



**Job Satisfaction among Pharmaceutical Sales Representatives in the  
context of Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory**

By

**DEVIKA ROOPAI**

**202527176**

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of

**MASTER OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION**

**College of Law and Management Studies**

**Graduate School of Business & Leadership**

**Supervisor:**

Mr Jayram Mervyn Naidoo

**Year of submission**

January 2012

Faculty of Management Studies  
Graduate School of Business

**Supervisors permission to submit for examination**

Date:	
Student Name:	
Student no.:	
Dissertation Title:	

As the candidate's supervisor,

I AGREE to the submission of this dissertation for examination

I DO NOT AGREE to the submission of this dissertation for examination

**The above student has satisfied the requirements of English Language competency.**

Name of Supervisor:

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## DECLARATION

I, Devika Roopai, declare that

- (i) The research reported in this dissertation, except where otherwise indicated, is my original research.
- (ii) This dissertation has not been submitted for any degree or examination at any other university.
- (iii) This dissertation does not contain other persons' data, pictures, graphs or other information, unless specifically acknowledged as being sourced from other persons.
- (iv) This dissertation does not contain other persons' writing, unless specifically acknowledged as being sourced from other researchers. Where other written sources have been quoted, then:
  - a) Their words have been re-written but the general information attributed to them has been referenced;
  - b) Where their exact words have been used, their writing has been placed inside quotation marks, and referenced.
- (vi) This dissertation does not contain text, graphics or tables copied and pasted from the Internet, unless specifically acknowledged, and the source being detailed in the dissertation and in the References sections.

Devika Roopai 202 527179

Signed .....

Date .....

## **Acknowledgements**

I wish to express my sincere appreciation and gratitude to the following individuals, without whose assistance, this study would not have been possible:

- Mr. J M Naidoo, my supervisor, who provided the expertise and experience needed to produce this piece of research. His valuable insights, helpful advice, constructive comments and encouragement helped me through the process.
- Mr Hugo Misselhorn who provided me with the inspiration and motivation desperately needed at the outset of the research process.
- Dr V Agambaram & Dr S Mall who allowed me the opportunity to utilize their practices to conduct the questionnaires
- Special thank you to all the respondents who took the time to answer the questionnaires that was so vital to the success of this study
- Finally, I am grateful to my husband and my daughters for their love, great encouragement and belief in me while conducting this research

## **Abstract**

The purpose of this study was to assess Job Satisfaction among pharmaceutical sales representatives using Herzberg's Motivation and Hygiene Theory. Also examined was the relationship of job satisfaction to variables such as age, gender, marital status, qualification and length of service to explore whether the demographic subgroups are statistically different regarding overall job satisfaction.

Data was collected using a questionnaire at two large medical practises. A sample of 50 respondents was used for the study using the convenience sampling technique. The questionnaire consisted of two sections, namely section A that comprised the demographic information and section B collected scores for job satisfaction questions on a five point scale ranging from very dissatisfied to very satisfied. Responses to individual questions were tabulated and mean scores and standard deviations were computed. Pearson's correlation was used to determine the relationship between the dimensions of job satisfaction and overall job satisfaction. The t-test was used to ascertain the relationship between gender and the job satisfaction factors, as well as overall job satisfaction. The F-test was used to examine the relationship between age, marital status, qualifications and length of service with the job satisfaction factors and overall job satisfaction respectively.

Overall the respondents were satisfied with their job. Highest satisfaction levels were experienced for working conditions, work itself and recognition. It was found that "Working Conditions" was the best predictor of overall job satisfaction followed by job security and responsibility.

## Table of Contents

<b>Description</b>	<b>Page</b>
Title Page	i
Supervisor's Permission to submit for examination	ii
Declaration	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Abstract	v
Table of Contents	vi
List of Tables	ix
CHAPTER ONE.....	1
Introduction .....	1
1.1 Introduction.....	1
1.2 Motivation for the study .....	1
1.3 Focus of the Study .....	2
1.4 Problem Statement.....	2
1.5 Objectives .....	3
1.6 Hypotheses/Research Questions .....	3
1.7 The importance of this study is that it: .....	4
1.8 Limitations of the Study .....	4
1.9 Outline of the Chapters .....	5
1.10 Conclusion.....	6
CHAPTER TWO.....	7
Job Satisfaction.....	7
2.1 Introduction.....	7
2.2 Definitions of Job Satisfaction.....	7
2.3 Importance of Job Satisfaction.....	8
2.4 Theories of Job Satisfaction.....	9
2.4.1 Need Fulfillment .....	9
2.4.2 Discrepancies .....	9
2.4.3 Value Attainment .....	9
2.4.4 Equity.....	10

2.4.5	Dispositional / Genetic Components .....	10
2.4.6	Herzberg's Motivator-Hygiene Theory .....	10
2.5	Predictors of Job Satisfaction .....	13
2.5.1	Personal Characteristics .....	13
2.5.2	Work-Related Characteristics .....	17
2.6	Consequences of Job Satisfaction.....	22
2.6.1	<i>Job Performance:</i> .....	22
2.6.2	<i>Absenteeism (Withdrawal Behaviour):</i> .....	23
2.6.3	<i>Company Turnover:</i> .....	23
2.6.4	<i>Life Satisfaction:</i> .....	23
2.7	The Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Motivation.....	24
2.8	Conclusion .....	27
CHAPTER THREE .....		28
Research Methodology .....		28
3.1	Introduction.....	28
3.2	Objectives of the Study.....	28
3.3	Research Design .....	28
3.3.1	Sampling Design .....	29
3.3.2	Data Collection.....	31
3.4	Data Analysis Techniques .....	33
3.4.1	Descriptive Statistics .....	34
3.4.2	Inferential Statistics .....	36
3.4.3	Reliability .....	38
3.4.4	Validity.....	39
3.5	Conclusion .....	40
CHAPTER FOUR .....		41
Presentation and Discussion of Results .....		41
4.1	Introduction .....	41
4.2	Descriptive Statistics .....	41
4.2.1	Sample profile .....	41
4.2.2	Measures of Central Tendency & Dispersion of Job Satisfaction.....	45
4.2.3	Measures of Central Tendency and Dispersion for the Overall Job Satisfaction	

Dimension.....	48
4.2.3 Inter-correlation among the dimensions of Job Satisfaction .....	49
4.3. Inferential Statistics .....	51
4.3.1. Hypotheses .....	51
4.4 Conclusion .....	65
CHAPTER FIVE .....	66
Recommendations and Conclusions .....	66
5.1 Introduction .....	66
5.2 Implications of this Research.....	66
5.3 Summary of findings .....	66
5.4 Recommendations.....	69
5.5 Conclusion .....	70
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	71
APPENDIX 1 .....	81
Questionnaire.....	81
APPENDIX 2 .....	82
Ethical Clearance Certificate .....	82

## List of Tables

No.	Description	Page
4.1	Frequencies & Percentages of the Gender Group	41
4.2	Frequencies & Percentages of the Age Group	42
4.3	Frequencies & Percentages of Marital Status	42
4.4	Frequencies & Percentages of Academic/Professional Status	43
4.5	Frequencies & Percentages of Length of Service of Group	43
4.6	Frequencies & Percentages of Position/Status groups	44
4.7	Means, Standard Deviation, Minimum and Maximum Scores for the Job Satisfaction Dimensions and Overall Job Satisfaction	45
4.8	Measures of Central Tendency & Dispersion for the Overall Job Satisfaction Dimension	48
4.9	Pearson's Inter-correlation Matrix of the Dimensions for Job Satisfaction	49
4.10	Pearson's Correlation Analysis for the Dimension of Job Satisfaction and Overall Job Satisfaction	51
4.11	T- Test – Dimensions of Job Satisfaction by Gender	52
4.12	ANOVA – Dimensions of Job Satisfaction by Age	54
4.13	ANOVA- Dimensions of Job Satisfaction by Marital Status	56
4.14	ANOVA- Dimensions of Job Satisfaction by Academic Qualifications	57
4.15	ANOVA Dimensions of Job Satisfaction by Length of Service	59
4.16	ANOVA Dimensions of Job Satisfaction by Position	60
4.17	T- Test – Overall Job Satisfaction Variable by Gender	61
4.18	ANOVA - Overall Job Satisfaction by Age, Marital Status, Academic Qualifications, Length of Service, and Position	62
4.19	Results of the Multiple Regression Analysis	63
4.20	Reliability Statistics for the Dimensions of Job Satisfaction	65

# CHAPTER ONE

## Introduction

---

### 1.1 Introduction

This study focuses on Job Satisfaction among Pharmaceutical Sales Representatives in the context of Herzberg Motivation-Hygiene Theory. Chapter 1 deals with the motivation and focus of the study, the problem statement, objectives, hypothesis and research questions, limitations of the study and the layout of the chapters.

### 1.2 Motivation for the study

Against the background of increasing local and global competitiveness, it is crucial for any organisation, particularly for those in developing countries with limited skills resources, such as South Africa, to ensure that it consistently develops and retains a loyal, committed and able workforce. The movement of workers to act in a desired manner has always consumed the thoughts of managers in many ways. Companies spend huge amounts of resources training their employees, creating incentive plans that they think will motivate, corporate team building exercises and improving administrative policies, but is this enough to create job satisfaction? Instilling job satisfaction is a crucial task of management. According to Tientjen & Myers (1998), satisfaction creates confidence, loyalty and ultimately improved quality of output of the employed.

Pharmaceutical sales representatives play a critical role in the pharmaceutical industry and they are mainly responsible for sales and giving information on medical products to doctors and pharmacists. The important functions of sales representatives are to achieve sales targets and to build and maintain excellent customer relations. The sales representatives are critically important to a pharmaceutical company as the company's image and revenue are highly dependent on their ability to satisfy all customer needs. It is therefore important that pharmaceutical companies do everything possible to support their sales representatives in their jobs to ensure that they all experience job satisfaction.

### **1.3 Focus of the Study**

The focus of the study was to explore factors that contribute to job satisfaction among sales professionals at Pharmaceutical Companies using Herzberg's motivation and hygiene factors and to present proposals on how to improve overall job satisfaction. The sample represented a wide range of selected demographic variables. It was deemed important to assess whether significant differences existed between the subgroups of sales representatives, in their experience of work motivation and job satisfaction. It is believed that its findings could be equally relevant to most other industries where organisational performance is largely dependent on the performance delivery by its staff. Despite their individual differences, the motivation theories show that by and large, people at work, wherever that may be, are motivated and satisfied by many of the same, or similar key characteristics of the workplace.

### **1.4 Problem Statement**

There is a multitude of research around job satisfaction and how it relates to performance, productivity, organisational commitment, retention and turnover of the employees. Job satisfaction is considered to be a vital factor in almost all the industries, including the pharmaceutical industry due to its competitive nature. The study of motivation forms an integral part of industrial and vocational psychology in which the concepts of need, incentive and attitude are discussed more extensively than the concepts of ability and skill (Vroom, 1995).

The business world's number one problem concerns how to motivate employees (Watson, 1994). Technological revolution, demographic changes in workplace and globalisation stimulate the need to search for novel ways to motivate the workforce. Getting to know about employees' preferences of what motivates them could help in improving productivity and building success stories for the organisations. Consequently, organisations attain a competitive edge whereby employees get valued rewards (Wiley, 1997). The Performance of employees is mostly determined by their abilities, motivation and positive job environment. The issues of deficiencies in the abilities of employees and secondly an undesirable job environment can be effectively addressed by appropriate training and the provision of

favourable work conditions. However, if motivation is the underlying cause of the performance problem, then its solution becomes more complex and challenging (Griffin, 1990).

Furthermore, the improvement in job satisfaction for sales staff at pharmaceutical companies requires urgent attention due to the competitive nature of the industry.

### **1.5 Objectives**

The research objectives were formulated to test job satisfaction among Pharmaceutical Sales Representatives in the pharmaceutical industry. The objectives of the study were to:

1. Conduct a literature review on Job Satisfaction
2. Determine the extent to which participants experience job satisfaction in terms of the dimensions and overall job satisfaction
3. Establish the relationship between the dimensions of job satisfaction and overall job satisfaction
4. Examine the relationship between the biographic variables and the dimensions of job satisfaction and overall job satisfaction respectively
5. Ascertain which of the dimensions best predict overall job satisfaction
6. Make recommendations

### **1.6 Hypotheses/Research Questions**

These hypothesis were formulated to answer the research questions and assess the objectives of the study.

The hypotheses that were tested are as follows:

#### **Hypothesis 1**

(H0): There is a statistically no significant relationship between the dimensions of Job satisfaction and overall job satisfaction

(H1): There is a statistically significant relationship between the dimensions of Job satisfaction and overall job satisfaction

## **Hypothesis 2**

(H0): There is a statistically no significant difference in the perceptions of the dimensions of Job satisfaction among the biographical variables

(H1): There is a statistically significant difference in the perceptions of the dimensions of Job satisfaction among the biographical variables

## **Hypothesis 3**

(H0): There is a statistically no significant difference in the perception of overall job satisfaction among the biographical variables.

(H1): There is a statistically significant difference in the perception of overall job satisfaction among the biographical variables.

## **Hypothesis 4**

(H0): The variance in the overall job satisfaction cannot be explained by the dimensions of job satisfaction.

(H1): The variance in the overall job satisfaction can be explained by the dimensions of job satisfaction.

### **1.7 The importance of this study is that it:**

- Provides management with more insight into what are the factors that contribute to perceived job satisfaction for sales representatives.
- Highlights the factors that are deemed important in creating job satisfaction that are not adequately addressed by management
- Will assist management with formulating policies that will help create job satisfaction.

### **1.8 Limitations of the Study**

- *Sample Size*

There are many pharmaceutical companies that operate in the Durban area. The task of obtaining the exact population size was not possible due to time constraints. Based on the uncertainty of the population size, a sample size of 50 may not be representative of the population, but is adequate for the purpose of the study.

However, according to Sekaran (2003) sample sizes larger than 30 and less than 500 are appropriate for most research. This theory is further supported, suggesting that there is no hard and fast rule regarding sample size, however the sample should consist of at least 30 respondents (Burns and Grove, 2001).

According to Polit and Beck (2006), quantitative research designs require a larger sample to increase representativeness and reduce sampling error.

- *Sampling Technique*

The convenience sampling technique was used to elicit responses from pharmaceutical sales representatives who visited two medical practitioners in the Durban area. This group may not represent all pharmaceutical sales people.

- *Questionnaire*

There is seldom much learnt about opinions, attitudes, intentions and expectations except by questioning. The questioning technique, however, does have its shortcomings. The major weakness is that the quality and quantity of information secured depends heavily on the ability and willingness of respondents to cooperate. Respondents may also interpret a question or concept differently from what was intended by the researcher. A respondent may intentionally mislead the researcher by giving false information (Cooper and Schindler, 2003).

## **1.9 Outline of the Chapters**

This study has been organised into five chapters. The first chapter contains an introduction to the study; a description of its purpose and its justification; and states the research questions that guided the study. Chapter two contains a review of current literature pertinent to the study. Chapter three describes the research design, the methodology and the procedures followed in the study. Chapter four details the analysis of the data obtained in the study and a discussion of the findings. Chapter five concludes the study and puts forward recommendations for further research.

## **1.10 Conclusion**

Job satisfaction is deemed as one of the most vital components in ensuring an efficient and effective working environment. There are several methods by which management may assess its employees overall satisfaction, however, many of them do come with shortcomings. It is imperative that management works in close proximity with its workforce, as unhappy employees could be severely detrimental on business sales, productivity and profit.

# CHAPTER TWO

## Job Satisfaction

---

### 2.1 Introduction

Job satisfaction is a complex topic that has been studied extensively by many researchers. Thousands of published articles and dissertations report that job satisfaction is related to performance, productivity, organisational commitment, retention and turnover of the employees. Job satisfaction is regarded as a vital factor in almost all industries and is gaining value in the pharmaceutical industry. It has become imperative to retain these sales people who play a valuable role to the success of the sales team, (Bodla and Naeem, 2004).

This chapter will attempt to define job satisfaction, its importance, discuss the theories of job satisfaction, examine the relationship between job satisfaction and motivation and discuss the predictors and consequences of job satisfaction.

### 2.2 Definitions of Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction has been defined and described in a variety of ways. It is virtually an impossible task to obtain a single definition for job satisfaction. Researchers over time have attempted to define job satisfaction, hence creating numerous definitions.

