

## A Case Study on Employee's Attitudes towards Reward System in Teaching Industry

By Mr. Muzafar Ahmad Shah<sup>[a]</sup>, Prof. (Dr.) Shabir Ahmad Bhat<sup>[b]</sup> & Ms. Syed Saliha Rufai<sup>[c]</sup>

### Abstract

Reward consists of monetary as well as non monetary benefits given to the employees by the employer. Compensation, benefits and recognition are three components of reward system which are treated as low cost and high return ingredient to a well balanced reward system. Therefore, reward system helps generate work motivation among employees. Performance based pay is one of the reward system innovations in which individuals are compensated based on their work output. Furthermore, organizations are required to reward their employees equitably, fairly and consistently in accordance with their value to the enterprise. However, positive motivation technique encourages employees to produce more and quality work. This study is an attempt to measure the level of satisfaction and motivation among the teachers in higher education and suggest the measures for an effective and aligned reward system in teaching industry of Kashmir.

Keywords:- Reward, Motivation, Satisfaction

<p><sup>[a]</sup><b>Mr. Muzafar Ahmad Shah,</b> Research Scholar, The Business School, University of Kashmir Srinagar, Jammu and Kashmir, India. Email:- <a href="mailto:muzaphershah@yahoo.com">muzaphershah@yahoo.com</a> Mobile No:- +919906663545</p>	<p><sup>[b]</sup><b>Prof. (Dr.) Shabir Ahmad Bhat,</b> Dean, Faculty of Business and Financial Studies and Management, University of Kashmir, Srinagar, Jammu and Kashmir, India. Email:- <a href="mailto:shabirb87@yahoo.com">shabirb87@yahoo.com</a> Mobile No:- +919419065899</p>	<p><sup>[c]</sup><b>Ms. Syed Saliha Rufai,</b> Research Scholar The Business School, University of Kashmir, Srinagar, Jammu and Kashmir, India. Email:- <a href="mailto:saliharufai@gmail.com">saliharufai@gmail.com</a> Mobile No:- +918713900777</p>
---	--	--

### 1. Introduction

Reward systems are critical part of any organizations design. Organizational culture and environment has a direct relationship with the effectiveness and quality of work life that people experience in the organization. In the recent past some new reward systems have been introduced in order to align reward systems (Lawler, 1990; Schuster and Zingheim, 1992). Rewards in the form of incentives are best considered for motivation. However this phenomenon is not a new phenomenon. It is rooted in scientific management, Vroom's valence expectancy theory, Herzberg's theory of motivation,

"Aano bhadraa krathavo yanthu vishwathaha"- "Let the noble thoughts come to all from all directions". Page No.1

Skinner's reinforcement theory and Equity theory. Hawthorne studies are the most famous researches conducted on the performance-based monetary incentives (Mirabella, 1999). Despite the fact that several motivation theories support pay-for-performance systems, W. Edwards Deming was adamantly opposed to them insofar as they impacted total quality management (TQM). Deming believed these systems encourage individuals to meet personal goals at the expense of the organization; as a result, individual competition will flourish while the teamwork and cooperation necessary for TQM to succeed may decline (Knouse, 1995). The theories of motivation argue that the people who contribute more to a company should receive more for doing so (Campbell, 1998). This expectation has a significant influence on the design of incentive systems, and payment by merit programs reflects this influence. However, they do not always achieve their objectives (Furtado et al., 2012).

Spector (1997) presented three reasons to clarify the importance of job satisfaction. First, organizations 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. Second, organizations can take on a utilitarian position in which employees' behavior would be expected to influence organizational operations according to the employees' degree of job satisfaction/dissatisfaction. Job satisfaction can be expressed through positive behaviors and job dissatisfaction through negative behaviors. Third, job satisfaction can be an indicator of organizational operations. Assessment of job satisfaction might identify various levels of satisfaction among organizational departments and, therefore, be helpful in pinning down 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.

## **2. Review of Literature**

The earliest examples of piece rate plans involved paying tradesmen in food based upon their output. By the Middle Ages, incentives were bleak amidst feudalism; production workers were given no form of payment until the work was done satisfactorily, and this system discouraged any regular production or labor hours. Attempts to tie rewards to performance among the various civilizations over the last four thousand years were spontaneous and localized in nature, and were generally simple. The overwhelming tradition was that the worker must be kept at a subsistence level because the hungry worker was best. Only with the advent of industrialization was there a rationale for tying higher rewards to greater performance (Peach & Wren, 1992). Adam Smith asserted his disagreement with the

traditional incentive plans: “The wages of labor are the encouragement of industry ... and where wages are high, accordingly we shall always find the workmen more active, diligent and expeditious than where they are low” (Briggs, 1969). A century later, Edward Atkinson, an American economist, noted that “the cheapest labor is the best-paid labor.” When an employer pays low wages, output is low, but when workers are paid well, output tends to be high and overall output costs are lower (Atkinson, 1885).

