrust of the study was to ascertain the implications of structural features like size, centralization, and formalization of organization for satisfaction of their employees on the one hand and the impact of personal background factors on job satisfaction on the other. According to the findings of the study, an overwhelming majority of industrial workers in the manufacturing sector are satisfied with their job. Findings seem to indicate that smaller firms tend to be more informal, cohesive, and integrated, creating a more conducive and favourable working environment for their workers to derive greater satisfaction from the work they engage themselves with. Social origin was found to be having a greater say in influencing the level of job satisfaction among the younger industrial workers. Chi-square and C tests were employed to ascertain the relationship between the dependent and independent variables with the level of job satisfaction, and the study reveals that the level of job satisfaction among the workers in the manufacturing sector is significantly associated with and determined by the organizational and personal background variables.*

**Keywords:** *Industrial Workers, Job Satisfaction, Manufacturing Sector, Social origin, Structural features.*

---

Date of Submission: 02-07-2021

Date of Acceptance: 17-07-2021

---

### **I. Introduction:**

Human resources are a significant component in the overall economic development of work organizations, as well as the society as a whole (Agnihotri, 2012). While agriculture is of critical importance to the overall economy, it needs to be emphasized that the manufacturing sector which employs a substantial proportion of employees compared to the service sector also contributes significantly to the economy of the nation. Thus, the importance of the manufacturing sector is predominant owing to the number of units that fall within small and medium-sized industries (SMEs) which are preponderant in the Gulbarga region. The manufacturing units' main emphasis is on operating the industry efficiently on a regular basis. These units are renowned for producing a broad range of goods and services to meet the requirements of both the local and international markets. In general, the manufacturing industry helps to alleviate poverty, unemployment, and insecurity.

There is a strong requirement for workers to enhance organizational performance in modern Indian society. Employee induction and their adaptation to the industrial way of life, on the other hand, is significantly associated with employee job satisfaction. The issue of contentment comes when an individual is assured to work with material and intrinsic benefits in an organization. While performing the duties, a worker is required to engage with colleagues, supervisors, managers, and the physical environment at the workplace and these interactions may have an impact on the level of employee satisfaction. Satisfied employees are more productive when the industrial environment is generally smooth and favourable. Thus, the employees who are adequately satisfied can be more creative, innovative, and committed. The factors that contribute to a positive attitude and morale will result in a higher degree of job satisfaction. If employees are satisfied at work, they will be more committed and productive (Al Hussami, 2008). However, there is a small corpus of research that investigates the social realities of worker satisfaction in the manufacturing sector. Therefore, one of the objectives of the study is to broaden the empirical emphasis on worker involvement and their satisfaction with work-life in the industrial

sector. This research aims to investigate the relationship between work satisfaction and the structural features of an organization to see whether a significant relationship between organizational and social variables is empirically demonstrable.

This paper is an attempt to explore what and how workers feel about their jobs in an industrially backward area; what are the motivations and constraints of men who are caught between tradition and modernity; how do they deal with adjusting to the transition from an agrarian society to an industrial one, and how do they navigate the emergence of an industrial subculture; What are the highs and lows of their working lives, and how can we best explain them in the context of the socioeconomic and organizational environment in which they work and live?

## **II. Literature Review:**

Recently, several pieces of research on job satisfaction and related aspects have been carried out. Sinha (2013) attempted to quantify employee satisfaction by utilizing such motivational factors as empowerment, work atmosphere, working relations, salary, career prospects, training, work involvement, and job rotation. According to Sinha, salary is shown to be strongly associated with employees' job satisfaction. Jain and Kaur (2014) examined the work environment, duties and responsibilities, refreshment and leisure facilities, grievance handling procedure, fun at work, and health and safety facilities to assess employee job satisfaction. All of these variables, according to their findings, have a direct effect on attrition and work satisfaction. Silpa and Chitti Babu (2016) investigated the intricate realities regarding the key variables that influence job satisfaction as well as the relation between job satisfaction and prevailing conditions of work such as working hours, satisfactory salaries, welfare facilities, and career development opportunities.