On examining the relevant literature on job satisfaction, some authors appear to use the term “job satisfaction” and “motivation” interchangeably. However, the two concepts can be viewed as separate concepts. Motivation can be defined as a persistent effort directed towards a goal (Weallens, 2003). Job satisfaction, on the other hand, refers to a collection of attitudes that workers have towards their jobs (Robbins, Odendaal & Roodt, 2003).

Locke’s (1976, p.1300) defined job satisfaction “as a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences”. Robbins et al, (2003) view job satisfaction as a subjective measure of worker attitudes, that is, an individual’s general attitude to his or her job. A person with a high job satisfaction holds positive attitudes towards the job, and the one who is dissatisfied with it has negative attitudes towards it (Robbins, et al, 2003).

Ivancevich, Konopaske and Matteson (2005) view job satisfaction as an attitude that individuals have towards their jobs which stems from their perception of their jobs and the degree to which there is a good fit between the individual and the organisation.

### **2.3 Importance of Job Satisfaction**

Spector (1997) presented three reasons to clarify the importance of job satisfaction.

Firstly, organisations can be directed by humanitarian values. Based on these values, they will attempt to treat their employees honorably and with respect. Job satisfaction assessment can then serve as an indicator of the extent to which employees are dealt with effectively. High levels of job satisfaction could also be a sign of emotional wellness or mental fitness.

Secondly, organisations can take on a utilitarian position in which employees' behaviour would be expected to influence organisational operations according to the employees' degree of job satisfaction/dissatisfaction. Job satisfaction can be expressed through positive behaviours and job dissatisfaction through negative behaviours.

Thirdly, job satisfaction can be an indicator of organisational operations. Assessment of job satisfaction might identify various levels of satisfaction among organisational departments and, therefore, be helpful in highlighting areas in need of improvement.

Spector (1997) believed that each one of the reasons is validation enough of the significance of job satisfaction and that the combination of the reasons provides an understanding of the focus on job satisfaction. Spector (1997) of course, is only one of many researchers, scholars, and writers who addressed the importance of job satisfaction. His reasons appear to be representative of many views on the importance of the concept in other major works dealing with job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction is a factor that has been shown to be linked to intentions to leave. King-Lawrence (2003) found that the higher the level of job satisfaction was, the lower the level of intent to leave for sales representatives of major pharmaceutical organisations. In another study on job satisfaction, Hellman (1997) used a meta-analysis method to analyse job satisfaction and intention to leave within U.S. organisations. Similar to King-Lawrence,

Hellman found an inverse relationship between job satisfaction and leaving an organisation. If the level of job satisfaction was high, then the intent to leave an organisation was low.

## **2.4 Theories of Job Satisfaction**

There is consensus in the literature that job satisfaction can be defined as the feelings that an employee has towards his job. These feelings manifest themselves as an attitude or emotional response, based on an individual's perception of the differences between what was expected; and what is actually experienced in the job. While there appears to be a common understanding of what job satisfaction is, there are a multitude of theories, either supported or challenged by researchers in the literature, describing its causes. Such researchers include Elton Mayo, Hawthorne, Abraham Maslow, Frederick Herzberg and Victor Vroom.

A review of the five most predominant and current models of job satisfaction are described by Buelens, Kreitner & Kinicki (2002) as follows:

### **2.4.1 Need Fulfillment**

This model proposes that job satisfaction is determined by the extent to which the characteristics of a job allow an individual to fulfill his needs. Although these theories are controversial, it is generally accepted that need fulfillment and job satisfaction are correlated.

### **2.4.2 Discrepancies**

This model proposes that job satisfaction is a result of met expectations. When expectations are greater than what is received, a person will be dissatisfied, while if outcomes are greater than expectations, the person will experience satisfaction. A Meta analysis of a large number of studies showed that met expectations, such as pay and promotion, were significantly related to job satisfaction.

### **2.4.3 Value Attainment**

This model supports the idea that job satisfaction stems from the perception that a job allows for fulfilment of a person's important work values. Generally, research has supported the prediction that the fulfilment of work values such as reward, recognition and work conditions is positively related to job satisfaction.

#### **2.4.4 Equity**

In this model, job satisfaction is dependent on an individual's perception that work outcomes, relative to inputs, compare favourably to those of significant others. This model has been considered as promising and has been supported by a large number of studies over a significant number of industries.

#### **2.4.5 Dispositional / Genetic Components**

This model is based on the belief that job satisfaction is partly a function of both personal traits and genetic factors. The model implies that stable individual differences are just as important as the characteristics of the work environment, in explaining job satisfaction. Although only a few studies have been conducted and further research is needed to test the model, the studies to date have supported a positive and significant relationship between personal traits and job satisfaction. The above review provides an insight into the complexities of job satisfaction and researchers continue to test these theories and explore the causes of job satisfaction.

#### **2.4.6 Herzberg's Motivator-Hygiene Theory**

The study of job satisfaction became more sophisticated with the introduction of Herzberg's motivator-hygiene theory. This theory focuses attention on the work itself as a principal source of job satisfaction. To Herzberg the concept of job satisfaction has two dimensions, namely intrinsic and extrinsic factors. Intrinsic factors are also known as motivators or satisfiers, and extrinsic factors as hygiene, dissatisfiers, or maintenance factors. The motivators relate to job content (work itself) and include achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility and advancement. The hygiene factors relate to job context (work environment) and involve, for example, company policy and administration, supervision, salary, interpersonal relations, and working conditions. Motivators are related to job satisfaction when present but not to dissatisfaction when absent whilst hygiene factors are associated with job dissatisfaction when absent but not with satisfaction when present.

Before the emergence of the motivator-hygiene theory, only single scales had been used to measure job satisfaction. Scores on the high end of the scale reflected high levels of job satisfaction, whereas scores on the low end represented high dissatisfaction. Research based on the motivator-hygiene theory should apply different scales for job satisfaction and

dissatisfaction because the opposite of job satisfaction is no job satisfaction and the opposite of job dissatisfaction is no job dissatisfaction (Iacqua, Schumacher & Li, 1995).

Robbins (1998) indicates that Herzberg conducted research to find out what people really need from their jobs. He asked people to describe in detail circumstances where they felt good and bad about their jobs. The findings indicated that intrinsic factors are mostly related to job satisfaction while extrinsic factors are linked with dissatisfaction. Herzberg's (1966) theory suggested that job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction are caused by different and independent sets of factors. He found that when people are satisfied, they attribute their satisfaction to work itself, but when people are dissatisfied with their jobs, they are concerned about the environment in which they work.

Some studies have criticized Herzberg theory saying it is actually a theory of job satisfaction rather than that of motivation. However, some organisations combine job tasks, expand employee responsibility and initiate work teams with the aim of increasing employee satisfaction and motivation. Graham & Messner (1998) report that there are three major criticisms associated with these content theories. Firstly, there is a scant empirical data to support. Secondly, they assume employees are alike. Thirdly and lastly, they are not really theories of motivation at all, but rather theories of satisfaction.

Other researchers such as Nadler and Lawler (1979) have been critical of Herzberg. They argue that Herzberg made assumptions about his theory. Those assumptions hold that all employees are alike, all situations are alike and there is one best way. Furthermore, House & Widgor (1967) revise Herzberg's two factors and identify four criticisms of the model. They note those criticisms as follows:

It is methodology bound in identifying critical incidents of satisfaction and dissatisfaction, raters are required to evaluate behaviour of respondents, which result in rater contamination, the research lacked a measure of overall satisfaction, and situational variables were not treated in defining the relationship between satisfaction and productivity.

However, Graham & Messner (1998) state that irrespective of those criticisms, content theorists like Herzberg contributed a lot to the body of knowledge of job satisfaction. On

the other hand, Mitchell (1982) insinuates that the research conducted by Maslow, McGregor, Herzberg and Alderfer indicates, in general, that organisations consume more time dealing with fulfilment of lower needs other than fulfilment of higher level needs. Organisations are deemed to have failed to take cognisance of upper level needs.

Motivator and hygiene factors are found to have moderate to substantial relationship with overall job satisfaction. This leads to the conclusion that the basic propositions of Herzberg's (1959) motivator-hygiene theory of job satisfaction does not hold true, (Bodla and Naeem, 2004). According to Bodla and Naeem, 2004 there were no significant differences in overall job satisfaction between demographic sub-groups. It implies that pharmaceutical sales representatives are stable regarding their overall level of job satisfaction.

A recent study done in Cape Town, South Africa, attempted to determine the amount of variance in overall job satisfaction among frontline pharmaceutical sales force. Besides, this it also investigated whether demographic subgroups of the sales-force are statistically different regarding their overall job satisfaction, (Singh, 2010).

The results of this study indicate that job content or motivation factors such as "growth", "relationship with co-workers", "promotion opportunities", and "recognition" as well as job context or hygiene factors such as "job security", "operating procedures", "work itself", and "supervision" explain significant proportion of variation in overall job satisfaction among pharmaceutical sales-force leading to the conclusion that five job content and context factors such as "growth", "relationship with co-workers", "promotion opportunities", "recognition", and "job security" can contribute drastically to improve overall level of job satisfaction among pharmaceutical sales-force, (Singh, 2010).

Therefore, it is advisable that sales and human resource management of both multinational and local pharmaceutical companies should pay special attention to these factors in order to improve productivity and performance of their sales-force. As regards growth and development, the management should evaluate managerial practices for the participation and autonomy of salespersons.

## **2.5 Predictors of Job Satisfaction**

Originally job satisfaction was studied as a predictor of behaviours such as performance, absenteeism, and turnover. More recently the interest has shifted toward identifying factors that influence or predict job satisfaction. Personal and work-related characteristics can influence job satisfaction (Locke, 1976; Spector, 1997).

Glisson and Durick (1988) examined simultaneously the ability of multiple variables from three categories (worker, job, and organisational characteristics) to predict both job satisfaction and organisational commitment. They proposed that job tasks would be excellent predictors of job satisfaction, characteristics of workers poor predictors, and characteristics of the organisation moderate predictors. Their findings supported the traditional emphasis on job characteristics as determinants of job satisfaction and to a lesser extent, the more recent examinations of organisational determinants.

### **2.5.1 Personal Characteristics**

Age, gender, education and tenure are common variables that are used to determine what relationship they may have on job satisfaction. Evidence from various research findings on the relationship between personal characteristics and job satisfaction has produced mixed results, with some positive relationships being identified and in some instances negative ones for the same variables.

#### **2.5.1.1 Age**

Older workers have lower expectations than younger workers, and they tend to be better adjusted to the work situation. Quinn, Staines, and McCullough (1974) claimed that older workers are more satisfied with their work because they move into better work or more desirable positions across their careers. Saleh and Otis (1964) proposed a positive and linear function between age and job satisfaction until the preretirement period during which job satisfaction significantly declines. They attributed the increasing level of job satisfaction to the general adjustment to life, and the decreasing level of job satisfaction to a decline in health and an obstruction of channels for self-actualisation and psychological growth.

Zeitz (1990) adopted a situational perspective of employee attitudes to investigate the relationship between age and work satisfaction among 434 employees of a Federal Government agency. The employees were categorised into three groups: non-professionals (mostly clerical personnel), non-elite professionals (not promoted to highest rank), and elite professionals (attainment of grade 13 or above). The results of the study show that the age-satisfaction curves differed among the non-professionals, non-elite professionals, and elite professionals.

Iiacqua et al. (1995) analysed factors that affect job satisfaction and dissatisfaction of faculty in higher educational institutions. Age was among the factors found to affect job dissatisfaction. Younger, less experienced faculty expressed more job dissatisfaction than experienced tenured faculty. Spector (1997) suggested two reasons why job satisfaction might increase with age. One, better benefits such as pension, for example, and rewards, pay, for example, could increase satisfaction. Two, Spector (1997, p.26) stated that, "...people adapt to the job by adjusting their expectations to be more realistic, so that they are happier with less as they get older." According to Malik & Naeem (2009), respondents aged between 26-30 years value "pay and fringe benefits" more than those aged between 20-25 years.

In the study conducted by Bodla and Naeem (2004), older sales representatives are more satisfied with the job than their younger counterparts. Junior frontline employees are somewhat more satisfied with job than senior counterparts. Singh (2010), received similar results that older salespersons (greater than 35 years) are somewhat more satisfied with job than younger counterparts (less than 35 years). Junior sales-force feel more satisfaction with job than senior sales force.

### **2.5.1.2 Gender**

Research investigating the relationship between gender and job satisfaction uncovered three possibilities. First, females are more satisfied than males (i.e., Hoppock, 1935). Second, males are more satisfied than females (i.e., Hulin & Smith, 1964; Locke, Fitzpatrick, & White, 1983). Third, no difference exists between males and females with respect to job satisfaction (i.e., D'Arcy, Syrotuik, & Siddique, 1984; Golding, Resnick, & Crosby, 1983; Iiacqua et al., 1995).

Thompson and McNamara (1997) reviewed various job satisfaction findings and suggested that neither age nor gender was of value in the prediction of job satisfaction. Gruneberg (1979) presented various reasons why results appeared inconsistent when comparing the relationship between gender and job satisfaction. Some reasons for these inconsistencies maybe due to occupying different job levels, promotion prospects, salary and level of satisfaction that the same job presents. Women are more likely to experience greater job satisfaction in a job that requires fewer skills and promotion opportunities than men.

Smith, Smits, and Hoy (1998) also conducted research on the relationship of gender and job satisfaction with employees at small businesses. The initial results of the study found no significant difference. On further investigation and this time introducing the gender of the small business owner as a variable, presented different results with significant difference. The most satisfied females were employed in female owned and managed companies, with up to 25 employees. The most satisfied men were employed in male owned and managed companies, with 50 or more employees.

According to Bishay (1996), there were differences between the responses of men and women. Mean responses of men and women indicated that women were significantly less satisfied with their incomes than men.

According to Bodla and Naeem (2004), female sales representatives are somewhat less satisfied with overall job satisfaction than their male counterparts, whereas, Singh, (2010), recorded no significant differences among salespersons' demographic subgroups regarding their current level of overall job satisfaction. However, female salespersons feel somewhat more satisfaction with job than male counterparts.

### **2.5.1.3 Education**

A review of literature regarding the relationship between job satisfaction and education suggests that the relationship could be either negative or positive. Carrell and Elbert (1974) found that the effect of education on job satisfaction was a negative effect primarily due to higher education workers being dissatisfied due to them performing routine tasks. DeSantis and Durst (1996) also identified differences in job satisfaction and the education variable. Their findings indicated a much stronger negative relationship between education and

overall job satisfaction in private-sector employees than in their public sector counterparts. A possible reason for this might be that private -sector individuals are employed in positions that do not challenge them (DeSantis and Durst 1996).

Quinn and Baldi de Mandilovitch (1980) analysed data from 11 studies of American workers. Based on this analysis, they documented a positive relationship between the workers' educational level and overall job satisfaction. The attainment of a college degree resulted in the largest increase in overall job satisfaction.

According to the results obtained by Malik & Naeem (2009), graduate degree holders have emphasised more on "promotion opportunities" than master degree holders, whilst, master's degree holders are more satisfied with their job than undergraduate degree holders.

In another study that explored job satisfaction among pharmaceutical sales representatives, it was found that master degree holders are more satisfied with job satisfaction than graduate degree holders Bodla and Naeem (2004). Job satisfaction studies, that included education as a variable suggested that there may exist a relationship that can be negative or positive. One particular study reported a negative effect of education on job satisfaction. It found that there may exist a level of dissatisfaction among younger workers who have a higher level of education due to performing routine tasks (Carrell and Elbert 1974).

#### **2.5.1.4 Tenure**

Gruneberg (1979) pointed out that the relationships between tenure, defined as length of service, and job satisfaction was unclear. DeSantis & Durst (1996) found that employees who have a longer length of service may experience a decrease in job satisfaction. However, evidence provided by Bedeian, Ferris, and Kacmear (1992) showed a positive relationship between tenure and job satisfaction.

According to Malik and Naeem (2009), sales representatives with job experience more than 5 years are more satisfied with their job than those having job experience less than 5 years. Older sales representatives are more satisfied with their job than younger counterparts. Junior frontline employees are somewhat more satisfied with their job than senior counterparts.

According to Singh (2010), older salespersons (Greater than 35 years) are somewhat more satisfied with job than younger counterparts (Less than 35 years). Junior sales-force feel more satisfaction with job than senior sales force.