Compensation-delivery mechanisms include components such as base salary administration, job evaluation, market pricing, performance management and delivery of variable pay programs. These mechanisms should be adjustable, within controls suited to the operating governance model of the company, and tailored to the needs of major business units. The core elements of rewards systems design are: 1) base pay; 2) variable compensation; 3) fringe benefits; and 4) compensation governance including performance management (Schuster and Kesler, 2011). Pay and promotion are rewards employees tend to expect for their efforts. Pay and promotion lead to satisfaction when they are perceived as being fair. For pay to be fair, decisions on the amount to pay should reflect job requirements, people’s abilities, and community pay standards. By the same token, employees encounter satisfaction when they perceive that promotion decisions are the result of fair policies and processes (Locke, 1976, 1983; Vroom, 1982).

The importance of job satisfaction has increased because of its relevance to the emotional wellbeing of employees. Most of the employees spent a large part of their life at work (Smith et al., 1969). Job satisfaction appears to be extensively researched in a variety of organisations for work related objectives. This is because of the implicit assumptions that job satisfaction is a potential determinant of productivity, absenteeism, turnover, in-role job performance and extra role behaviour, and also that the primary antecedents of job attitudes are within management’s ability to influence. Therefore, apart from its humanitarian utility, it appears to make economic sense to consider whether and how job satisfaction can be improved. In recent times there has been a convergence of interest on the efforts by organizations to examine conditions that foster greater satisfaction with job. The basic reason for this renewed interest is the perception that broad even global, shifts in the internal structures and employment practices are inducing changes in the ties that bind employees to their job. Investigated by several disciplines such as psychology, sociology, economics and management sciences, job satisfaction is a frequently studied subject in work and organisational literature. This is mainly due to the fact that many experts believe that job satisfaction trends can affect labour market behaviour and influence work productivity, work effort, employee absenteeism and staff turnover. Moreover, job satisfaction is considered a strong predictor of overall individual well-being (Diaz-Serrano and Cabral

Vieira, 2005), as well as a good predictor of intentions or decisions of employees to leave a job (Gazioglu and Tansel, 2002). Beyond the research literature and studies, job satisfaction is also important in everyday life. Organizations that have goals to achieve require satisfied and happy staff, (Oshagbemi, 2000). Organisations have significant effects on the people who work for them and some of those effects are reflected in how people feel about their work (Spector, 1997). This makes job satisfaction an issue of substantial importance for both employers and employees. As many studies suggest, employers benefit from satisfied employees as they are more likely to profit from lower staff turnover and higher productivity if their employees experience a high level of job satisfaction. However, employees should also 'be happy in their work, given the amount of time they have to devote to it throughout their working lives' (Nguyen, Taylor and Bradley, 2003).

Content theorists assume that fulfillment of needs and attainment of values can lead to job satisfaction (Locke, 1976). Maslow's (1954) need hierarchy theory and Herzberg's motivator-hygiene theory (Herzberg, 1966) are examples of content theories. According to Maslow's (1954) view of individual needs, job satisfaction is said to exist when an individual's needs are met by the job and its environment. The hierarchy of needs focuses on five categories of needs arranged in ascending order of importance. Physiological, safety, belongingness and love are the lower-level needs in the hierarchy. The higher-level needs are esteem and self-actualization. When one need is satisfied, another higher-level need emerges and motivates the person to do something to satisfy it. A satisfied need is no longer a motivator. Whaba and Bridwell (1976) did an extensive review of the research findings on the need hierarchy concept. The results of their review indicate that there was no clear evidence showing that human needs are classified into five categories, or that these categories are structured in a special hierarchy. Even though hardly any research evidence was discovered in support of the theory, it enjoys wide acceptance.

Assessing the motivator-hygiene theory, Locke, Fitzpatrick, and White (1983) pointed out that Herzberg's theory is method dependent. Herzberg used what is known as the critical incident technique in the development of his theory. This type of research approach has been the only one consistently leading to results confirming the theory. The results of other applied methods have indicated that hygienes indeed can be associated with job satisfaction and motivators with job dissatisfaction. While as, process theorists assume that job satisfaction can be explained by investigating the interaction of variables such as expectancies, values, and needs (Gruneberg, 1979). Vroom's (1982) expectancy theory suggests that people not only are driven by needs but also make choices about what they will or will not do. The theory proposes that individuals make work-related decisions on the basis of their perceived abilities to perform tasks and receive rewards. Vroom's (1982) expectancy theory suggests that both