While taking into consideration certain empirical research focusing on opportunity structure and employee satisfaction, W.H. Form (1973) believes that conventional studies of work satisfaction are based on numerous, most likely false assumptions. It is assumed, for example, that all workers comprehend a hierarchical occupational structure, that they all want upward occupational mobility, and that their degrees of job satisfaction is linked to their success in this graded occupational system. Promotion is the most significant motivator, according to Grusky (1969), Lehman (1968), Ali and Ahmed (2009), and Parvin Kabir (2011), since it includes many kinds of incentives such as salary raises, increased status and recognition, and increased authority. Furthermore, some important studies (Rhodes, 1983; White and Spector, 1987; Bernal, et.al 1998) have aimed at ascertaining the role of personal attributes in determining the level of job satisfaction. The relationship between age and job satisfaction represents a 'U' shaped curve, according to Herzberg and others (1957). For instance, Herzberg reported that the relationship between age and job satisfaction is not related to the person's height or weight, but rather to his/her ability to cope with social situations. Thus, job satisfaction begins high, decreases until the late twenties, and then begins to increase again throughout the rest of the worker's life. However, Saleh and Otis (1964) demonstrate that this curve is not generally true. Managers' job satisfaction increased until they reached the age of sixty and then started to decline as they neared retirement. Hulin and Smith (1965) found that women are far less satisfied than men, indicating that women are not, as commonly believed, the "Contented Cows."

Coming to education, Klein and Maher (1966) found that college-educated managers were less satisfied than non-college-educated managers, most likely owing to the different reference groups they were referring to. Thus, education, according to Blauner (1964), is the most significant element affecting ambitions and expectations in the workplace. The more knowledge a person has, the greater his or her need for power, creativity, and autonomy. Similarly, we would anticipate lower-status or blue-collar workers to be more satisfied with salary raises or fringe benefits than higher-status ones. According to Vila and Garca Mora (2005), the effects of education on job satisfaction vary in intensity and direction depending on the aspect of the job being evaluated, particularly after taking into account real job characteristics and other characteristics of employees in a specific work scenario.

Furthermore, the effect of different social variables on work satisfaction has been experimentally investigated. Social variables, according to Blood and Hulin (1967), influence people's expectations of their jobs and, as a result, the level of satisfaction they are likely to derive. According to Pearlin (1962), the most common desires among employees are for social progress and better living conditions. Moreover, workgroups, which he sees as manifestations of workers' sociability needs, play the most important function, namely, setting norms that members internalize and providing much-needed meaning to work on the job. Amiria Mohammad et al. (2010), found that the promotion process, merit-based training, and appointments, cooperative management, a convivial and pleasant work environment conditions may all contribute to an increase in overall employee satisfaction in workplaces.

The number of employees working in a specific geographical area may be used to estimate the size of an organization. Worthy (1950) in his study found that the size of the organization is significantly related to job satisfaction. Several studies on the effect of organizational size on employee morale have been published.

According to Meltzer and Salter (1962), the smaller the organization, the greater the employee satisfaction, and vice versa, since smaller groups had a higher degree of integration, particularly of the mechanical kind. This, according to Worthy, is due to smaller organizations' aptitude and propensity to facilitate warm relations, jovial and healthy relationships. He claims that the smaller the organization, the simpler the social system, or less complicated the structural complexity, the fewer are the individuals and fewer layers of administration. He also relates this high degree of work satisfaction to the fact that in smaller organizations, adaption is easier and simpler, particularly for individuals who come from non-industrial backgrounds such as rural, agricultural, and backward regions. The research of Dunn (1980, 1986), Clark (1996), and others found a significant relationship between the size of the firm and employee job satisfaction. Marlow et al. (2004), on the other hand, found a negative association between organizational size and job satisfaction.

Another significant factor that correlates with work satisfaction is the nature and level of the job, the overall reputation of the employee, and other job characteristics that individuals look for while looking for employment. They claim that lower levels of the occupational hierarchy have higher levels of work satisfaction because they are less concerned with the intrinsic advantages (Mosse and Weiss (1956), in their book, 'The Organization of Interest Group Management' (1955). Blauner (1964), on the other hand, provides an example of this kind of reasoning in his account of high levels of work satisfaction reported by blue-collar workers engaged in self-estranging labor. Because they do not need responsibility at work and are pleased with their income, the typical manual worker and many lower-level white-collar employees may be content with relatively stable employment that is mainly instrumental and non-involving. The impact of service duration and occupational type on work pleasure was investigated by Natarajan and Dinesh (2011), who discovered that managers with longer service tenure reported greater intrinsic job satisfaction than their counterparts with shorter careers. Knowledge workers, according to research by Drucker (2001) and Sajeve (2007), are more empowered and need less supervision than blue-collar workers. As a result, intellectual workers have more autonomy, while blue-collar workers do not. Thus it may be stated that organizational structure is an important variable in determining the level of job satisfaction.