## **2.5.2 Work-Related Characteristics**

The work situation can seriously affect one's job satisfaction levels. Any aspect relating to the job itself or the organisation forms part of the work situation. According to Bruce and Blackburn (1992), Locke (1976), and Vroom (1982) challenging work, equitable rewards, supportive working conditions, and supportive colleagues are the main determinants of job satisfaction.

### **2.5.2.1 Challenging work**

Schneider, Gunnarson, & Wheeler (1992) states that work itself correlates most highly with overall job satisfaction. Employees' prefer jobs that allow them to use their abilities and skills effectively, as well as, a job that offers freedom, a varied tasks and performance feedback. This kind of job presents the employee with work that is mentally challenging. However, the challenge needs to be balanced to prevent boredom in some instances or frustration in some instances when the challenge presented by the job is too great. It is important to maintain the challenge at an appropriate level to create feelings of pleasure and satisfaction (Bruce & Blackburn, 1992; Locke, 1976; Vroom, 1982).

People tend to be more satisfied with jobs that provide an overall work load and level of variety that is not low, but also not so high that it becomes overwhelming and unduly challenging. Recent research shows that this factor applies particularly to career orientated individuals as opposed to those who see the position as short term or temporary. The latter individuals would be more satisfied with the social aspects of the job rather than the challenge of the job (Greenberg & Baron, 1993). The Job Characteristics model is also effective in describing the growth need strength of the individual and his desire for personal growth and development. The model predicts that individuals, who are not interested in these attributes, are not expected to experience the theorized psychological reactions to the core dimensions of the job, or to consequently enjoy the beneficial personal and work outcomes, as described by the model. They would again, be more inclined to the social aspects of the job.

### **2.5.2.2 Equitable rewards**

Employees expect to be rewarded by being compensated fairly for their efforts and in some situations receiving a promotion to a better position. To establish a system where pay is perceived to be fair, decisions regarding the value of pay should take job requirements, people's abilities and community pay standards into consideration (Bruce & Blackburn, 1992; Locke, 1976, Locke, Fitzpatrick & White, 1983; Vroom, 1982).

Research clearly indicates that an organisation's reward system is strongly related to job satisfaction. This refers not only to how pay and promotions are distributed but also to how fairly they are distributed. Adam's equity theory of motivation predicts that people are motivated to maintain a balance between their cognitive beliefs and their behaviour, in typically give and take situations. In the work place, employees will evaluate whether the rewards they receive for their input, match those received by relevant others. Employees will tend to compare themselves to others, who are similar in certain respects, such as: the work they do, gender, educational level, amongst other factors. Field research has also shown that perceptions of distributive and procedural justice are positively related to job satisfaction and negatively so, to attitudinal problems such as absenteeism, intentions to quit and turnover (Kreitner, Kinicki & Beulens; 2002). According to Malik and Naeem (2009), sales force in senior position have placed higher importance on "pay and fringe benefits" while junior salesforce valued "interesting work" more than their counterparts.

Locke's (1969), value theory, articulates that job satisfaction is closely associated with job outcomes, meaning that the reward must match that which is desired by the individual. If the individual perceives value in the reward, then the higher the job satisfaction experienced. However, should there be discrepancy between what the individual expects and what one really receives, the lower will be the job satisfaction. A study conducted by Rice, MacFarlin & Bennet (1989) as cited in Greenberg & Baron (1993) on a diverse group of employees, was fully consistent with the above theory.

In other studies, pharmaceutical sales force rated pay and fringe benefits as the most important motivating factor (Wiley, 1997; Dubinsky, Jolson, Michaels, Kotabe and Lim, 1993; Shipley and Kiely, 1988).

### **2.5.2.3 Supportive working conditions**

Working conditions that provide comfort and safety to employees can lead to job satisfaction. Companies need to ensure that the physical environment is adequate lit, temperature is well maintained and noise levels are kept to a minimum to prevent any discomfort that may cause workers to feel dissatisfied. Furthermore, people prefer cleanliness to dirt and living close to their jobs over living far away (Bruce & Blackburn, 1992; Locke, 1976, Locke et al; 1983; Vroom, 1982).

Research has shown that job satisfaction is positively related to pleasant working environments (Greenberg & Baron, 1993). While these factors are not directly associated with the job itself, they are associated with the context in which the job is performed. Working conditions are relevant because they impact and influence life, both inside and outside of work. Factors such as hours of work and over-time have a direct bearing on life satisfaction and recreation. Generally, unless work conditions are either very bad or very good, they are taken for granted. Research has shown that complaints about working conditions could be a manifestation of deeper frustrations such as anger towards management and feelings of a lack of appreciation (Arnold & Feldman, 1986).

### **2.5.2.4 Supportive colleagues**

Supportive colleagues play a vital social role through their favourable interaction with their colleagues. Job satisfaction can increase if an individual has sympathetic and helpful co-workers. It is equally important to have managers who are able to communicate effectively with employees and provide them with feedback that is meaningful. A manager who is receptive to the needs of his co-workers can lead to increased job satisfaction for employees (Bruce & Blackburn, 1992; Herzberg, Mausner & Snyderman, 1959; Locke et al; 1983, Vroom, 1982).

Studies have determined that job satisfaction is high when employees believe their superiors: are competent; have their best interest at heart and treat them with dignity and respect. The converse is that satisfaction is low when supervision is perceived to be of poor quality, incompetent and uncaring (Greenberg & Baron, 1993).

According to Malik & Naeem (2009), the demographic subgroups of sales force differ from another in perceived importance of job content and context factors. The analyses reflect that male respondents place significantly higher value on the “supportive coworkers” than female counterparts.

#### **2.5.2.5 Decentralisation of Power**

When power is decentralised, many employees can make decisions and freely participate in the decision-making process. Such situations tend to promote job satisfaction. The converse is also true in that when power is concentrated, employees tend to believe that they are relatively powerless and helpless. Such a situation reduces job satisfaction (Greenberg & Baron. 1993). Research has shown that employee participation in performance appraisals was positively related to job satisfaction and that participation in the work place had a small, but significant effect on job performance and a moderate link to job satisfaction (Kreitner, *et al*, 2002).

Participative management, power sharing and empowerment are consistent with Maslow’s need theory and the Job Characteristics model of Hackman and Oldham. Maslow’s theory proposed that motivation was a function of five basic needs, arranged in a graduated hierarchy. As each need is achieved, it loses its ability to motivate and the next need in the hierarchy is sought. These needs range from the basic psychological needs of survival, safety and love, through to those of esteem and self-actualization, as the most sophisticated of motivators. The Job Characteristics model predicts that increased internal work motivation can be realized by experiencing meaningfulness, responsibility and knowledge of results, when five core job characteristics are present. These core characteristics are: skill variety, task identity and significance, autonomy and feedback. These two theories predict that motivation will be increased and job satisfaction attained by fulfilling basic needs, autonomy, meaningful work, and interpersonal contact (Kreitner, *et al*, 2002).

Syptak, Marsland and Ulmer (1999) posit that job satisfaction may be influenced by various factors such as the quality of the physical environment in which employees work, the quality of employees’ relationship with their supervisor and the degree of fulfillment in their work amongst others. Job satisfaction seeks to explain how content an individual is with the job. Job satisfaction may be linked with motivation to some extent even though

they are not similar.

Oshagbemi (1997) acknowledges the notion that job satisfaction is significant due to its relevance to the physical and emotional well-being of employees. In other words, job satisfaction has relevance for human health. In their study, Yammarino & Dubinsky (1987) suggest that an organisation should seek to create a working environment where supervisors foster and provide:

- Higher levels of support, encouragement and information,
- Higher levels of discretion and autonomy in order to increase levels of satisfaction,
- Job and set of tasks that are clearly defined,
- A greater attachment and loyalty to the organisation
- Higher levels of productivity

They believe that an employee's satisfaction with his/her supervisor is influenced by the supervisor attention and employee autonomy. Likewise it can also affect the employee role ambiguity, organisational commitment and job performance.

- Task characteristics

Taber & Alliger (1995) identify task characteristics that affect satisfaction with the work itself. They set forth the tasks characteristics as the following:

- *Task importance*

There is an expectation that importance of the tasks show a positive relationship with overall job satisfaction. An important task is expected to contribute largely to job satisfaction than does an unimportant task.

- *Task complexity*

A complex task is found to be more challenging and brings out a new way of thinking; hence contributes more to job satisfaction.

- *Level of supervision of the task*

An employee that is free to perform his tasks unsupervised is bound to have a positive effect on job satisfaction.

- *Level of concentration required on the task*

A concentration level needed by a particular task is deemed to connect positively with job satisfaction.

- *Time*

An amount of time spent on a particular task is expected to have a greater effect on satisfaction with the work itself. It is regarded as a moderating variable.

- *Task enjoyment*

It is believed that enjoyment that one receives from each individual task could possibly affect job satisfaction. The impact on satisfaction from enjoyment on a particular task could be assessed by how important that task is felt to be. The above-mentioned task characteristics are highly related and potentially valuable to an understanding of job satisfaction and motivation. Lund (2003) highlights the fact that job satisfaction has been widely studied. In fact, several researchers have examined the relationship between job satisfaction and human and organisational behaviour.

## **2.6 Consequences of Job Satisfaction**

The consequences of job satisfaction are the factors that ultimately impact on various elements that are essential or detrimental to the functioning of any organisation.

These include the following:

### **2.6.1 Job Performance:**

According to Sari and Judge (2004), employee performance and therefore job performance is ascertained by an employee's abilities, motivation and positive job environment. Bodla & Naeem (2009) however found that "work itself" is the most motivating dimension of sales representatives' job whilst "operating procedures" the least motivating job dimension.

Job satisfaction plays an imperative role in understanding employee performance and has been found to be more complex for more complex and professional jobs than for less complex jobs (Sari and Judge, 2004). Research has found that there is in a general a positive correlation between satisfaction and job performance. Iaffaldano & Muchinsky (1985) found that there is a statistical correlation of about 0.17 between job satisfaction and performance however, more recent studies as conducted by Judge, Thoresen, Bono and Patton (2001) found that a significantly higher correlation of 0.30 existed between job satisfaction and job performance and higher complexity jobs yielded a correlation of 0.52.

### **2.6.2 Absenteeism (Withdrawal Behaviour):**

In general, employees that are not satisfied with their jobs are more likely to display absenteeism and are more likely to quit (Sari and Judge, 2004). Behavioural traits such as lateness, unionisation, grievances, drug abuse and decisions to retire are also indicative of withdrawal behaviours of dissatisfaction of employees in the job that currently occupy. It has been proven in studies that employees that are the most dissatisfied typically have a higher frequency of absenteeism because this provides a temporary escape from an otherwise unpleasant work situation (Sari and Judge, 2004). Sari and Judge (2004) go further to identify that employee absences increase significantly during holidays and in certain circumstances, is known to increase as a result of alcoholism, addiction and also poor health. Mowday, Porter & Steers (1982) postulated that employees that are satisfied have a greater affinity to remaining with an organisation that they a part of and working toward that organisation's goals hence are less likely to quit or retire early. Correlations between job satisfaction and absenteeism have been shown to indicate correlations in the range of -0.25 (Sari and Judge, 2004).

### **2.6.3 Company Turnover:**

Smerek and Peterson (2007) have found that job satisfaction not only attributes to humanistic needs to improve the quality of work life but also its ultimate overall impacts on the desired outcomes as required by the company e.g. productivity and turnover. This involves using finances to affect job satisfaction and inadvertently the company's overall functioning.

### **2.6.4 Life Satisfaction:**

Employees that are happy and satisfied with their lives, in general are satisfied with their jobs and vice versa. This theory however, proves that company's/ employers therefore have a limited input on job satisfaction among their employees as they cannot maintain that employees are satisfied in their lives outside from work.

In the study conducted by Bodla and Naeem (2004), older sales representatives are more satisfied with the job than their younger counterparts. Junior frontline employees are somewhat more satisfied with job than senior counterparts.

## **2.7 The Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Motivation**

Dessler (2001) defined motivation as “the intensity of a person’s desire to engage in some activity.” Motivation and job satisfaction have often been confused. According to Peretomode (1991) these two terms are related but not synonymous. The relationship suggests that motivation is the driving force behind the attainment of personal goals, whilst job satisfaction is experienced when a task is successfully completed with possible rewards. Some employees may present with low motivation, yet at the same time this is able to fulfill all aspects of his job, hence representing high job satisfaction. Peretomode (1991, p.113) also argued that the reverse is equally possible with a highly motivated employee being dissatisfied with various aspects of his or her job. According to Ifinedo (2003) a motivated worker is easy to spot by his or her agility, dedication, enthusiasm, focus, zeal, and general performance and contribution to the organisational objectives and goals.

A large number of studies have investigated the link between job satisfaction and motivation. For instance, Eskildsen, Kristensen & Westlund (2003) investigate the differences in intrinsic work motivation and employee/job satisfaction among employees with different characteristics such as gender and many others. They concluded that there is no difference between the genders with respect to job satisfaction in the Nordic countries.

In related studies, Graham & Messner (1998) examining the relationship of factors, such as gender, size of enrollment and years of experience to principalship were generally satisfied with their current job, colleagues/co-workers and level of responsibility. But they were less satisfied with their pay, opportunities for advancement and fringe benefits. In addition, Testa, Skaruppa & Pietrzak (1998) found that job satisfaction of cruise line customer-contact employees accounted for 30 percent of the variance in customer satisfaction. Similarly, Hoffman & Ingram (1992) argue that overall job satisfaction, as well as, satisfaction with work supervision, co-workers and promotion was positively related to customer-oriented behaviours.

Besides, Pors & Johannes (2002) affirm that job satisfaction is related to the underlying personality structure and socialisation. They assert that employee related tasks such as delegating, informing and communicating correlate positively with job satisfaction.

Extensive review of job satisfaction literature suggested recommendations of what lead to employee satisfaction. Robbins (1998) suggests that employees must be given mentally challenging jobs, they must be provided with equitable rewards and that they want a pay system that they perceive as just and in line with their expectations. Ultimately, they want their quality of working life to be enhanced. Employees prefer physical surroundings that are not detrimental to their lives. Indeed, employees become more satisfied in an organisation that encourages supportive colleagues. Perhaps it can be argued that satisfaction is felt where the immediate supervisor demonstrates friendliness, empathy and support to their subordinates.

Many research studies have dealt with productivity /satisfaction/motivation in a variety of work related settings. According to Becherer, Morgan & Richard (1982), the literature base concentrating on salesperson performance and motivation has been too little. Therefore managers have received insufficient direction on how to develop, stimulate and revive their sales force.

Tietjen & Myers (1998) postulate that the dual-factor findings of Herzberg theory are important, in the sense that they create awareness to management on how to bring on satisfaction within workers. They posit that Herzberg's theory states the fact that the work itself encloses the potential for causing satisfaction and bringing fulfilment. Taber & Alliger (1995) contend that work itself satisfaction is a main attitude with regards to the intrinsic properties of a job because it is triggered by the variety, interest, flow and other tasks that are performed on the job.

Malik & Naeem (2009) conducted a study to explore the motivational preferences of pharmaceutical sales-force and to determine the significant differences in the value placed on each job factor across demographic subgroups. The findings of this study reported that pay and fringe benefits, job security and promotional opportunities were the top three motivators. This study however rated recognition as the most important motivating factor irrespective of the demographic backgrounds. All the demographic subgroups of the sales-force, except salespersons above 10 years job experience, emphasised job security as one of the top motivators. It could be probably due to widespread unemployment conditions in the country. Job insecurity can deteriorate economic and psychological well-being of the sales-force. So, when

downsizing is necessitated, appropriate initiatives such as severance programmes, incentives for early retirement and outplacement techniques should to be taken to sustaining productive behaviours of the salespersons (Wiley, 1997).

In a separate study done to explore the impact of person-job fit and person-organisation fit on the job satisfaction, organisation commitment and turnover intentions of pharmaceutical salespersons in India. This survey found that person-job fit had a strong positive relationship with job satisfaction and person-organisation fit had a positive relationship with organisation commitment. Job satisfaction had a positive influence on organisation commitment and a negative influence on turnover intentions. The differences in job satisfaction across age and experience categories were not significant but salespersons with higher educational qualifications reported lower levels of job satisfaction, Mulky, 2010.