### **III. Need for the Study:**

Motivating industrial employees and ensuring their satisfaction and commitment to their firms, is a difficult task, but one that is critical in today's competitive and aggressive employment market. As a result, many organizational, behavioral, management, and social science professionals, academics, and researchers seem to be focused on studying the factors that influence employee job satisfaction. The present study is one such attempt to explore the structural and social characteristics of industrial organizations and their impact on job satisfaction, as well as to determine their significance in understanding the interests of employees on the one hand, and measuring satisfaction levels to serve as a guideline for employers on the other. Much has been lamented, discussed, and investigated into the structural and social realities of job satisfaction in different types of service and IT industries and different cultural contexts. However, research into work satisfaction among employees in the manufacturing industry, though equally important, appears to have been not adequately focused upon. Hence, an attempt is made in the present study to ascertain the salient features and determinants of satisfied employees, who are assumed to be more productive with better performance and are looked upon as an asset to manufacturing enterprises. It is critical to undertake more work satisfaction surveys to minimize accidents, injuries, and expenditures while also keeping employees safe and happy in manufacturing units. In today's labor market, these industrial firms are working harder than ever to attract and retain employees. As stated earlier, employee satisfaction levels are also influenced by the structure of work organizations, such as size, centralization, and formalization. Simultaneously, while evaluating work satisfaction among industrial workers, social factors such as age, education, job type, and social background are viewed as relevant. To evaluate the significance of informal relationships and scope for providing opportunities and better compensation to workers in industrial organizations, it is essential to examine the association between organizational size and job satisfaction.

### **IV. Objectives:**

In pursuance of the argument presented in the statement above, the study seeks to address itself the following objectives.

1. To ascertain the satisfaction levels among industrial workers.
2. To identify and ascertain the features of an organization's structure that influence job satisfaction.
3. To study the impact of socioeconomic background on overall satisfaction among workers in the manufacturing industry.

### **V. Data and Methodology:**

Due to the constraints of time, the techniques used to conduct the research are described briefly below. To generate a sample, the units were first categorized as small, medium, and large, and then randomly selected using a proportional stratified sample of 450 people. However, only 432 workers could be interviewed. Each employee was interviewed on three different schedules, one of which was used to assess job satisfaction and alienation. The second was used to assess the degree of centralization, formalization, and other aspects of their workplace. The third was utilized to evaluate Job Satisfaction as a subjective element of an organization's environment, as seen by workers. The questions were phrased in such a way as to elicit information on the workers' perception of work organizations' degrees of centralization and formalization. A ten-item scale of Job Satisfaction was presented to the respondents to determine the degree of Job Satisfaction among them. The responses of the workers to the statements were scored by giving due weightage to each item. Similarly, a twenty-item scale was presented to the respondents to determine the degree of centralization, formalization, and other structural characteristics as seen by them in their respective work organizations. The responses were scored and analyzed using appropriate methods, resulting in a composite score that categorized them as having varying degrees of centralization and formalization at their workplaces. The Job Satisfaction of the respondents so ascertained was cross-tabulated with organizational or structural variables like size, centralization, and formalization and also with personal background variables such as education, occupational level, and social origin.

**The research setting:** The present study is based on data collected from 432 workers working in eight industrial units ranging in size from 242 to 1800. A varied group of industrial workers, such as those working in cement, sugar, steel, and textile factories in the district of Kalaburgi in Karnataka, India, represent the sample of respondents chosen for the present study.

### VI. Results and Discussion:

It has been said often that the Indian industrial workers are misfits in industrial cities because of their rural backgrounds, traditional perspective, lack of scientific outlook, knowledge, and technical abilities (Ornati, 1955). However, in consonance with the findings of the most recent research reports, the present study reveals that more than three-fourths (76.16 percent) of the respondents are satisfied with their jobs. It's also worth noting that nearly one-third (32.41 percent) of the workers surveyed are highly satisfied.

**Table-1: Level of Job Satisfaction**

Level of Job Satisfaction	Number of Workers	Percentage
Low	103	23.84
Moderate	189	43.75
High	140	32.41
Total	432	100.00

The overall conclusion that can be drawn from the data is that a significant majority of the workers studied were generally satisfied with their employment. The added fact is that nearly one-third of the respondents were highly satisfied with their work.

Furthermore, the primary goal of this research was to investigate the effects of organizational factors such as size, degree of centralization and formalization, and personal variables such as occupational level, education, and social origin on employee satisfaction.

The eight industrial units from which the sample of workers was drawn were categorized as small, medium, and large, as previously stated. The data reveal that 25.46 percent of the workers come from small units, 35.65 percent belong to the medium category and 38.89 percent of the respondents were drawn from the large units. Further, the level of employ-satisfaction was viewed in the light of organizational size, and the details are as follows:

**Table-2: Job Satisfaction and Size of Work Organization**

Job Satisfaction	Organizational Size			N = 432 Total
	Small	Medium	Large	
Low	20 (18.18)	32 (20.78)	51 (30.36)	103 (23.84)
Moderate	43 (39.09)	71 (46.10)	75 (44.64)	189 (43.75)
High	47 (42.73)	51 (33.12)	42 (25.00)	140 (32.41)
Total	110 (100.00) (25.46)	154 (100.00) (35.65)	168 (100.00) (38.89)	432 (100.00)

$\chi^2 = 12.31$ ; d.f.=4; C = 0.17 Significant at 0.05 level.

The data presented indicate that the size of the organization has significant implications for employee satisfaction. It may be observed that among those who come from small units, the proportion of those with low job satisfaction is considerably small (18.18 percent), whereas nearly one half (42.73 percent), of the employees coming from such units experience high job satisfaction, and another 40 (39.09 percent) have moderate satisfaction. Taken together, nearly 82 (81.82) percent of the employees representing small work organizations are, by and large, satisfied with their work on jobs. On the contrary, the proportion of employees with high job satisfaction in large organizations is as low as one-fourth (25 percent). On the whole, the relationship between employee satisfaction and organizational size was found to be statistically significant at 0.05 level with a C value of 0.17.

Nonetheless, the study did not probe into the causal factors contributing to the low job satisfaction among the employees of larger organizations or high satisfaction among those coming from small organizations. To do this, it is important to probe into the unique characteristics of each type of organization. However, there are a few universally recognized features that are mutually exclusive across small and large organizations, which if properly examined, may provide interesting hypotheses about the complex relationships between organizational environment and work satisfaction. A couple of these are attempted here.

It has been shown that the size of an organization and its internal structure influences the nature of employee relationships, communication system, and patterns of participation inside the organization. Even the degrees of centralization, formalization, and bureaucratization in an organization have been considered to be a consequence of its size. In summary, the organizational climate has long been thought to be influenced by the size of the organization. Furthermore, it has been argued that employees join a work organization with a certain set of expectations and ambitions, which may be influenced by a variety of variables such as their credentials, occupational skills and position, social origins, and so on. A worker from a rural background, for example, has a distinct set of social and professional or career experiences and expectations as a result of his or her exposure to a comparatively more "primary group-like" existence. His familiarity with living in a small, close-knit, and informal social group may make life in a large, formal organization incongruous with his experiences and expectations. He may find it too huge to effectively connect himself with the organization, i.e., the social milieu in a large organization may result in a social distance, resulting in decreased dynamic density, making a worker feel out of place. His experience of living in a social collective defined by mechanical solidarity may prevent him from making the required changes in a social environment characterized by organic solidarity. He may not feel at ease on the job as a result of the organization's alien social environment, and as a result, he may fail to develop a level of commitment to the organization and its goals that are otherwise possible. Such an employee may experience a feeling of absence of meaningful relationships at work, which may cause him to get stressed and exhausted. On the contrary, a small organization with intimate, face-to-face, informal, and lasting primary group type relationships and exchanges may increase workers' identification with and dedication to the organizations, as well as their sense of satisfaction. As a result, it may be concluded that the size of an organization has consequences for centralization, formalization, and bureaucratization. The degree to which workers feel powerless, meaningless, normless, and isolated could be stated as having a substantial impact on the levels of job satisfaction. These assumptions, although impressionistic, may serve as a springboard for future investigation into the complex reality of organizational size and employee satisfaction, particularly in the Indian context.

The other two organizational variables were the degrees of centralization and formalization, examined for their impact on job satisfaction. These are regarded as key components of organizational climate in the most of research on organizations. The goal of this research is to learn whether these two components of organizational climate have a significant bearing on the levels of worker satisfaction.

According to the results, almost one-half (49.07 percent) of the workers studied thought the degree of centralization in their organization was low, while the other half (50.93 percent) thought it was on the higher side. It's also worth noting that the percentage of individuals who thought the degree of centralization in their workplace was high was greater among those who worked for larger organizations than among those who worked for small firms. However, there was no statistically significant association between workers' perceptions of centralization and the size of the organizations they represent.

Further, employees' conception of centralization was cross-tabulated with their level of job satisfaction. Much against what could be expected; the relationship between the two was statistically significant. The earlier research shows a tendency toward decreased employee satisfaction is highly centralized organizations.

**Table-3: Job Satisfaction and Degree of Centralization**

Job Satisfaction	Degree of Centralization		N = 432 Total
	Low	High	
Low	47	56	103

	(22.17)	(25.46)	(23.84)
Moderate	90 (42.45)	99 (45.00)	189 (43.75)
High	75 (35.38)	65 (29.54)	140 (32.41)
Total	212 (100.00)	220 (100.00)	432 (100.00)

$X^2 = 1.79$ ; d.f. = 1; C = .06 Not significant.