Bodla and Naeem (2004) explored the ‘Motivator and Hygiene Factors Explaining Overall Job Satisfaction among Pharmaceutical Sales Representatives’. The findings of this study reported that “Work Itself” is the most motivating dimension of the job whilst “operating procedures” is reported to be the least motivating dimension of the job for frontline sales-force in pharmaceutical companies. Five distinct job factors such as “growth”, “co-workers”, “promotion opportunities”, “rewards and recognition” and “job security” are found to be the significant predictors in sales representatives’ overall job satisfaction. This study concludes that demographic variables do not contribute significant variations in sales representatives’ overall level of job satisfaction.

## **2.8 Conclusion**

In this chapter, job satisfaction was defined and its importance discussed. The chapter also discussed the theories relevant to job satisfaction, examined the relationship between job satisfaction and motivation and also examined the predictors and consequences of job satisfaction.

Chapter 3 deals with the research methodology used in this study.

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **Research Methodology**

---

#### **3.1 Introduction**

Chapter three describes the procedures that were used to determine the job satisfaction of the sales representatives within the pharmaceutical sales industry and thereby answer the research questions posed. This chapter discusses the design of the research, the population under investigation, the data collection procedure, the instrument utilised for the research and the methods used to analyse the data.

#### **3.2. Objectives of the Study**

The research objectives are formulated to test job satisfaction among Pharmaceutical Sales Representatives. The objectives of the study were to:

- Conduct a literature review on Job Satisfaction
- Determine the extent to which subjects experience job satisfaction in terms of the dimensions and overall job satisfaction
- Establish the relationship between the dimensions of job satisfaction and overall job satisfaction
- Examine the relationship between the biographic variables and the dimensions of job satisfaction and overall job satisfaction respectively
- Ascertain which of the dimensions best predict job satisfaction

#### **3.3. Research Design**

The research design is the blueprint for fulfilling objectives and answering questions (Cooper and Schindler, 2003). Research designs can be classified by the approach used to gather primary data. There are basically two approaches; observation or communication. The distinctive feature of observation is that it offers an investigator the opportunity to gather live data from naturally occurring social institutions. In this way the researcher could look directly at what is taking place rather than relying on second hand account- the use of immediate awareness, or direct cognition, as a principle mode of research thus have

the potential to yield more valid or authentic data than with otherwise be the case with mediated or inferential methods. (Cooper & Schindler, 2003: 317-319)

The communication approach involves questioning or surveying people and recording their responses for analysis. The great strength of questioning as a primary data collecting technique is its versatility. Abstract information of all types can be gathered by questioning others (Cooper and Schindler, 2003).

### **3.3.1 Sampling Design**

Sampling involves a process of selecting a sub-section of a population that represents the entire population in order to obtain information regarding the phenomenon of interest. A sample is a subsection of the population, which is selected to participate in a study. There are two methods of sampling, one yields probability samples which the probability of selection of each respondent is assured. The other yields non probability samples in which the probability of the selection is unknown (Polit & Hungler 1995:279).

There are two types of data: qualitative and quantitative. Quantitative research or a positivistic paradigm (Collis & Hussey, 2003:47) is a formal, objective, systematic process to obtain information and describe variables and their relationships (Burns & Grove, 1997:26). Quantitative research is also a conclusive research format involving large samples and fairly structured data collection procedures (Struwig & Stead, 2001:4). Quantitative research uses structured tools, to generate numerical data and uses statistics; to interpret, organise and represent the collected data” (Burns & Grove 2001:30).

Although most researchers emphasise one or the other, qualitative and quantitative methods can be combined and used in the same study.

#### **3.3.1.1 Population and Sample**

According to Zikmund (2003:373), the first question related to sampling concerns identifying the target population that is the complete group of specific population elements relevant to the research project.

The population of this study will comprise of pharmaceutical sales representatives from different pharmaceutical companies operating in Durban. Two large specialist practices

were chosen in Durban that will serve as the location for the study. These two specialist medical practices get on average sixty pharmaceutical sales representatives from different pharmaceutical companies.

A sample is a subset of a population selected to estimate the behaviour or characteristics of the population (Cooper & Schindler, 2003). A sample of 50 respondents who visited these practices over a two month period was selected. Sekaran (1992) states that sample sizes larger than 30 and less than 500 are appropriate for most research. Burns and Grove (2001:377) states that there is no hard and fast rule about the sample size but a sample should have at least 30 respondents. According to Polit and Beck (2006: 267-268), quantitative research designs require a larger sample to increase representativeness and reduce sampling error.

### **3.3.1.2 Sampling techniques**

Zikmund (2003: 379) states that the “major alternative plans may be grouped into probability techniques and non-probability techniques.” Probability sampling techniques include simple random, systematic, stratified random and cluster sampling. (Saunders et al.: 2000). The selection of sampling units in non-probability sampling is, including quota, purposive, snowball and convenience sampling on the other hand, quite arbitrary, as researchers rely heavily on personal judgment. Thus, projecting the data beyond the sample is statistically inappropriate (Zikmund, 2003: 379- 380).

Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill (2000: 170) states that “limited resources or the inability to specify a sampling frame may dictate the use of one or a number of non-probability sampling techniques.” Given the absence of a sampling frame combined with time and cost constraints, it was apparent that a non-probability sampling technique would be most appropriate for this research. In particular, the convenience sampling technique will be used. Convenience sampling is used in exploratory research where the researcher is interested in getting an inexpensive approximation of the truth. As the name implies, the sample is selected because they are convenient.

Sales representatives from various pharmaceutical companies who visited the two medical practices during the two month data collection period were invited to participate. As the

researcher was not able to collect this data, two receptionists that worked at these practices were chosen to invite pharmaceutical sales representatives to participate in this survey. The researcher held a training session with the receptionists on how to administer these questionnaires, as well as, how to answer possible questions that the pharmaceutical sales representatives may have. The researcher was present to observe the administration of two questionnaires each at both the medical practices to ensure that there was consistency in the process and to observe any shortcomings. The questionnaire and consent form were placed in separate envelopes and were self-administered. Participation in the survey was voluntary and sales representatives who participated were required to complete the consent form and the questionnaire. This was important to maintain the integrity of the data that was collected.

To increase the response rate, reliability, and validity of the data collected the design of the questionnaire incorporated the following factors (Saunders et al., 2000:279):-

- Careful design of individual questions,
- Clear layout of the questionnaire form,
- Lucid explanation of the purpose of the questionnaire, and
- Pilot testing

### **3.3.2 Data Collection**

The data collection devices associated with the survey method includes the use of questionnaires, structured observation and structures interviews (Saunders et al, 2000). For the purpose of this study a questionnaire was used. Shao (199:246) defines a questionnaire as a: “formal set of questions or statements designed to gather the information from the respondents that will accomplish the goals of the research project.”

#### **3.3.2.1 The measuring instrument**

The questionnaire was adjusted and adapted after extensively researching literature on Herzberg’s Two Factor Theory. It was adapted from Herzberg’s Two Factor Theory of Motivation that claims there are two kinds of factors that interact in the employment situa-

tion that can either make employees satisfied (motivators) or dissatisfied (hygiene factors). The satisfiers (motivators) are made up of the following factors, namely, achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility and opportunity for advancement. The dissatisfiers (hygiene factors) consist of the following factors, namely, company policy and administration, supervision, salary, interpersonal relationships, working conditions, job security and status.

- Section A: In this section, respondents are asked to give information regarding gender, age, marital status, academic qualification, length of service and position.
- Section B: This section, asks the respondents to rate the level of satisfaction they experience in their current job. The objective will be on assessing which motivators and hygiene factors contribute or do not contribute to their level of job satisfaction of pharmaceutical sales representatives in their current job. It will also test the overall level of job satisfaction currently being experienced by pharmaceutical representatives in their jobs.

The objective concerned on assessing which motivators and hygiene factors contribute or do not contribute to their level of job satisfaction of pharmaceutical sales representatives in their current job. It also tested the overall level of job satisfaction currently being experienced by pharmaceutical representatives in their jobs.

The questionnaire used a five-point Likert scale that ranged from very dissatisfied (1) to very satisfied (5). A Likert scale is a psychometric scale commonly used in questionnaires, and is the most widely used scale in survey research. When responding to a Likert questionnaire item, respondents specify their level of agreement to a statement. (Cooper & Schindler, 2003)

### **3.3.2.2 The Pilot study**

A pilot test is conducted to detect weakness in design and instruments and to provide proxy data for selection of probability sample (Cooper & Schindler, 2003). According to Malhotra (2003), pre-testing refers to the testing of the questionnaire on a small sample of respondents in order to identify and eliminate potential problem. A sample of 8 respondents was used during the pilot phase of the study. These respondents used in the pilot study

were all pharmaceutical sales representatives from different pharmaceutical companies operating in the Durban area. It was important to ensure consistency with the proposed test sample. The two medical practices used in the test sample were also used during the pilot study. The medical practitioners allowed their receptionists to be briefed on the purpose for the survey and that this process was of a voluntary nature.

The following changes to the questionnaire needed to be made following the pilot study are tabulated below:

Changes made to Questionnaire	Why changes were made
<p>The entire questionnaire was long and cumbersome</p> <p>Section B1 was reduced to one question instead of 12 questions</p> <p>Section B2 was reduced to 2 questions instead of 25 questions</p>	<p>The pilot study picked up repetitiveness and redundancy. This had to be corrected to ensure that the data collected met the objectives of the study.</p>
<p>The entire questionnaire was long and cumbersome and was some questions were misunderstood</p>	<p>Adjustments had to be made to some of the questions so that the sound and its transition were fluid to ensure that the respondent understood the question.</p>
<p>The questionnaire was refined using senior lecturers and professors in the field. The questions were changed to ensure that the dimensions being tested would be in line to meet the objectives and hypothesis</p>	<p>The question sequence needed adjustment in line with the objectives and set hypothesis.</p>

### 3.4 Data Analysis Techniques

This section discussed statistical techniques used to analyse data and obtain the research results. There are two basic types of statistical analysis, namely, descriptive and inferential statistics.

Lind, Boman & Sollenberg (2005:6) describes descriptive statistics as a method of organising, summarising and presenting data in an informative way. Cozby (1989:142) indicates that inferential statistics allows researchers to make inferences about the true differences in the population on the basis of the sample data. An integral concept in inferential statistics is statistical significance.

### **3.4.1 Descriptive Statistics**

Zikmund (2003: 403) describes descriptive statistics as statistics used to describe or summarise information about a population or sample. Zikmund (2003:473) also states that descriptive analysis is the transformation of raw data into a form that will make them easy to understand and interpret, rearranging, ordering and manipulating data to provide descriptive information. Calculating averages, frequency distributions and percentage distributions are the most common ways of summarising data. Descriptive objectives were analysed with frequency tables. The results were graphically presented through tables and graphics in chapter 4 of this study. The following descriptive statistics was used in the study.

#### **3.4.1.1 Frequencies & percentages**

Howell & Hall-Merenda (1999:28) describes a frequency distribution as a distribution that plots the values of a variable against their frequency of occurrence, i.e. the number of times each value of the variable is observed in the sample. Frequency tables, therefore, consist of information about the values of variables (Theron, Gresse & Siegfried & Rogers (1992:371). In these tables, percentages and cumulative percentages are used to describe the sample.

This method was used to analyse the distribution of the sample according to the biographical variables.

#### **3.4.1.2 Measures of central tendency**

Measures of central tendency include the mean, mode and the median. Means and standard deviations are techniques used to describe characteristics of a dataset and compare results (Wegner, 2000). The mean is best known measure of central tendency that reveals what sets of measure are like on average.

It is comprised of the mean, median and the mode.

- a. Mean – The mean is the most frequently used statistic for both interval and interval-ratio data (Cooper & Schindler, 2001,2003:428) and is described as the arithmetic average, which is symbolized by  $\bar{X}$ .
- b. Median – The median is the mid-point of distribution and divides an ordered frequency distribution into two equal halves. One half of the distribution falls above and the other below the median (Bohrstedt & Parrish, 1988). Due to the fact that the median has resistance to extreme scores, it is a preferred measure of interval-ratio data. In cases where even numbers of observations occur in the distribution, the average of the two middle scores represents the median.
- c. Mode – The mode is a further measure of central tendency. It refers to the most frequently occurring value in situations where different values of X occur more than once. A modal value can therefore not be calculated when all values of X occur with equal frequency and where the frequency may be equal to or greater than one. The mode is a point of reference and, together with the mean and median, may be used for analysing spread and shape.

In this study, the mean was used as the measure of central tendency to establish the level of job satisfaction among the participants.

#### **3.4.1.3 Measures of Dispersion**

The standard deviation is the measure of dispersion and indicates the distances that describe the distribution of the individual scores from the mean. The standard deviation is the square root of the variance. It is also used to describe a dispersion of a distribution. According to Theron et al, (1992:370) the standard deviation is a measure of the average of the scores' deviations of the mean. In a normal distribution, two-thirds of the observations lie within one standard deviation of the mean.

There are several measures of dispersion.

- a. Range – The simplest measurement of dispersion is known as the range. It is the difference between the largest and the smallest values in a data set.
- b. Variance – Is the arithmetic mean of the squared deviations from the mean.

- c. Standard Deviation – The standard deviation is the square root of the variance. It is also used to describe a dispersion of a distribution. According to Theron et al (1992:370) the standard deviation is a measure of the average of the scores' deviations of the mean. In a normal distribution, two-thirds of the observations lie within one standard deviation of the mean.

This analysis will be used to examine the variation in the responses of the respondents. For the purposes of this study, standard deviation was used.

### **3.4.2 Inferential Statistics**

Inferential statistics, according to Zikmund (2003:403), are the statistics used to draw inferences or make judgments about a population on the basis of a sample. This process was formally known as statistical inference and various techniques that are employed are commonly known as inferential statistics. Cooper and Schindler (2003:534) summarise the various techniques to choose from for the inferential statistics. Based on the distribution of the descriptive statistics obtained from the study, the following techniques were used to perform the inferential analysis: frequency distribution, t-test, One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), Cronbach Alpha, and Pearson's Correlation Coefficient.

Normal distribution testing was computed for the dimensions using the One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test. The scores do not follow an approximately normal distribution. Hence, non-parametric inferential statistics were computed.

#### **3.4.2.1 T-Test**

DeFusco, McLeavey, Pinto & Runkle (2001:327) show that the appropriate inferential test when comparing two means obtained from different groups of subjects is a t-test for independent groups. The t-test for the independent groups is defined as the difference between the samples means divided by the standard error of the mean difference.

The Mann-Whitney t Test was used to compare differences in the mean dimensions between male and female respondents.

#### **3.4.2.2 Analysis of Variance - ANOVA**

Ott, Grebogi & Yorke (1990:695) define analysis of variance (ANOVA) as “a procedure

for comparing more than two populations”, while Bohrnstedt et al., (1998:219) view ANOVA as a statistical method to test the hypothesis that “...the sample means of two or more groups come from the same rather than different populations”. ANOVA could be seen as a method to determine whether or not differences between groups exist (Theron et al, 1992:343). Theron et al, (1992:343) note that it is also possible to test the strength of association between independent and dependent variables, for which a variety of techniques are available. The essential question in an ANOVA is how much of the total variance in the dependent variable can be explained by the independent variables and how much is left unexplained.

One-way variance analysis allows the researcher to measure the effect of an independent variable (IV) on a dependent variable (DV) (Theron et al., 1992:345). In factorial ANOVA (another technique of variance analysis), two IV's are simultaneously investigated. This technique involves two bases of classification, which are called factors. ANOVA, being analogous to the levels test, the parallelism test and the flatness test, allows for analysis of variance to be used for conducting a profile analysis. Here, treatments correspond to rows and dependent variables to columns (Harris, 1975:81).

The Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to compare mean differences of the dimensions between age, marital status, length of service, qualifications and position.

### **3.4.2.3 Multiple Regression**

In an attempt to improve on the simple linear-regression model, the accuracy of a prediction can be increased through incorporating additional information from several independent variables (Mason, McGee, Farmer – Dougan & Risley 1989: 182). This is referred to as multiple regression, and the simplest form is when the scores on two independent variables (X1 and X2) are used to predict the score Y. The multiple regression co-efficient indicates the strength of the association between a continuous dependent variable and an independent variable while controlling the other independent variable in the equation (Bohrnstedt et al., 1998: 495- 496).

Cooper et al., (2003) state that multiple regression can be used as a descriptive tool in various types of situations:

- When developing a self-weighting estimating equation to predict values for a criterion variable (DV).
- It can be a descriptive application. This calls for controlling of confounding variables to better evaluate the contribution of other variables.
- It can also be used to test for and explain casual theories (referred to as path analysis). Here multiple regression is used to describe the linkages that have been advanced from casual theory.

The regression coefficient may be stated either in raw score units or as a standardized coefficient (Cooper et al., 2003). In both these cases the coefficient value states the amount the Y varies for each unit change of the associated X variable, while the effects of all other X variables are being held constant (Cooper et al., 2003).

Multiple regression was used to ascertain which of the dimensions of job satisfaction is the best predictor of overall job satisfaction. Multiple regression was computed using the 12 dimensions as predictors and B7 as the independent variable.

### **3.4.3 Reliability**

Reliability demonstrates the consistency of measurement (Bryman & Cramer, 1997:63). This means that with repeated measurements, equivalent results must be found. Nueman (1997) states that reliability is mainly tested in three ways.

These are:

- a. Stability reliability: i.e. whether the instrument will provide the same results over time
- b. Representative reliability: i.e. whether the instrument will provide the same results when applied to different sub-populations for .e.g. different age groups or gender groups; and
- c. Equivalence reliability: i.e. whether the instrument will provide the same result when multiple indicators are used to measure a construct.

For this study, the Cronbach's alpha was used to measure the 12 dimensions of job satisfaction and the results were demonstrated a high degree of internal consistency and correlation amongst the dimensions. Further, the dimensions of job satisfaction together

measure a common construct.

#### **3.4.4 Validity**

Validity is the degree to which the measuring instrument actually measures what it is supposed to measure (Uys, 2003: 123). Validity can firstly be divided into internal and external validity.

- a. *Internal Validity*: In a quantitative study, the test for internal validity is how confident the researcher is that the independent variable is at least partly responsible for the variation found in the dependent variable (Quinton & Smallbone, 2004:154).
  
- b. *External validity*: External validity concerns whether the results can be applied to other contexts or situations and to what extent this might be possible. In quantitative studies the representativeness of the sample is key issue in generalising about the larger population (Quinton & Smallbone, 2004).

Cooper et al., (2003) sub-divide internal validity into three types of validity. These are:

- Content validity – is the definition of what is to be researched represented in the measuring instrument;
- Criterion validity – how does the measuring instrument weigh up to other instruments if results are compared; and
- Construct validity – to what degree does the different measurement indicators correspond to results from these indicators.

Very often a process called factor analysis is used to determine construct validity (Uys, 2003). For the purpose of this study, validity was established by using content and criterion validity. The questionnaire was adopted from established questionnaires which have been used in other research. Questionnaires were given to lecturers and senior researchers in the field who found the questionnaire was aptly designed to receive the intended results of the study.

### **3.5 Conclusion**

In this chapter the research methodology and design was discussed. The research strategy was explained, after which the process of survey research was discussed in detail by refer-

ring to the objectives of the study. The population was demarcated and the procedures for administering the questionnaires and the collection of data were discussed. The last part of the chapter entailed a description of the statistical methods to be used, namely, descriptive statistics, analysis of variance, Student's T-test, and multiple regression. This chapter provided a logical basis and framework which will be used in the empirical analysis to be completed in Chapter 4.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### Presentation and Discussion of Results

---

#### 4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the statistical tests mentioned in the previous chapter were applied and the results obtained are included here. Also the meaning of the results as well as the reference to literature is discussed.

The chapter concludes with a summary of the results and leads to the next chapter which discusses the results obtained.

#### 4.2 Descriptive Statistics

##### 4.2.1. Sample profile

The tables that follow reflect the distribution of the sample profile according the biographical variables.

**Table 4.1 Frequencies & Percentages of the Gender Group**

Gender	Count	Percent
Male	19	38.0
Female	31	62.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The data in Table 4.1 represents the gender distribution and indicates the number of males and females that participated in this study. Females comprised 62% of the respondents and 38% were male.

**Table 4.2 Frequencies & Percentages of the Age Group**

<b>Age Group</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>Percent</b>
20 – 30	18	36.0
31 – 40	23	46.0
41 – 50	9	18.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The data in Table 4.2 represents the age groups that participated in the study and indicates that 46% of respondents were between 31 -40 years of age, whilst 38% were between 20-30 years of age; and 18% were between 41 – 50 years of age. This shows that 82% of the respondents were between 20 and 40 years old.

**Table 4.3 Frequencies & Percentages of Marital Status**

<b>Marital Status</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Married	28	56.0
Single	20	40.0
Divorced	2	4.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The data in Table 4.3 represents the marital status of the respondents that participated in the study. Married respondents comprised 56% of the sample followed by 40% who were single and 4% divorced.

**Table 4.4 Frequencies and Percentages of Academic/Professional Qualification**

<b>Qualification</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Matric	1	2.0
Post Matric Qualification	8	16.0
Degree	18	36.0
PG Degree/Diploma	23	46.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The data in Table 4.4 represents the qualification of the respondents that are employed as sales representatives. Only 2% had a matric certificate, whilst 16% had a post matric certificate; 36% were in possession of a degree and 46% of the respondents had a post graduate degree/diploma.

**Table 4.5 Frequencies & Percentages of Length of Service of Group**

<b>Length of Service</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>Percent</b>
< 5 years	15	30.0
5 – 10 years	21	42.0
11 – 15 years	14	28.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The data in Table 4.5 represents the length of service of the respondents that participated in the study. The majority of sales representatives (42%) have between 5- 10 years serviced followed by those with five years and less (30%) and those with 11 – 15 years service (28%).

**Table 4.6 Frequencies & Percentages of Position/Status Groups**

<b>Position</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Junior Sales representative	8	16.0
Senior sales representative	27	54.0
Executive sales representative	15	30.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The data in Table 4.6 represents the position of the respondents that participated in the study. Only 16% occupied junior positions, whilst 54% of the respondents were senior sales representatives and 30% were executive sales representatives.

#### 4.2.2. Measures of Central Tendency & Dispersion of Job Satisfaction

Table 4.7 below reflects the results for the means, standard deviation and maximum and minimum scores for the job satisfaction dimensions and overall job satisfaction.

**Table 4.7: Means, Standard Deviation, Minimum and Maximum Scores for the Job Satisfaction Dimensions and Overall Job Satisfaction**

Dimensions	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation
1. Achievement	50	1	5	3.84	.792
2. Recognition	50	1	5	3.96	1.049
3. Work itself	50	1	5	4.16	.889
4. Responsibility	50	1	5	3.88	1.062
5. Opportunity for Advancement	50	1	5	3.56	1.296
6. Company Policy & Administration	50	2	5	3.84	.955
7. Supervision	50	1	5	3.70	1.266
8. Salary	50	3	5	3.62	.602
9. Interpersonal Relations	50	1	5	3.96	1.009
10. Working conditions	50	1	5	4.18	.919
11. Job security	50	1	5	3.32	1.077
12. Status	50	3	5	3.70	.580

The mean scores indicate that the subjects expressed satisfaction with all the dimensions. In descending order subjects expressed the highest satisfaction for working conditions ( $m = 4.18$ ) followed by work itself ( $m = 4.16$ ), recognition and interpersonal relationships ( $m = 3.96$ ), responsibility ( $m = 3.88$ ), achievement and company policy and administration ( $m =$

3.84). Supervision and status ( $m = 3.70$ ) respectively, salary ( $m = 3.62$ ), opportunity for advancement ( $m = 3.56$ ) and job security ( $m = 3.32$ ).

The variation of subject responses in descending order was as follows: opportunity for advancement ( $SD = 1.296$ ), supervision ( $SD = 1.266$ ), job security ( $SD = 1.077$ ), responsibility ( $SD = 1.062$ ), recognition ( $SD = 1.049$ ), interpersonal relationships ( $SD = 1.009$ ), company policy & administration ( $SD = .955$ ), working conditions ( $SD = .919$ ), work itself ( $SD = .889$ ), achievement ( $SD = .792$ ), salary ( $SD = .602$ ), status ( $SD = .580$ )

In terms of minimum and maximum scores, responses that ranged from 1-5 were as follows: achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, opportunity for advancement, supervision, interpersonal relationships, working conditions, and job security. This indicates that there were some subjects who were very dissatisfied while others were very satisfied regarding the variables.

The minimum and maximum scores from 2-5 was as follows: company policy and administration. This indicates that the same subjects were dissatisfied with company policy and administration while others were very satisfied.

The minimum and maximum scores ranged from 3-5, for responses relating to: salary and status. The result shows that the same subjects were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with salary and status while others were very satisfied.

The percentage distribution for the responses to the dimensions of job satisfaction is as follows: majority of the respondents indicated Satisfied or Very satisfied with most items. There were 44% of the respondents who remained Neutral for Salary while 30% indicated Neutral for Job Security and 36% for Status.

According to Bodla & Naeem (2004), “work itself” is the most motivating dimension of sales representatives’ job whilst “operating procedures” the least motivating job dimension, whereas the current study shows that “working conditions” is expressed as the dimension that offers the highest satisfaction.

Malik and Naeem (2009), found that “pay and fringe benefits” are rated as the most important motivator, while good “working conditions” as the least important factor. The current study however, reveals that “working conditions” offers the highest satisfaction.

On the contrary and as Herzberg et al., (1966) observes, remuneration is only an aspect of the hygiene factors rather than a motivator. Motivators, as opposed to hygiene factors should originate from within an individual rather than from the outside and include such things as achievement, recognition, responsibility, personal growth, advancement and the nature of the job itself. These are directly related to the job content or the work itself and are generally referred to as motivators or growth factors (Herzberg et al., 1966).

On the other hand, salary, job security, work conditions, supervision, company policy and interpersonal relations are not motivators but merely hygiene or maintenance factors which if absent cause dissatisfaction - but if present, do not motivate workers. They are concerned with work environment and are extrinsic to the job itself. Money or remuneration, being a factor from without an individual, is merely a dissatisfier and not a motivator. Thus, even though the remuneration may be low, the staff of an organisation may still be highly motivated in their work (Koontz and Wehrich, 1998).

In this study subjects, expressed the highest satisfaction for working conditions ( $m = 4.18$ ) followed by work itself ( $m = 4.16$ ), recognition and interpersonal relationships ( $m = 3.96$ ). According to Herzberg (1966), work itself and recognition are motivators and working conditions and interpersonal relationships are hygiene factors. One can extrapolate from this that although the subjects felt satisfied with these dimensions the dimensions may not necessarily increase their motivation.

The data that follows look at measures of central tendency and dispersion for the overall job satisfaction dimension.

### 4.2.3 Measures of Central Tendency and Dispersion for the Overall Job Satisfaction dimension

Table 4.8 below reflects the measures of central tendency and dispersion for the overall job satisfaction dimension.

**Table 4.8: Measures of Central Tendency & Dispersion for the Overall Job Satisfaction Dimension**

Dimensions	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation
Overall level of job satisfaction in current job	50	2	5	3.78	.840

Overall the subjects were satisfied with their job. There was variation in the responses. The results for overall job satisfaction reflect that 62% of respondents were satisfied with their current job while 14% indicated very satisfied.

The minimum and maximum scores show that some subjects indicated that they were dissatisfied with their overall level of job satisfaction, while others indicated that they were very satisfied with their overall level of job satisfaction.

### 4.2.3 Inter-correlation among the dimensions of Job Satisfaction

Table 4.3 below reflects the results for the dimensions of job satisfaction using the Pearson's inter-correlation matrix

**Table 4.3 Pearson's Inter-correlation matrix of the dimensions for job Satisfaction**

		B5.1	B5.2	B5.3	B5.4	B5.5	B5.6	B5.7	B5.8	B5.9	B5.10	B5.11	B5.12
B5.1	Pearson Correlation												
	p												
	N	.385 **											
B5.2	Pearson Correlation	.006											
	p	.530 **	.488 **										
	N	.000	.000										
B5.3	Pearson Correlation	.244	.692 **	.280 *									
	p	.088	.000	.049									
	N	.050	.050	.050									
B5.4	Pearson Correlation	.109	.707 **	.346 *	.598 **								
	p	.451	.000	.014	.000								
	N	.050	.050	.050	.050								
B5.5	Pearson Correlation	.181	.442 **	.391 **	.403 **	.634 **							
	p	.208	.001	.005	.004	.000							
	N	.050	.050	.050	.050	.050							
B5.6	Pearson Correlation	-.232	.452 **	-.083	.595 **	.403 **	.331 *						
	p	.105	.001	.565	.000	.004	.019						
	N	.050	.050	.050	.050	.050	.050						
B5.7	Pearson Correlation	.169	.040	.345 *	-.041	.304 *	.460 **	-.393 **					
	p	.239	.782	.014	.778	.032	.001	.005					
	N	.050	.050	.050	.050	.050	.050	.050					
B5.8	Pearson Correlation	.273	.615 **	.257	.605 **	.610 **	.670 **	.613 **	.008				
	p	.055	.000	.071	.000	.000	.000	.000	.956				
	N	.050	.050	.050	.050	.050	.050	.050	.050				
B5.9	Pearson Correlation	.349 *	.389 **	.614 **	.545 **	.256	.312 *	.293 *	.089	.448 **			
	p	.013	.005	.000	.000	.072	.027	.039	.538	.001			
	N	.050	.050	.050	.050	.050	.050	.050	.050	.050			
B5.10	Pearson Correlation	-.011	.535 **	.009	.444 **	.585 **	.408 **	.476 **	.191	.481 **	.126		
	p	.942	.000	.948	.001	.000	.003	.000	.184	.000	.383		
	N	.050	.050	.050	.050	.050	.050	.050	.050	.050	.050		
B5.11	Pearson Correlation	-.018	-.255	.135	.073	.119	.317 *	.042	.485 **	.118	.371 **	-.137	
	p	.999	.024	.259	.645	.409	.025	.774	.000	.449	.000	.249	
	N	.050	.050	.050	.050	.050	.050	.050	.050	.050	.050	.050	

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**B5.1= Achievement, B5.2= Recognition, B5.3= Work itself, B5.4=Responsibility,**  
**B5.5= Opportunity for advancement, B5.6= Company policy and administration, B5.7= Supervision, B5.8=**  
**Salary, B5.9= Interpersonal Relationships, B5.10= Working conditions, B5.11= Job security, B5.12=Status**

There is a statistically significant correlation between Achievement and Recognition and Work Itself respectively at the 1% level of significance and Working Conditions at the 5% level of significance.

There is a statistically significant correlation between Recognition and Work Itself, Responsibility, Opportunities for Advancement, Company Policy and Administration, Supervision, Interpersonal Relations, Working Conditions, Job Security respectively at the 1% level of significance.

There is a statistically significant correlation between Work Itself and Company Policy and Administration and Working Conditions respectively at the 1% level of significance. At the 5% level of significance, there is a statistically significant correlation between Work Itself and Responsibility, Opportunities for Advancement and Salary respectively.

There is a statistically significant correlation between Responsibility and Opportunities for Advancement, Company Policy and Administration, Supervision, Interpersonal Relations, Working Conditions and Job Security at the 1% level of significance.

There is a statistically significant correlation between Opportunities for Advancement and Company Policy and Administration, Supervision, Interpersonal Relations and Job Security at the 1% level of significance and with Salary at the 5% level of significance.

There is a statistically significant correlation between Company Policy and Administration and Salary, Interpersonal Relations and Job Security at the 1% level of significance and with Supervision, Working Conditions and Status at the 5% level of significance.

There is a statistically significant negative correlation between Supervision and Salary and a statistically significant positive correlation with Interpersonal Relations and Job Security at the 1% level of significance. At the 5% level of significance, there is a statistically significant correlation between Supervision and Working Conditions.

There is a statistically significant correlation between Salary and Status at the 1% level of significance. There is a statistically significant correlation between Interpersonal Relations and Working Conditions and Job Security at the 1% level of significance.

There is a statistically significant correlation between Working Conditions and Status at the 1% level of significance.

### 4.3. Inferential Statistics

#### 4.3.1. Hypotheses

The hypotheses stipulated in Chapter one is presented again to be tested.

##### 4.3.1.1 Hypothesis 1

**(H0):** There is a statistically no significant relationship between the dimensions of Job satisfaction and overall job satisfaction

**(H1):** There is a statistically significant relationship between the dimensions of Job satisfaction and overall job satisfaction

Table 4.10 below reflects the results for the dimensions of job satisfaction and overall job satisfaction using the Pearson’s inter-correlation matrix.