It is evident from the data that no particular pattern or trend could be seen in the relationship between employee perceptions of centralization and job satisfaction. However, among those who considered the degree of centralization to be modest, 35.38 percent were highly satisfied, whereas the corresponding proportion of those who imagined a greater degree of centralization was just 29.54 percent. Though the results suggest that a low degree of centralization is more favourable to employee satisfaction on a proportional basis, this could not be asserted with any level of statistical significance. However, the centralization of power at work does not pose a grave threat to their job satisfaction in the light of assumptions about the Indian workforce as it is traditional in its perspective and lacks the will and desire for assertiveness, which in turn could be attributed to its exposure and socialization to a system of values in which authority from higher status and position is rarely questioned.

The most plausible hypothesis is that the feeling of helplessness and being denied authority is inversely related to an employee's position in the hierarchy. When positions of little authority are occupied, centralization will fail to have a restraining effect on the job satisfaction of the operatives, because their off-the-job social life is characterized by compliance with commands of authority emanating from traditionally superior statuses. Positive values to be explored include the social environment in which they work and live, as well as the culture in which they participate in decision making. They come from a social context in which choices affecting their personal life are made by elders with traditional authority. Further, depending on the kind of traditional family they come from, they may have little or no autonomy in how they live and manage their lives. These living circumstances may be training and conditioning individuals to be less responsive to work-related responsibilities, authority, autonomy, and participation in decision-making. These attributions may help to explain why a high degree of centralization and a high level of job satisfaction coexist in an Indian work environment. More in-depth study, however, is needed to draw more valid and reliable conclusions on the causal relationship between the degree of centralization in work organizations and levels of job satisfaction among Indian workers.

The degree of formalization was another aspect of the organizational environment that was investigated for its impact on job satisfaction. The study indicated that 47.45 percent of respondents thought the degree of formalization at their workplaces was low while the remainder (52.55 percent) thought the formalization was high. When the employee's perception of formalization was cross-tabulated with their job satisfaction scores, the association was found to be highly significant.

**Table-4: Job Satisfaction and Degree of Formalization**

Job Satisfaction	Degree of Formalization		N = 432 Total
	Low	High	
Low	30 (14.63)	73 (32.17)	103 (23.84)
Moderate	84 (40.98)	105 (46.25)	189 (43.75)
High	91 (44.39)	49 (21.58)	140 (32.41)
Total	205 (100.00)	227 (100.00)	432 (100.00)

$X^2 = 31.83$ ; d.f. = 2; C = 0.26. Significant at 0.05 level.

It is evident from the data that the proportion of those with low job satisfaction among those who conceived low formalization was less than 15 (14.63) percent. Furthermore, 85 (85.37) percent of workers who saw formalization at their workplace as low were either contented or somewhat satisfied with their employment. Thus, the research indicates a strong negative relationship between the degree of formalization in the workplace and employee satisfaction. The association between the two variables is significant at 0.01 level with a C value being 0.26.

It is also significant and essential to note that, although acknowledged as two key constituents of the same process, namely bureaucratization, centralization and formalization have not been shown to have similar consequences for employee satisfaction. The closer association between poor work satisfaction and formalization, on the other hand, might logically be ascribed to their off-the-job experiences and predispositions, which are defined by "primary group like" face-to-face, personal, informal, and spontaneous interactions.

Thus, the factory routines, formality, impersonality, discipline, and impersonal authoritative rule conveyed via official channels may conflict with their experiences and expectations. Formalization, defined as the degree of work standardization and the amount of variation permitted from norms, may create an environment in which Indian employees may not feel at ease or home. This can be explained in terms of the nature of work they are accustomed to in their traditional occupations such as agriculture, handicrafts, and trade, where work is highly flexible, casual, informal, un-standardized, and does not require factory regimentation, or strict discipline, acute impersonality, and a strong emphasis on rules and procedures. In these kinds of situations, the worker may fail to properly respond and adjust to the requirements put on him by the organization. A clear reversal between on-the-job and off-the-job lifestyles may pose significant difficulties of adjustment. This failure to reconcile two mutually exclusive and conflicting life patterns may result in alienating tendencies, i.e., a scenario in which, in Marx's words, the worker feels at home off the job but is a stranger to himself on the job. However, no clear causal connections could be found in this research to explain the negative relationship between work satisfaction and degree of formalization.

When it comes to personal attributes and their consequences for work satisfaction, the study shows that education, occupational level, and social background could have a significant bearing on job satisfaction. Education of the workers in the present study was found to be very strongly associated with Job Satisfaction. The data show that the percentage of those with poor work satisfaction was as low as 14 (14.28 percent) among those with low education.