**Table 4.10: Pearson’s Correlation Analysis for the Dimension of Job Satisfaction and Overall Job Satisfaction**

		Correlations												
		B5.1	B5.2	B5.3	B5.4	B5.5	B5.6	B5.7	B5.8	B5.9	B5.10	B5.11	B5.12	B7
B7	Pearson Correlation	.191	.685**	.267	.725**	.547**	.388**	.532**	-.007	.615**	.634**	.575**	.029	
	p	.183	.000	.061	.000	.000	.005	.000	.960	.000	.000	.000	.840	
	N	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

*B5.1= Achievement, B5.2= Recognition, B5.3= Work itself, B5.4=Responsibility,*

*B5.5= Opportunity for advancement, B5.6= Company policy and administration, B5.7= Supervision, B5.8= Salary, B5.9= Interpersonal Relationships, B5.10= Working conditions, B5.11= Job security, B5.12=Status*

There is a statistically significant relationship between recognition, responsibility and opportunity for advancement, company policy and administration, supervision interpersonal relationships, working conditions and job security and overall job satisfaction respectively at the 0.01 level of significance.

There is no statistically significant relationship between achievement, salary and status and overall job satisfaction respectively.

The results of the study done by Bodla and Naeem (2004), reflects that there is no significant differences in the demographic subgroups in relation to overall job satisfaction.

#### 4.3.1.2 Hypothesis 2

**(H0):** There is a statistically no significant difference in the perceptions of the dimensions of job satisfaction among the biographical variables

**(H1):** There is a statistically significant difference in the perceptions of the dimensions of job satisfaction among the biographical variables

##### a. Gender

Table 4.11 below reflects the results of the dimensions of job satisfaction by gender.

**Table 4.11: T- Test – Dimensions of Job Satisfaction by Gender**

Dimensions	t	df	p
B5.1 Achievement	-.714	37.615	.480
B5.2 Recognition	-.330	34.158	.744
B5.3 Work itself	-.316	30.561	.754
B5.4 Responsibility	.354	40.253	.725
B5.5 Opportunity for advancement	.304	38.518	.763
B5.6 Company policy and administration	-.539	27.741	.594
B5.7 Supervision	1.623	42.637	.112
B5.8 Salary	-.910	44.906	.368
B5.9 Interpersonal Relationships	.767	34.161	.448
B5.10 Working Conditions	-.141	45.789	.888
B5.11 Job Security	1.083	40.679	.285
B5.12 Status	-.643	37.104	.524

Results in Table 4.11 show no significant difference in the perception of the dimensions of job satisfaction levels between males and female respondents at the 5% level of significance.

According to Malik & Naeem (2009), the demographic subgroups of sales force differ from another in perceived importance of job content and context factors. The analyses reflect that male respondents place significantly higher value on the “supportive coworkers” than female counterparts. Malik & Naeem (2009) also point out the promotion opportunities and personal growth and development was the top ranked motivators for pharmaceutical sales force in Pakistan. Its findings also support the Herzberg theory. This also found that public and private sector professionals had the same opinion on hygiene and motivational factors on workplace.

According to Bodla and Naeem (2004), female sales representatives are somewhat less satisfied with overall job than male counterparts.

According to Bishay (1996), there were differences between the responses of men and women. Mean responses of men and women indicated that women were significantly less satisfied with their incomes than men. This study also noted considerably lower overall levels of job satisfaction for women.

According to Thompson and McNamara (1997) after extensive research concluded that neither age nor gender provided any value to job satisfaction. There are also other studies that present very similar findings to this study. However, one particular study considered another variable, namely, gender of the small business owner. The results in this case indicated that there was a significant difference in job satisfaction based on the gender of the small business owner. Most satisfied females were most satisfied working for a female owned and managed company and the most satisfied men were employed in male owned and managed company (Smith, Smits and Hoy, 1998).

According to Singh, (2010), no significant differences exist among salespersons’ demographic subgroups regarding their current level of overall job satisfaction. However, female salespersons feel somewhat more satisfaction with job than male counterparts.

Age

Table 4.12 below reflects the results of the dimensions of job satisfaction by age

**Table 4.12: ANOVA – Dimensions of Job Satisfaction by Age**

Variables	F value	P value
B5.1 Achievement	5.596	.007**
B5.2 Recognition	1.334	.273
B5.3 Work itself	3.308	.045*
B5.4 Responsibility	1.482	.238
B5.5 Opportunity for advancement	1.116	.336
B5.6 Company policy and administration	.479	.622
B5.7 Supervision	25.297	.000**
B5.8 Salary	10.795	.000**
B5.9 Interpersonal Relationships	4.095	.023*
B5.10 Working Conditions	.384	.683
B5.11 Job Security	4.495	.016*
B5.12 Status	2.226	.119

\*p<0.05

\*\*p<0.01

The results in Table 4.12 indicate that there is a statistically significant difference in the levels of job satisfaction among the various age groups for the following dimensions: achievement (F=5.596; p<0.01), work itself (F=3.308; p<0.05), supervision (F=25.297; p<0.01), salary (F=10.795; p<0.01), interpersonal relationships (F=4.095; p<0.05), Job security (F=4.495; p<0.05)

There was no statistically significant difference in the satisfaction levels for job satisfaction for the dimensions: recognition (F=1.334; p>0.05); responsibility (F=1.482;p>0.05); opportunity for advancement (F=1.116;p>0.05); company policy and administration (F=0.479;p>0.05); working conditions (F=0.384;p>0.05); status (F=2.226;p>0.05).

According to Malik and Naeem (2009), respondents aged between 26-30 years value “pay and fringe benefits” more than those aged between 20 – 25 years. Sales force having job experience between 6-10 years have rated “good working conditions significantly higher than those with a job experience more than 10 years.

According to Zeitz (1990), the relationship between age and job satisfaction differed among these three groups of employees: non-professionals (mostly clerical personnel), non-elite professionals (not promoted to highest rank), and elite professionals (attainment of grade 13 or above).

According to a study done by Iacqua et al. (1995) younger, less experienced workers expressed more job dissatisfaction than older more experienced workers. One particular study suggested that job satisfaction might increase with age due to better benefits such as pension and rewards and pay, as well as, become more realistic with their job outcomes Spector (1997).

In the study conducted by Bodla and Naeem (2004), older sales representatives are more satisfied with the job than their younger counterparts. Junior frontline employees are somewhat more satisfied with job than senior counterparts.

According to Singh (2010), older salespersons (Greater than 35 years) are somewhat more satisfied with job than younger counterparts (Less than 35 years). Junior sales-force feel more satisfaction with job than senior sales force.

## Marital Status

Table 4.13 below reflects the results of the dimensions of job satisfaction by marital status.

**Table 4.13: ANOVA- Dimensions of Job Satisfaction by Marital Status**

Variables	F value	P value
B5.1 Achievement	1.345	.270
B5.2 Recognition	.178	.837
B5.3 Work itself	.755	.475
B5.4 Responsibility	1.171	.319
B5.5 Opportunity for advancement	1.549	.223
B5.6 Company policy and administration	2.494	.093
B5.7 Supervision	1.803	.176
B5.8 Salary	5.359	.008**
B5.9 Interpersonal Relationships	1.190	.313
B5.10 Working Conditions	1.725	.189
B5.11 Job Security	4.397	.018*
B5.12 Status	4.168	.022*

\* $p < 0.05$

\*\* $p < 0.01$

The results in Table 4.13 show that there is a statistically significant difference in the perception of the dimension in the levels of job satisfaction among the marital status groups for the following dimensions: salary ( $F=5.359$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ), job security ( $F=4.397$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ) and status ( $F=4.168$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ).

There was no statistically significant difference in the perception of job satisfaction among the marital status groups for the following dimensions: achievement ( $F=1.345$ ;  $p > 0.05$ ), recognition ( $F=0.178$ ;  $p > 0.05$ ), work itself ( $F=0.755$ ;  $p > 0.05$ ), responsibility ( $F=1.171$ ;  $p > 0.05$ ), opportunity for advancement ( $F=1.549$ ;  $p > 0.05$ ), company policy and administration ( $F=2.494$ ;  $p > 0.05$ ), supervision ( $F=1.803$ ;  $p > 0.05$ ), interpersonal relationships ( $F=1.190$ ;  $p > 0.05$ ), and working conditions ( $F=1.725$ ;  $p > 0.05$ ).

According to Malik & Naeem (2009) married individuals have rated “job security” significantly higher while un-married consider “interesting work” more important than their counterparts.

According to Singh (2010), married individuals are somewhat more satisfied with job than unmarried counterparts.

*Academic Qualifications*

Table 4.14 below reflects the results of the dimensions of job satisfaction by academic qualifications.

**Table 4.14: ANOVA- Dimensions of Job Satisfaction by Academic Qualifications**

<b>Variables</b>	<b>F value</b>	<b>P value</b>
B5.1 Achievement	.063	.939
B5.2 Recognition	9.946	.000**
B5.3 Work itself	2.834	.069
B5.4 Responsibility	.960	.391
B5.5 Opportunity for advancement	1.037	.363
B5.6 Company policy and administration	3.849	.028*
B5.7 Supervision	9.400	.000**
B5.8 Salary	2.059	.139
B5.9 Interpersonal Relationships	3.846	.029*
B5.10 Working Conditions	2.155	.127
B5.11 Job Security	9.986	.000**
B5.12 Status	1.355	.268

\*p<0.05

\*\*p<0.01

The results in Table 4.14 show that there is a statistically significant difference in the perception of the dimensions of job satisfaction among the academic qualification group for the following dimensions: recognition (F=9.946;p<0.01), company policy and administration (F=3.849;p<0.05), supervision (F=9.400;p<0.01), interpersonal relationships (F=3.846;p<0.05) and job security (F=9.986;p<0.01).

There was no statistically significant difference in the perception of the dimensions of job satisfaction among the academic qualification group for the following dimensions: achievement ( $F=0.063;p>0.05$ ), work itself ( $F=2.834;p>0.05$ ), responsibility ( $F=0.960;p>0.05$ ), opportunity for advancement ( $F=1.037;p>0.05$ ), salary ( $F=2.059;p>0.05$ ), working conditions ( $F=2.155;p>0.05$ ) and status ( $F=1.355;p>0.05$ ).

According to the results obtained by Malik & Naeem (2009), graduate degree holders have emphasised more on “promotion opportunities” than master degree holders, whereas the results in this study revealed that Post Graduate Degree/ Diploma holders emphasised more on recognition. Job satisfaction studies, that included education as a variable suggested that there may exist a relationship that can be negative or positive. One particular study reported a negative effect of education on job satisfaction. It found that there may exist a level of dissatisfaction among younger workers who have a higher level of education due to performing routine tasks (Carrell and Elbert 1974).

*b. Length of Service*

Table 4.15 below reflects the results of the dimensions of job satisfaction by length of service.

**Table 4.15: ANOVA Dimensions of Job Satisfaction by Length of Service**

<b>Variables</b>	<b>F value</b>	<b>P value</b>
B5.1 Achievement	1.687	.196
B5.2 Recognition	.524	.595
B5.3 Work itself	.935	.400
B5.4 Responsibility	3.204	.050*
B5.5 Opportunity for advancement	2.737	.075
B5.6 Company policy and administration	3.509	.038*
B5.7 Supervision	7.904	.001**
B5.8 Salary	3.162	.051
B5.9 Interpersonal Relationships	9.277	.000**
B5.10 Working Conditions	1.271	.290
B5.11 Job Security	2.736	.075
B5.12 Status	.337	.716

\* $p < 0.05$

\*\* $p < 0.01$

The results in Table 4.15 show that there is a statistically significant difference in the perception of the dimensions of job satisfaction among the length of service group for the following dimensions: responsibility ( $F=3.204$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ), company policy and administration ( $F=3.509$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ), supervision ( $F=7.904$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ) and interpersonal relationships ( $F=9.277$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ).

There was no statistically significant difference in the perception of the dimensions of job satisfaction among the length of service groups for the following dimensions: achievement ( $F=1.687$ ;  $p > 0.05$ ); recognition ( $F=0.524$ ;  $p > 0.05$ ); work itself ( $F=0.935$ ;  $p > 0.05$ ), opportunity for advancement ( $F=2.737$ ;  $p > 0.05$ ), salary ( $F=3.162$ ;  $p > 0.05$ ), working conditions ( $F=1.271$ ;  $p > 0.05$ ), job security ( $F=2.736$ ;  $p > 0.05$ ) and status ( $F=0.337$ ;  $p > 0.05$ ).

According to Gruneberg (1979), the relationship between length of service and job satisfaction was unclear. Some studies also suggest that an increase in job tenure can lead to a decrease in job satisfaction (DeSantis & Durst, 1996). However, Bedeian, Ferris, and Kacmear (1992) provided evidence to show a positive relationship between tenure and job satisfaction.

According to Singh (2010), experienced sales representatives (Greater than 5 years) feel somewhat more satisfaction with job than those having job experience less than 5 years.

*c. Position*

Table 4.16 below reflects the results of the dimensions of job satisfaction by position

**Table 4.16: ANOVA Dimensions of Job Satisfaction by Position**

<b>Variables</b>	<b>F value</b>	<b>P value</b>
B5.1 Achievement	.029	.972
B5.2 Recognition	1.940	.155
B5.3 Work itself	1.964	.152
B5.4 Responsibility	.737	.484
B5.5 Opportunity for advancement	.646	.529
B5.6 Company policy and administration	.587	.560
B5.7 Supervision	4.031	.024*
B5.8 Salary	16.676	.000**
B5.9 Interpersonal Relationships	2.226	.119
B5.10 Working Conditions	3.215	.049*
B5.11 Job Security	.806	.453
B5.12 Status	22.661	.000**

\*p<0.05

\*\*p<0.01

The results in Table 4.16 show that there is a statistically significant difference in the perceptions of the dimensions of job satisfaction among the position groups for the following dimensions: supervision (F=4.031; p<0.05), salary (F=16.679; p<0.01), working conditions (F=3.215; p<0.05) and status (F=22.661; p<0.01).

There was no statistically significant difference in the perceptions of the dimensions of job satisfaction among the position groups for the following dimensions: achievement (F=0.029; p>0.05), recognition (F=1.940; p>0.05), work itself (F=1.964; p>0.05), responsibility (F= 0.737;P>0.05), opportunity for advancement (F=0.646; p>0.05), company policy and administration(F=0.587; p>0.05), interpersonal relationships (F=2.226; p>0.05) and job security (F=0.806; p>0.05).

According to Malik and Naeem (2009), sales force in senior position have placed higher importance on “pay and fringe benefits” while junior sales-force valued “interesting work” more than their counterparts.

#### 4.3.1.3. Hypothesis 3

**(H0):** There is a statistically no significant difference in the perception of overall job satisfaction among the biographical variables.

**(H1):** There is a statistically significant difference in the perception of overall job satisfaction among the biographical variables.

##### *a. Gender*

The following table presents the perception of overall job satisfaction by gender using the t-test

**Table 4.17: T- Test – Overall Job Satisfaction Variable by Gender**

Dimension	t	df	p
Overall job satisfaction in current job	.71	47.449	.944

The results in Table 4.17, shows no statistically significant difference in the perceptions of overall job satisfaction between in males and females.

However, the study conducted by Bodla and Naeem (2004), revealed that female sales representatives are somewhat more satisfied with overall job satisfaction that their male counterparts.

b. *Other biographical variables*

**Table 4.18: ANOVA- Overall Job Satisfaction by Age, Marital Status, Academic Qualifications, Length of Service, and Position**

Variables	F value	P value
Age	2.999	.059
Marital Status	.820	.447
Academic Qualification	6.571	.003**
Length of Service	1.435	.248
Position	.685	.509

\*p<0.01

The results in Table 4.18 show that there is a statistically significant difference in the overall job satisfaction among the academic qualification group (F=6.572; p<0.05).

There was no statistically significant difference in the perception of the dimensions of job satisfaction among the biographical groups for the following variables: age (F=2.999; p>0.05), position (F=0.685; p>0.05), marital status (F=0.820; p>0.05) and length of service (F=1.435; p>0.05).

According to Naeem (2009), the results of the study into pharmaceutical sales representatives reflected that no significant differences exist in demographic subgroups in relation to overall level of job satisfaction. However, female sales representatives are somewhat more satisfied with overall job than male counterparts. Master's degree holders are more satisfied with their job than undergraduate degree holders. Married individuals are somewhat more satisfied with their job than unmarried individuals. Sales representatives with job experience more than 5 years are more satisfied with their job than those having job experience less than 5 years. Older sales representatives are more satisfied with their job than younger counterparts. Junior frontline employees are somewhat more satisfied with their job than senior counterparts.

#### 4.3.1.4. Hypothesis 4

(H0): The variance in the overall job satisfaction cannot be explained by the dimensions of job satisfaction.

(H1): The variance in the overall job satisfaction can be explained by the dimensions of job satisfaction

**Table 4.19: Results of the Multiple Regression Analysis**

R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
0.846 <sup>c</sup>	.716	.679	.462

The model summary shows that 71.6% of the variance in overall job satisfaction can be explained by the dimensions of job satisfaction.

#### ANNOVA<sup>d</sup>

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	f	Sig.
Regression	24.750	3	8.250	38.604	.000 <sup>c</sup>
Residual	9.830	46	.214		
Total	34.580	49			

The ANOVA results show that the regression model is statistically significant at the 0.05 level

#### Coefficients

	Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.236	.350		.673	0.505
responsibility	.268	.083	.339	3.228	.002
working conditions	.367	.087	.402	4.232	.000
job security	.292	.069	.374	4.210	.000

<sup>a</sup>. Dependent Variable: B 7

The beta values show that working conditions is the best predictor of overall job satisfaction, followed by job security and responsibility.

In other studies, pharmaceutical sales force rated pay and fringe benefits as the most important motivating factor (Wiley, 1997; Dubinsky, Jolson, Michaels, Kotabe and Lim, 1993; Shipley and Kiely, 1988).

In addition, results indicate that pay and fringe benefits are highly valued by the sales force of all demographic backgrounds. Its' possible explanation could be that pay and fringe benefits enable salespersons to fulfil their physiological as well as esteem needs (Malik & Naeem, 2009). All the demographic subgroups of the sales-force, except salespersons above 10 years job experience, emphasised job security as one of the top motivators. It could be probably due to widespread unemployment conditions in the country. Job insecurity can deteriorate economic and psychological well-being of the sales-force. So, when downsizing is necessitated, appropriate initiatives such as severance programmes, incentives for early retirement and outplacement techniques should to be taken to sustaining productive behaviours of the salespersons (Wiley, 1997). Pharmaceutical salespersons placed promotion opportunities among top three motivators.

Malik & Naeem (2009) found that top the three motivators of pharmaceutical sales people in Pakistan are good pay and fringe benefits, job security and promotion opportunities for pharmaceutical sales force. The findings in this study however rated recognition as the most important motivating factor irrespective of the demographic backgrounds.

According to Bodla and Naeem, 2004 there were no significant differences in overall job satisfaction between demographic sub-groups. It implies that pharmaceutical sales representatives are stable regarding their overall level of job satisfaction. However, this study showed that “work itself” was the most motivating dimension of a sales representative’s job, whilst “operating procedures” the least motivating dimension.

#### 4.3.1.5 Reliability

Table 4.20 below reflects the results of reliability using the cronbach's alpha

**Table 4.20: Reliability statistics for the Dimensions of Job Satisfaction**

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.854	12

The Cronbach's alpha of 0.854 for the 12 items indicate that there is a high degree of internal consistency and correlation amongst the items. Further, the items together measure a common construct.

#### 4.4 Conclusion

This chapter discussed the empirical results of the study. Overall the subjects were satisfied with their job. Highest satisfaction levels were experienced for working conditions, work itself, and recognition. Working conditions was the best predictor of overall job satisfaction, followed by job security and responsibility.

Chapter five; deals with the interpretation and discussion of the results found in Chapter 4.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### Recommendations and Conclusions

---

#### 5.1 Introduction

The purpose of the study was to assess job satisfaction among pharmaceutical sales representatives in the context of Herzberg Motivation-Hygiene Theory. The findings of the study, based on the objectives that guided the research, can be summarized as follows. The first objective in order to fully address the other objectives of the study, was to carry out an in depth review of the literature on job satisfaction. The second objective was to determine the extent to which subjects experience job satisfaction in terms of the dimensions and overall job satisfaction. The third objective was to establish the relationship between the dimensions of job satisfaction and overall job satisfaction. The fourth objective was to examine the relationship between the biographic variables and the dimensions of job satisfaction and overall job satisfaction and the fifth objective was to ascertain which of the dimensions best predict job satisfaction.

This chapter will look at the implications of this research, summarise the findings of the research and goes on to make recommendations for future research.

#### 5.2 Implications of this Research

This section is to inform us about the contributions your research work has made to scholarship. Here, you can also put across your personal reflections.

#### 5.3 Summary of findings

##### 5.3.1 Objective 1: To conduct a literature review on Job Satisfaction

An in depth literature review on job satisfaction was carried out.

##### 5.3.2 Objective 2: To determine the extent to which subjects experience job satisfaction in terms of the dimensions and overall job satisfaction

This objective was tested using measures of central tendency and dispersion. The mean

scores indicate that the subjects expressed satisfaction with all the dimensions. In descending order subjects expressed the highest satisfaction for working conditions and the lowest satisfaction for job security.

The variation of subject responses in descending order was as follows: opportunity for advancement, supervision, job security, responsibility, recognition, interpersonal relationships, company policy & administration, working conditions, work itself, achievement, salary and status.

The percentage distribution for the responses to the dimensions of job satisfaction is as follows: majority of the respondents indicated Satisfied or Very satisfied with most items. 44% of the respondents indicated Neutral for Salary while 30% indicated Neutral for Job Security and 36% for Status.

Overall the subjects were satisfied with their job. There was variation in the responses. The results for overall job satisfaction reflected that 62% of respondents were satisfied with their current job while 14% indicated very satisfied.

### **5.3.3 Objective 3: To establish the relationship between the dimensions of job satisfaction and overall job satisfaction**

This objective was tested by Hypothesis 1: There is a statistically significant relationship between the dimensions of Job satisfaction and overall job satisfaction

There is a statistically significant relationship between recognition, responsibility, and opportunity for advancement, company policy and administration, supervision interpersonal relationships, working conditions and job security and overall job satisfaction respectively at the 0.01 level of significance.

### **5.3.4 Objective 4: To examine the relationship between the biographic variables and the dimensions of job satisfaction and overall job satisfaction respectively**

This objective was tested by Hypothesis 3 which is: There is a statistically significant difference in the perception of overall job satisfaction among the biographical variables. The results, shows no statistically significant difference in the perceptions of overall job satis-

faction between in males and females. The results also show that there is a statistically significant difference in the perception of the dimensions of job satisfaction among the academic qualification group. There was no statistically significant difference in the perception of the dimensions of job satisfaction among the biographical groups for the following variables: age, position, marital status and length of service.

- a. *Gender*: Results show that there is no significant difference in the perception of the dimensions of job satisfaction levels between male and female respondents.
- b. *Age*: There was a statistically significant difference in levels of job satisfaction among the age groups for the following dimensions; achievement, work itself, supervision, salary, interpersonal relationships and job security.
- c. *Marital Status*: There was a statistically significant difference in levels of job satisfaction among the marital status groups for the following dimensions; salary, job security and status.
- d. *Academic qualification*: There was a statistically significant difference in levels of job satisfaction among the academic qualification groups for the following dimensions: recognition, company policy and administration, supervision, interpersonal relationships and job security
- e. *Length of Service*: There was a statistically significant difference in levels of job satisfaction among the length of service group for the following dimensions: responsibility, company policy and administration, supervision, and interpersonal relationships.
- f. *Position*: There was a statistically significant difference in levels of job satisfaction among the position groups for the following dimensions: supervision, salary, working conditions and status.

### **5.3.5 Objective 5: To ascertain which of the dimensions best predict job satisfaction**

This objective is tested by Hypothesis 4 which is: The variance in the overall job satisfaction can be explained by the dimensions of job satisfaction.

This hypothesis was tested using Multiple Regression Analysis which indicates that 71.6% of the variance in overall job satisfaction can be explained by the dimensions of job satisfaction. The beta values show that working conditions is the best predictor of overall job

satisfaction, followed by job security and responsibility. All these variables were significant at the 0.05 level.

#### **5.4 Recommendations**

The following is an example of the recommendations one could make for future research: In this section you must address problems that were identified and your solutions for those problems. This section is once again your unique contribution to solve the research problem. One's recommendations must be realistic and organisations should be able to implement them.

The current study determines the amount of variability in pharmaceutical sales representatives' overall job satisfaction explained by motivator and hygiene factors. Additionally, it seeks to explore if demographic subgroups are significantly different regarding their current level of overall job satisfaction. Demographically, the pharmaceutical industry is male dominated, whereas the study indicates that 62% of the respondents in this study are female. Human resource managers appear to have placed more efforts to balance gender diversity among sales representatives. The results, shows no statistically significant difference in the perceptions of overall job satisfaction between in males and females.

The results of the current study show that "working conditions" is the best predictor of job satisfaction for sales representatives' job. This implies that pharmaceutical sales representatives are most satisfied with context of their job. Decision makers should put more efforts to improve the environment in which sales representatives perform the job. Motivator and hygiene factors are found to have moderate to substantial relationship with overall job satisfaction. This leads to the conclusion that the basic propositions of Herzberg's (1959) motivator-hygiene theory of job satisfaction does not hold true. In this study, we find no significant differences in overall job satisfaction between demographic subgroups. It implies that pharmaceutical sales representatives are stable regarding their overall level of job satisfaction.

With regards to responsibility, the management of pharmaceutical companies should evaluate managerial practices for the participation and autonomy of sales representatives. To meet the growth expectations of the sales staff, empowerment and involvement are the best

strategies to promote perceptions of control on their career, reinforcement of competence and internalisation of objectives on their part. Regarding co-workers, supervisors should develop such a climate in which sales representatives recognise and admire one another on successful selling strategies and tactics and avoid highlighting mistakes and weaknesses of one another. With regard to job security, managers should take initiatives to promote the sense of job security among sales force. Management should meet the expectations regarding promotion opportunities by promoting the people from within the company. It is advisable to introduce more new job titles for sales representatives with more empowerment and responsibilities as sales representative while enjoying the benefits like a manager. Management should evaluate the rewards and recognition systems in light of the many contemporary changes taking place in selling to determine whether present reward and recognition systems are meeting the expectations of pharmaceutical sales representatives.

## **5.5 Conclusion**

In conclusion job satisfaction can be deemed the most important aspect of the overall business success. It ultimately has influence over production, failure and success. It is thus extremely important that a firm does all that it can to maintain a suitable and welcoming working environment. All avenues need to be addressed in terms of culture, gender, diversity etc. The working environment should encompass the promotion of all aspects of life and not only business.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adair, J., 1996. *Effective Motivation. How to get extraordinary results from everyone.* London: Pan Books.
- Arnold, H. J. Feldman. 1986. *Organizational Behavior.* New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Babbie, E., 2001. *The practice of Social Research.* 10<sup>th</sup> ed. Belmont: Wadsworth Thompson Learning.
- Becherer, C., Morgan, W., and Richard, M. 1982. *The job characteristics of industrial salespersons: relationship to motivation and satisfaction.* Journal of Marketing Vol. 46 No. 4 pp 125-135.
- Bedeian, A.G., Ferris, G.R. and [Kacmear, K.M.](#) 1992. Age, tenure, and job satisfaction: A tale of two perspectives. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, pp.33 – 48.
- Bishay, A. 1996. Teacher motivation and job satisfaction: A study employing the experience sampling method. *Journal Of Undergraduate Sciences* 3, pp.147- 154.
- Bodla MA, Naeem B (2004). Motivator and Hygiene Factors Explaining Overall Job Satisfaction among Pharmaceutical Sales Representatives. MS Scholar, Department of Management Sciences COMSATS University,
- Bohrnstedt, G.W. & Parrish, T.B. 1998. *California's Class Size Reductions Initiative: Is it Likely to Reduce or Create Further Inequities in California Districts?* Presented at the 93rd Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association.
- Brenner, V.C., Carmack, C.W., and Weinstein, M.G. 1971. *Journal of Accounting Research*, 9(2), pp.359-366.
- Bruce, W.M. and Blackburn, J.W. 1992. *Balancing job satisfaction and performance: A guide for human resource professionals.* Westport: Quorum Books. pp.4-23.
- Bryman, A. and Cramer, D., 1997. *Quantitative data analysis with SPSS for Windows.* London: Routledge.
- Burns, N. and Grove, S.K. 1997. *Practise of nursing Research: Conduct, critique and*

*utilization*. Philadelphia: Saunders.

Burns, N. and Grove, S.K. 2001. *Practise of nursing Research: Conduct, critique and utilization*. Philadelphia: Saunders.

Buelens, M., Kreitner, R. and Kinicki, A. 2002. *Organisational Behaviour*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Carrell, M. and Elbert, N. 1974. Some personal and organizational determinants of job satisfaction of postal clerks. *Academy of Management Journal*, pp.368-373.

Caston, R.J. and Braitto, R. 1985. A Specification Issue in Job Satisfaction Research: What Happens to Job Satisfaction Models When Workers Place High Value on Increasing Their Satisfaction? *Sociological Perspectives*, 28(2), pp.175-197.

Collis, J. and Hussey, R. 2003. *Business Research: A Practical Guide for Undergraduate and Postgraduate Students*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Cooper, D.R. and Schindler, P.S. 2003. *Business Research Methods*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Cosby, P.C. 1989. *Methods in Behavioural research*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Mountain View: Mayfield Publishing Company.

D'Arcy, C., Syrotuik, J. and Siddique, C.M. 1984. Perceived job attributes, job satisfaction and psychological distress: A comparison or working men and women. *Human Relations*, 37(8), pp.603-611.

Davis, G. 2004. Job satisfaction survey among employees in small business. *Journal of Small Business & Enterprise Development*, 11(4), pp.495-503.

DeCaro, D.S. 2006. *A Student's Guide to the Conceptual Side of Inferential Statistics*

DeFusco, R.A., McLeavey, D.W., Pinto, J.E., & Runkle, D.E. 2001. *Quantitative Method for Investment Analysis*. Baltimore: United Book Press.

Dermer, J. 1975. The Interrelationship of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 18(1), pp.125-129.

DeSantis, V.S., & Durst, S.L. 1996. *Comparing job satisfaction among public and private-sector employees*. *American Review of Public Administration*, 26(3), 327-343.

Dessler, G. 2001. *Management: Leading People and Organisation in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. Harlow: Prentice Hall.

Dubinsky, A.J, Jolson, M.A, Michaels, R.E, Kotabe, M, & Lim, C.U (1993), "Perceptions of Motivational Components: Salesmen and Saleswomen Revisited", *Journal of Personnel Selling and Sales Management*, 13 (4):25-37.

Dweck, C.S. and Leggett, E.L. 1998. A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review*, 95(2), pp.256-273.

Eskildsen, J.K., Kristensen, K., & Westlund, H,A. 2003. *Work motivation and job satisfaction in the Nordic Countries Employee Relations*. 26(2), pp.122-136.

Ghauri, Pervez, *Research Methods in Business Studies, A Practical Guide* 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, Pitman Publishing.

Golding, J., Resnick, A. and Crosky, F. 1983. Work satisfaction as a function of gender and job status . *Journal of Applied Psychology* , 60(3), pp.313 – 317.

Golembiewski, R.T. 1973. Motivation. In Carl Heyel (Ed.) *The encyclopedia of Management*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold

Glisson, C. and Durick, M. 1988. *Predictors of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in human service organizations*. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. pp.61–81.

Graham, M.W. and Messner, E.P. 1998. Principals and job satisfaction. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 12(5), pp.196-202.