**Table-5: Job Satisfaction and Education**

Job Satisfaction	Education		N = 432 Total
	Low	High	
Low	43 (14.29)	60 (45.81)	103 (23.84)
Moderate	146 (48.50)	43 (32.82)	189 (43.75)
High	112 (37.21)	28 (21.37)	140 (32.41)
Total	301 (100.00)	131 (100.00)	432 (100.00)

$X^2 = 50.21$ ; d.f. =2; C = .32 Significant at 0.01 level.

It could be observed that more than 85 percent (85.71percent) of those with lower levels of education were either moderately or highly satisfied with their jobs, while almost half (45.81percent) of those with high education were not satisfied all much with their jobs. This could indicate that educational attainment and job satisfaction have a strong inverse association. This may be attributed to the reasoning that the higher the educational level, the greater are aspirations and expectations, and as a result, the greater the expectations, the greater the dissatisfaction until their aspirations are fulfilled.

It should also be noted that all of the respondents were operatives, holding lower positions in the work hierarchy, and as such, those with higher educational levels may be experiencing a feeling of disparity between their desired and realized status, leading to a sense of discontent and disappointment. This phenomenon may also be described in terms of various social reference groups of employees with varying levels of education. Those who compare themselves with other persons with the same level of education, who are more fortunate socially, occupationally, and financially, are probably less happy with their lot at the workplace. This is more evident in the context of an educationally backward region as the one under study. It might also be claimed that, as a result of widespread unemployment and poverty, people with comparatively higher educational levels may be forced to settle for a position that is below their educational and occupational level. However, they continue to feel the situation incompatible or even exploitative and contributing to their poor level of job satisfaction.

Further, the respondents' occupational level was examined as a factor in determining work satisfaction. The study revealed that those at higher occupational levels tend to exhibit a relatively higher level of job satisfaction, and statistically significant relationship was found between the two.

**Table-6: Job Satisfaction and Occupational Level**

Job Satisfaction	Occupational Level			N = 432 Total
	Low	Intermediate	High	
Low	39 (33.05)	35 (22.15)	29 (18.59)	103 (23.84)
Moderate	47 (39.83)	74 (46.84)	68 (43.58)	189 (43.75)
High	32 (27.12)	49 (31.01)	59 (37.83)	140 (32.41)
Total	118 (100.00)	158 (100.00)	156 (100.00)	432 (100.00)

$X^2 = 9.48$ ; d.f.=4; C = .15. Significant at 0.05 level.

It could be observed from the data that, about one-third (33.05 percent) of respondents with low occupational levels were found to be having low job satisfaction; while the proportion of such workers among those with high occupational status was only 18 (18.59) percent. On the other hand, almost 40 (37.83) percent of those with a high occupational level were found with high levels of work satisfaction, compared to 27 (27.12) percent of those with a low occupational level. As such, it could be stated that there is a very weak positive association between work satisfaction and occupational level. The dispositional explanation for high levels of job satisfaction among workers at the lower end of the occupational hierarchy is based on the assertion that such workers are not concerned about intrinsic rewards like responsibility, challenge recognition that goes with higher occupations. Given the general economic and social situation, it is reasonable to assume that the average manual worker, as well as many lower-level white-collar workers, would be content with relatively steady jobs that are largely instrumental and non-involving because they have no need for responsibility at work and are only concerned with pay-packets. The vast majority of employees in India engage in industrial employment as a second string to their bow. Industrial employment, however, is of less importance than other gainful engagements from which these people get their income. These are some of the dispositional and situational reasons for the phenomena of high job satisfaction being associated with a lower occupational level. More focused research on this phenomenon, however, is required.

Finally, work satisfaction was viewed in the light of the social origins of the respondents, to ascertain whether or not their level of satisfaction with employment was influenced by their social background and status in society. Job satisfaction is assumed to be influenced by the social status people come to hold in society as well as the specific social groupings with which they identify. Even the union to which they belong may influence their ambitions since unions vary in terms of philosophy, strategy, and objectives.

The composite variable of “social origin” is a more realistic measure of the social status of an individual in Indian society than each of its constituent variables. Hence the social origin of the respondents was ascertained by taking into consideration the respondents' caste, family income, father's education, and family occupation. Each of these background variables is classified as high, medium and low and is assigned scores. The social origin of a responder is determined by his combined score of all these criteria.

**Table-7: Job Satisfaction and Social Origin**

Job Satisfaction	Social Origin		N = 432 Total
	Low	High	
Low	52 (17.69)	51 (36.96)	103 (23.84)
Moderate	136 (46.26)	53 (38.40)	189 (43.75)
High	106 (36.05)	34 (24.64)	140 (32.41)
Total	294 (100.00)	138 (100.00)	432 (100.00)

$X^2 = 19.72$ ; d.f.=2; C = .20 Significant at 0.01 level.