- Greenberg, J. and Baron, R.A. 1993. *Behavior in organizations*. 4th ed. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Griffin, R.W. 1990. *Management*. 3rd ed. Dallas: Houghton Mifflin Company. p.437.
- Gruneberg, M.M. 1979. *Understanding job satisfaction*. New York: The Macmillan Press, Ltd.
- Harrington, J. Incentive. 2004. Vol. 178, iss. 7, pp. 13. New York.
- Harris, R.J. 1975. *A primer of multivariate statistics*. New York: Academic Press.
- Hellman, C. M. (1997). Job satisfaction and intent to leave. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 137, 677-689.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B. and Snyderman, B.B 1959. *The motivation to work*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Herzberg, F., 1966. *Work and the nature of man*. Cleveland: World Publishers.
- Hoffman, D.K. and Ingram, T.N. 1992. Service provider job satisfaction and customer oriented performance. *The journal of Services Marketing*, 6(2), pp.86-78.
- Hoppock, R. 1935. *Job satisfaction*. New York: Harper and Brothers.
- House, R.J. and Widgor, L. 1967. Herzberg's dual factor theory of job satisfaction and motivation. *A review of evidence and a criticism Personnel Psychology*, vol. 20, pp. 369-389.
- Howell, J.M. and Hall-Merenda, K.E. 1999. The ties that bind: The impact of leader-member exchange, transformational and transactional leadership and distance on predicting follower performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 84, pp. 680-694.
- Hoy, W.K. and Miskel, C.G. 1987. *Educational Administration: Theory, Research and Practice*. New York: Random House.

- Hulin, C. L. and Smith, P.C. 1964. Sex differences in job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 48(2), pp.88-92.
- Iaffaldano, M.T. and Muchinsky, P.M. 1985. Job satisfaction and job performance: a meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, no. 97, pp. 251-73.
- Ifinedo, P. 2003. *Employee Motivation and Job Satisfaction in Finnish Organisations: A study of Employees in the Oulu Region*, Finland Master of Business Administration Thesis University of London.
- Iacqua, J.A., Schumacher, P. and Li, H.C. 1995. Factors contributing to job satisfaction in higher education. *Education*, 116(1), pp.51-61.
- Ivancevich, J.M., Konopaske, R., & Matteson, M.T. 2005. *Organizational behavior and management*. New York: McGraw-Hill. Kanter, DL, & Mirvis, PH (1989).
- Judge, T.A., Thoreson, C.J., Bono, J.E., & Patton, G.K. 2001. The job satisfaction-job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, no. 127, pp. 376–407.
- Kelly, J. 1974. *Organisational Behavior*. Homewood: Richard D. Irwin
- King-Lawrence, S. U. (2003). *An examination of the relationship between job satisfaction and intention to leave among specialty sales representatives in a major pharmaceutical organization*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Capella University, Minneapolis.
- Koontz, H. and Wehrich, H. 1998. *Management*. New York: McGraw-Hill
- Kreitner, R., Kinicki, A. and Beulens, M. 2002. *Organizational Behaviour*. 2nd ed. Berkshire: McGraw-Hill.
- Lawler, E. E. 1973. *Motivation in Work Organization*. New York: Brooks Cole.
- Lewis, P.S., Goodman, S.H. and Fandt, P.M. 1995. *Management: Challenges in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. New York: West Publishing Company.

- Lind, M.L., Boman, A., and Sollenberg, J. et al. 2005. *Occupational dermal exposure to permanent hair dyes among hairdressers. Ann Occ Hyg*, no. 49, pp. 473–80.
- Locke, E.A. 1969. What is job satisfaction? *Organisational Behaviour and Human Performance*, vol. 4, pp. 309-336.
- Locke, E.A. 1976. *The Nature and Causes of job satisfaction*. In M.D.Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Rand McNally, Chicago.
- Locke, E.A., Fitzpatrick, W. and White, F.M. 1983. Job satisfaction and role clarity among university and college faculty. *Review of Higher Education*, 6(4), pp.343-365.
- Lund, D.B. 2003. Organisational culture and job satisfaction. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 18(3), pp.219-236.
- Luthans, F., & Kreitner, R. 1985. *Organizational Behavior Modification*. Glenview, 111: Scott, Foresman.
- Malhotra, N.K. 2003. *Marketing Research: An Applied Orientation*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Prentice Hall.
- Malik, M.E. and Naeem, B. 2009. Motivational preferences of pharmaceutical sales force empirical evidence from Pakistan. *Pakistan Economic and Social Review*, 47(1), pp.19-30.
- Maslow, A.H. 1943. A Theory of Human motivation. *Psychological Review*, vol. 50, pp. 370-396.
- Maslow, A.H. 1970. *Motivation and Personality*. 2nd ed. New York: Harper and Row.
- Mason, S.A., McGee, G.G, Farmer-Dougan, V., & Risley, T.R. 1989. A practical strategy for on going reinforce assessment. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, vol. 22, pp. 171-179.
- Mitchell, T.R. 1982. Motivation: New Directors for Theory, Research and Practice. *The Academy of Management Review*, 7(1), pp.80-88.

Mowday, R.T., Porter, W. and Steers, R.M. 1982. *Employee-organization Linkages: The Psychology of Commitment, Absenteeism, and Turnover*. New York: Academic Press.

Mulky, A.G. 2010. *An exploration of salepeople job satisfaction in India using P-E fit constructs*, India: Indian Institute of Management Bangalore

Nadler, D.A. & Lawler, E.E. 1979. *Motivation: A diagnostic Approach*. New York: McGrawHill.

Naylor, J. 1999. *Management*. Harlow: Prentice Hall.

Newstrom, J.W. and Davis, K. 1997. *Organisational Behaviour: Human Behaviour at Work*. 10<sup>th</sup> ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Norwood, G. 1999. *Maslow's hierarchy of needs: The Truth Vectors (Part I)*.

Nueman, W. 1997. *Social research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative approaches*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Needham Heights: Allyn & Bacon.

Oshagbemi, T. 1997. Academics and their managers: a comparative study in job satisfaction. *Personnel Review*, 28(1)(2), pp.108-123.

Ott, E., Grebogi, C. and Yorke, J.A. 1990. Controlling chaos. *Physical Review Letters*, 64(11). pp.1196–1199.

Peretomode, V.F. 1991. *Education Administration: Applied Concepts and Theoretical Perspective*. Lagos: Joja Educational Research and Publishers.

Polit, D., & Beck, C. 2006. *Essentials of Nursing Care: Methods, Appraisal and Utilization*. 6th ed. Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams and Wilkins.

Polit, D.F. and Hungler, B.P. 1995. *Research: Principles and methods*. Philadelphia.

Pors, N. O., & Johannes, C, G. 2002. Job satisfaction and motivational strategies

among library directors. *New Library World* Vol.103 No.1177 pp.199-208

Quinn, R.P. and Baldi de Mandilovitch, M.S. 1980. Education and job satisfaction, 1962-1977. *The Vocational Guidance Quarterly*, 29(2), pp.100-111.

Quinn, R.P., Staines, G.L. and McCullough, M.R. 1974. *Job satisfaction: Is there a real trend?* Manpower Research Monograph, 30, U.S. Department of Labor.

Quinton, S. and Smallbone, T. 2004. 'How do I know my research is any good? Teaching reliability, validity and generalisation'. *Conference on Research Methods, Reading*.

Robbins, S.P. 1998. *Organisational Behaviour*. 8<sup>th</sup> ed. New Jersey: PrenticeHall.

Robbins, S.P., Odendaal, A. and Roodt, G. 2003. *Organisational behavior: Global and Southern Africa Perspectives*. Cape Town: Pearson Education South Africa.

Robbins, S.P. and Decenzo, D.A. 2004. *Fundamentals of Management: Essential concepts and applications*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. New Jersey: PrenticeHall.

Rosenfeld, R.H. and Wilson, D.C. 1999. *Managing Organisations: Text, Readings and Cases*. London: McGraw- Hill.

Ruthankoon, R. and Ogunlana, S.O. 2003. Testing Herzberg's two-factor the Thai construction industry. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, 10(5), pp.333-341.

Saleh, S.D. and Otis, J.L. 1964. Age and level of job satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*, vol. 17, pp. 425-430.

Sari, L.M. and Judge, T.A. 2004. Employee attitudes and job satisfaction. *Human Resource Management*, 43(4), pp.395 – 407.

Saunders, M., Lewis, P. and Thornhill, A. 2000. *Research Methods for Business Students*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. London: Pearson Education Limited.

Saunders, M., Lewis, P. and Thornhill, A. 2003. *Research Methods for Business Stu-*

dents. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. London: Prentice Hall.

Schneider, B., Gunnarson, S.K., & Wheeler, J.K. 1992. The role of opportunity in the conceptualization and measurement of job satisfaction. In Cranny, C.J., Smith, P. C., & Stone, E. F. (Eds.). *Job Satisfaction: How People Feel About Their Jobs and How it Affects Their Performance*, 53-68. New York: Lexington Books.

Sekaran, U. 2003. *Research Methods for Business*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Publishers.

Shipley, D. and Kiely, J. 1988. Motivation and dissatisfaction of industrial salespeople- How relevant is Herzberg's theory? *European Journal of Marketing*, 22(1), pp.17-30.

Singh, V.K. 2010. *Job Satisfaction among Pharmaceutical Sales force in South Africa – A Case with Special Reference to Cape Town*. Ministry of Higher Education, Sultanate of Oman

Skinner, B.F. 1939. *The Behaviour of Organism: An Experimental Analysis*. D. New York: Appleton-Central Company.

Skinner, B.F. 1971. *Beyond Freedom and Dignity*. New York: Alfred Knopf.

Smerek, R.E., & Peterson, M.W. 2007. Examining Herzberg's theory: Job satisfaction among non-academic employees at a research university. *Research in Higher Education*, 48(2), pp.229-250.

Smith, P.L., Smits, S.J. and Hoy, F. 1998. Employee Work Attitude: the subtle influence of Gender. *Human Relations*, vol. 51, pp. 649-666.

Soper, B., Milford, G. and Rosenthal, G. 1995. Belief When Evidence does not Support Theory. *Psychology & Marketing*, 12(5), pp.415-422.

Spector, P.E. 1997. *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.

- Struwig, F.W. and Stead, G.B. 2001. *Designing & reporting research*. Cape Town: Pearson Education.
- Syptak, M.J., Marsland, D.W. and Ulmer, D. 1999. Job Satisfaction: Putting theory into practice. *Family Practise Management*, 6(9),
- Taber, T.D. and Alliger, G.M. 1995. A Task-level Assessment of Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 16(3), pp.101-121.
- Testa, M.R., Skaruppa, C. and Pietrzak, D. 1998. Linking job satisfaction and customer satisfaction in the cruise industry: Implications for hospitality and travel organisations. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 22(1), pp.4-14.
- Theron, J.N., Gresse, P.G., Siegfried, H.P., and Rogers, J. 1992. *The geology of the Cape Town area. Explanation on Sheet 3318, Geological Survey, South Africa*. pp.140.
- Thompson, D. and McNamara, J. 1997. Job satisfaction in educational organizations: A synthesis of research findings . *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 33(1), pp.1 – 31.
- Tietjen, M.A. and Myers, R.M. 1998. Motivation and Job Satisfaction. *The Management Decision*, 36(4),
- Tyilana, X.E. 2005. *The Impact of Motivation on Job Satisfaction amongst employees of a National Broadcaster*.
- Uys, T. 2003. Measuring and quantifying. In D. Rossouw (ed.) *Intellectual tools: Skills for the human sciences*. 2nd ed. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers. pp. 17-126.
- Vroom, V.H. 1964. *Work and motivation*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Vroom, V.H. 1982. *Work and Motivation*. Malabar: Krieger Publishing Company.
- Vroom, V. 1995. Work and motivation. In: Wiley, C. (1997), What motivate employees according to 40 years of motivation surveys. *International Journal of Manpower*, 18(3), pp. 263-280.

Watson, T. 1994. Linking employee motivation and satisfaction to the bottom line. *CMA Magazine*, 68(3), 4.

Weallens, F. 2003. *Psychology at work*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Wegner, T. 2000. *Applied Business Statistics: Methods and applications*. Cape Town: Juta.

Wiley, C. 1997. What Motivates Employees According To 40 Years Of Motivation Surveys. *International Journal Of Manpower*, 18(3), pp.263-280.

Yammarino, F.J. and Dubinsky, A.J. 1987. On the Job Satisfaction: It's the relationships that count! *The Journal of Risk and Insurance*, 54(4), pp.804-809.

Zeitz, G. 1990. Age and work satisfaction in a government agency: A situational perspective. *Human Relations*, 43(5), pp. 419-438.

Zikmund, W.G. 2003. *Business Research Methods*. 7<sup>th</sup> ed. Thompson South-Western, Ohio, United States of America.

**APPENDIX 1**  
**Questionnaire**

UNIVERSITY OF KWAZULU-NATAL  
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS

MBA Research Project

**Researcher:** Mrs. Devika Roopai (084 582 7976)

**Supervisor:** Mr J Mervyn Naidoo (031 2607563)

**Title of Survey: Job Satisfaction among Pharmaceutical Sales Representatives in the context of Herzberg Motivation-Hygiene Theory**

The purpose of this survey is to solicit information from Pharmaceutical representatives regarding factors contributing to motivation and job satisfaction. The information and ratings you provide us will go a long way in helping us identify these factors. The questionnaire should only take 15-20 minutes to complete. In this questionnaire, you are asked to indicate what is true for you, so there are no “right” or “wrong” answers to any question. Work as rapidly as you can. If you wish to make a comment please write it directly on the booklet itself. Make sure not to skip any questions.

Thank you for participating!

## **SECTION A**

### **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

**1. Gender**

Male

Female

**2. Your age-group is**

20-30

31-40

41-50

years.

**3. Your marital status**

Married

Single

Divorced

Widowed

**4. What is your academic/professional qualification?**

Below Matric

Matric

Post Matric Cert

Degree

PG Degree/Dip

Other

**5. Length of Service**

<5 years

5-10 years

11-15 years

**6. Position**

Junior Sales Representative

Senior Sales Representative

Executive Sales Representative

## **SECTION B 1**

In the questions below you are asked to rate each statement. You are then required to choose an appropriate option to match your response. Please answer all questions and remember there are no right and wrong answers

### **5. Rate you level of job satisfaction that you experience in your current job**

1. Achievement (Specific success, such as the successful completion of a job, solutions to problems, vindication, and seeing the results of your work.	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very satisfied
2. Recognition (Any act of recognition, be it notice or praise. A distinction can be made between situations where concrete rewards are given along with acts of recognition and those in which they are not.	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very satisfied
3. Work itself (The actual doing of the job or phases of it. is it challenging and stimulating?)	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very satisfied
4. Responsibility (Being given real responsibility, matched with the necessary authority to discharge it properly)	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very satisfied
5. Opportunity for advancement (Actual changes which enhance position or status at work. Pertains to career growth and promotions)	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very satisfied
6. Company policy and administration (Availability of clearly defined policies, especially those relating to people, adequacy of organisation and management.)	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very satisfied
7. Supervision( this deals with the manner in which your immediate supervisor gives you guidance in performing your related task, the accessibility, competence & fairness of the supervisor)	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very satisfied
8. Salary (The total compensation package, such as wages, salary, pension, company car and other financially related benefits)	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very satisfied

9 Interpersonal Relationships (with peers, manager or colleague in the work place. The relations with supervisors, subordinates and colleagues, the quality of social life at work )	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very satisfied
10. Working Conditions (The physical conditions in which you work the amount of work, the facilities available. Ventilation, tools, space, noise and other environmental aspects)	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very satisfied
11. Job Security (Freedom from insecurity, such as loss of position or loss of employment altogether)	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very satisfied
12. Status (A person's position or rank in relation to others, symbolized by title, parking space, car, size of office, furnishings)	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very satisfied

**7. How would you rate your overall level of job satisfaction in your current job?**

Strongly Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Strongly Satisfied
-----------------------	--------------	---------	-----------	--------------------

**APPENDIX 2**  
**Ethical Clearance Certificate**



RESEARCH OFFICE (GOVAN MBEKI CENTRE)  
WESTVILLE CAMPUS  
TELEPHONE NO.: 031 - 2603587  
EMAIL : [ximbap@ukzn.ac.za](mailto:ximbap@ukzn.ac.za)

---

26 FEBRUARY 2009

MRS. D ROOPAI (202527176)  
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS

Dear Mrs. Roopai

**ETHICAL CLEARANCE APPROVAL NUMBER: HSS/0047/09M**

I wish to confirm that ethical clearance has been approved for the following project:

***"Job satisfaction among Pharmaceutical Sales Representatives in the context of Herzberg Motivation-Hygiene Theory"***

**PLEASE NOTE: Research data should be securely stored in the school/department for a period of 5 years**

Yours faithfully

  
.....  
**MS. PHUMELELE XIMBA**

cc. Supervisor (Mr. JM Naidoo)  
cc. Mrs. C Haddon