The study reveals that less than one-third (about 32 percent) of the respondents have high social origins while the rest have low social origins. The study also indicates that there is an inverse association between social origin and job satisfaction, with only 17 (17.69) percent of those with low social origin having poor job satisfaction, while 37 (36.96) percent of those with high social origin had low job satisfaction. This negative relationship between social origin and job satisfaction may be explained by the mismatch of high social origin and lower factory jobs of the respondents. It is reasonable to suppose that people with high social standing want to work in occupations that are consistent with their status and therefore being in a low-status blue-collar job result in low job satisfaction among those coming from higher social origins. On the other hand, a sizable proportion (83 percent) of the workers from low social backgrounds is somewhat or highly satisfied. This may also be attributed to lower expectations on the part of these respondents, as well as to purely instrumental orientation toward their work, which is more than reasonably well fulfilled by manufacturing occupations. The blue-collar workers from lower social origins, owing to their lower economic status, may see their industrial employment as an opportunity and an avenue for social ascent and insurance against social descent. According to vast Indian literature on caste dynamics, lower-caste men and women who have moved into blue-collar or industrial jobs are among of the most mobile social groups in the country. These ideas may explain the negative relationship between social origin and work satisfaction, and may also call for more structured and probing research in the future.



## VII. Conclusion:

On the whole, the findings of the present study seem to indicate that a significantly large proportion of the workers in the manufacturing sector (76.16 percent) are satisfied with their jobs and the conditions of their work environment. Further, it is quite heartening and promising to observe that about one-third (32.41 percent) of the total workers in the manufacturing sector are highly satisfied. This level of job satisfaction among the workers in manufacturing is quite significant and encouraging as well, particularly because industrialization, in the true sense of the term, has taken roots in Indian soil in the recent past. It must be more aggressively pursued and promoted in an industrially backward region such as the one selected for the research. From the findings of the present study, it could be inferred that workers in the manufacturing industrial sector, of late, have begun to adopt and adapt to a new way of life fostered and conditioned by industrialization and industrialism. Further, it indicates and testifies the gradual emergence of an industrial subculture to which the working class is adjusting and adapting.

The primary goal of the study was to determine the implications of structural characteristics of the work organizations and personal background variables for their job satisfaction. The findings seem to indicate that small firms are more cohesive and connected, and therefore, provide a more conducive working environment for workers. Further, the degree of formalization was also found to be inversely related to work satisfaction. Another important finding of this study is that the several components of organizational climate that are thought to comprise a single organizational process do not always have similar consequences for employee satisfaction. The findings of this study indicate that, although centralization and formalization are taken as contributing to the degree of bureaucratization in an organization, they do not seem to have similar consequences for employee satisfaction.

About the personal background factors, the findings indicate that job satisfaction is significantly related inversely to the educational level of employees; that is, the higher the levels of education, the greater the likelihood that a worker would have lower job satisfaction. Concerning occupational status, the data seems to indicate that efforts to generalize across organizational units should be approached with care. Job satisfaction may vary significantly across skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled employees in the same work organization. Finally, the social origin was found to be having a significant bearing on the levels of job satisfaction. Industrial workers coming from lower social origins tend to be more satisfied than their counterparts from higher social origins. However, it may finally be noted that the findings of the present study are region-specific and sector-specific and broader generalizations could be attempted and explored by undertaking more focused studies with a broader scope.

## References:

- [1]. Agnihotri, A., (2012), What's Your 'H' Factor? The Hindu Nxtg, Chennai, Thursday, May 10, p. 4, Feel Good.
- [2]. Al-Hussami, Mahmoud. (2008), A Study of Nurses Job Satisfaction: The Relationship to Organizational Commitment, Perceived Organizational Support, Transactional Leadership, Transformational Leadership, and Level of Education. *European Journal of Scientific Research*. 22(10), 286-295.
- [3]. Ali, R., and Ahmed, M. S. (2009). The Impact of Reward and Recognition Programs on Employee's Motivation and Satisfaction: An Empirical Study. *International Review of business research papers*, 5(4), 270-279.
- [4]. Amiria Mohammad , Ahmad Khosravib and Abbas Ali Mokhtari. (2010). Job Satisfaction and Its Influential Factors. *Journal of Research in Health Sciences*. 10(1). 42-46.
- [5]. Bernal, David, David Snyder, and Michael McDanie,( 1998). The Age and Job Satisfaction Relationship: Does It Shape and Strength Still Evade Us? *Journal of Gerontology*, 53B, (5), 287-P293.
- [6]. Blauner, R. (1964), *Alienation and Freedom: The Factory Worker and His Industry* Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- [7]. Blauner, Robert. (1964). *Alienation and Freedom*. Chicago. University of Chicago Press.
- [8]. Blood, M. R.. and C. L. Hulin. (1967). Alienation, Environmental Characteristics, and Worker Responses. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 51 284-290.
- [9]. Clark, A. E.(1996). Job Satisfaction in Britain. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol.34 No. 2, pp.189-217.
- [10]. Drucker, P.F. (1993). *Post-Capitalist Society*, Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann Ltd.
- [11]. Dubin, Robert. (1956). Industrial Workers Worlds. *Social Problems*, 3, 131-42.
- [12]. Dunn, L. F. (1980), "The Effects of Firm and Plant Size on Employee Well-Being" in *The Economics of Firm Size, Market Structure, and Social Performance* (Ed.) J. J. Siegfried, *Federal Trade Commission, Washington DC*.
- [13]. Dunn, L. F. (1986), "Work Disutility and Compensating Differentials: Estimation of Factors in The Link Between Wages and Firm Size", *Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 68, pp. 67-73.
- [14]. Grusky, Oscar (1959). Role Conflict in Organization: A Study of Prison Camp Officials. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 3: 452-472.
- [15]. Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., Peterson, R.O., & Capwell, D.F. (1957). Job attitudes: Review of research and opinion. Pittsburgh: Psychological Service of Pittsburg.
- [16]. Hulin, C.L., & Smith, P.C. (1965). A linear model of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 49, 209-216.
- [17]. Jain, R., & Kaur, S. (2014). Impact of work environment on job satisfaction. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 4(1), 1-8.
- [18]. Klein, S. M., & Maher, J. R. (1966). Education level and satisfaction with pay. *Personnel Psychology*, 19(2), 195-208.
- [19]. Lehman, Edward W. (1968). Opportunity, Mobility, and Satisfaction within an Industrial Organization. *Social Forces*, 46(4), 492-501.
- [20]. Marlow, S., D. Patton and M. Ram (2004). *Managing Labour in Small Firms*, London, Routledge Studies in Small Business.

- [21]. Meltzer, L. and Salter, J. (1962). Organizational Structure and the Performance and Job Satisfaction of Physiologists, *American Sociological Review*, 27(3): 351-62.
- [22]. Morse, Nancy, and Robert Weiss. (1955). The Function and Meaning of Work and the Job. *American Sociological Review*, 20, 191-98.
- [23]. Natarajan N. K. and Nagar Dinesh. (2011). Effects of Service Tenure and Nature of Occupation on Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Management Research*. 11 (1), 59-64.
- [24]. Parvin, M. M., and Kabir, M. N. (2011). Factors affecting Employee Job Satisfaction of Pharmaceutical Sector. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research*, 1(9), 113.
- [25]. Pearlin, L. I. (1962). Alienation from work: A study of nursing personnel. *American Sociological Review*. 27 314-326.
- [26]. Rhodes SR. (1983). Age-related differences in work attitudes and behavior: a review and conceptual analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 93, 328-67.
- [27]. Sajeve, S. (2007). Identifying Factors Affecting Motivation and Loyalty of Knowledge Workers. *Economics and Management*, 12, 643-652.
- [28]. Saleh, S.D., &Otis, J.L. Age and level of job satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*, 1964, 17, 425-430.
- [29]. Silpa, N., and ChittiBabu, P. (2016). A Study on Relationship between Employee Satisfaction and Its Determinants. *International Journal of Engineering Research and Applications*, 6(1), 113-118.
- [30]. Sinha, E. (2013). A Research Work on Employee Satisfaction Measurement with special reference to KRIBHCO, Surat. *International Journal of Morden Engineering Research*, 3(1), 523-529.
- [31]. Vila Luis E. and Belen García-Mora, (2005). Education and the Determinants of Job Satisfaction. *Education Economics*, 13(4), 409-425,
- [32]. Vila, Luis E., and Belen García-Mora. 2005. "Education and the Determinants of Job Satisfaction." *Education Economics* 13(4): 409-425.
- [33]. White, A. T, and Spector, P. E. (1987). An investigation of age-related factors in the age-job satisfaction relationship. *Psychology and Aging*, 2, 261-265.
- [34]. William H. Form., (1973), *Auto Workers and Their Machines: A Study of Work, Factory, and Job Satisfaction in Four Countries*. *Social Forces*, 52,(1),1-15.
- [35]. Worthy, James C. (1950). Organizational Structure and Employee Morale. *American Sociological Review*, 15 (2) 169-79.
- [36]. Blauner, R. (1964), *Alienation and Freedom: The Factory Worker and His Industry* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press)

Dr. C. Somahekher, et. al. "Structural and Contextual Determinants of Job Satisfaction Among Industrial Workers." *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)*, 23(07), 2021, pp. 09-18.