situational and personality variables produce job satisfaction. Equity theory proposes that workers compare their own outcome/input ratio (the ratio of the outcomes they receive from their jobs and from the organization to the inputs they contribute) to the outcome/input ratio of another person. Adams called this other person “referent.” The referent is simply another worker or group of workers perceived to be similar to oneself. Unequal ratios create job dissatisfaction and motivate the worker to restore equity. When ratios are equal, workers experience job satisfaction and are motivated to maintain their current ratio of outcomes and inputs or raise their inputs if they want their outcomes to increase. Outcomes include pay, fringe benefits, status, opportunities for advancement, job security, and anything else that workers desire and receive from an organization. Inputs include special skills, training, education, work experience, effort on the job, time, and anything else that workers perceive that they contribute to an organization. Situational theorists assume that the interaction of variables such as task characteristics, organizational characteristics, and individual characteristics influences job satisfaction (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). Examples of models are the situational occurrences theory of job satisfaction (Quarstein, McAfee, & Glassman, 1992) and Glisson and Durick’s (1988) predictors of job satisfaction.

### **3. Research Methodology**

The essential element of every research activity is the effective design. Thus appropriate strategies need to be utilized for different types of investigations. A research design is a blueprint for conducting the research project and the plan is overall scheme program of the research. This research describes the methodology used to develop a comprehensive model to measure the impact of employee’s attitudes towards monetary and non monetary benefits in private B. Ed. Colleges of Kashmir. The interviews were conducted with the teachers of the colleges. In order to lessen interviewee reluctance to discuss sensitive issues related to motivation and job satisfaction or indeed the possibility of obtaining only socially desirable answers, questions could be angled at “what other people can do”, rather than what the respondent does, to obtain a richer item pool. All the aforementioned have obviously a very significant purpose; to fine tune the conceptual model. The idea of a research design is to specify methods and procedures for collecting and analyzing required information. It is thus design to increase the validity of the questionnaire and gain more responses. The data collected in this piece of research were from primary as well secondary sources. Primary data was collected by distributing a structured non-disguised questionnaire. In addition to this secondary data was collected from journals, magazines, books and internet.

A minimum sample of 160 respondents from nine B.Ed. colleges was sought and all the appropriate response rate enhancement techniques were used (including pre-notification of targeted

respondents and follow-up of non-respondents). The sample was selected from respondents of Srinagar city in this very research project. The questionnaire was administered personally to collect the primary data only from the respondents. However the questionnaire consisted of ranking scale five point questions. The survey data was analyzed using SPSS and MS-Excel. The analysis started with univariate analysis such as frequency distributions and descriptive statistics to gain an understanding of the data collected. However bi-variate and multi-variate analysis was used to extract the meaningful information out of the data collected.

#### **4. Analysis and Interpretation**

Pay is simply the consideration arising from a contract of employment (as opposed to a contract for services associated with subcontracting) to give somebody a particular amount of money for work done for goods or services provided. Benefits are similarly defined as regular payments made to somebody qualified to receive it. Total pay and benefits are also known collectively as a 'remuneration package' and this includes wage and nonwage payments such as bonuses and fringe benefits such as health insurance, pension fund, sickness benefits, etc. Wages and salaries are recognized to be a significant but cognitively complex and multidimensional factor in job satisfaction. Money not only helps people attain their basic needs but is also instrumental in providing upper level need satisfaction. Employees often see pay as a reflection of how management views their contribution to the organization. Fringe benefits are also important but they are not as influential. One reason undoubtedly is that most employees do not even know how much they are receiving in benefits. Moreover, most tend to undervalue these benefits because they do not realize their significant monetary value. However research indicates that if employees are allowed some flexibility in choosing the type of benefits they prefer within a total package, called flexible or cafeteria benefits plan, there is a significant increase in both benefits satisfaction and overall job satisfaction.

During the research, statements related to attitudes of employees towards the compensation provided by the Management were revealed to the respondents. These statements dealt with the wage rates, opportunity to earn more and retention, satisfaction with the current profile and satisfaction with reward system. 70% employees from among the teaching staff were satisfied with the wage rates provided to them in comparison with non-teaching staff and 14.10% respondents showed their dissatisfaction. While as 52.11 % respondents from among the entire staff were satisfied with the wage rates. Therefore lesser margin of the employees from non-teaching staff showed their satisfaction which leads us to interpret that the existing pay structure of the employees needed to be improved. Next statement dealt with the employee retention in the colleges. The employee retention needed to be

measured with the reward system. The responses for this statement were noteworthy because 31.7% respondents were not able to answer this question from among the teaching staff. While as 40.6% employees from among all, agreed that they will quit the current job if prospective jobs along with good compensatory benefits are provided to them. Only 49.10% respondents were satisfied with the job benefits provided to them by the Administration which means more than 50% responses were adverse to this statement which is a matter of concern. So a total of 54% responses were dissatisfied with this statement. The employees were then asked whether the rewards are given in equal, 87% employees agreed with the statement. Therefore the chi-square values calculated were lesser than the table value for the four statements related to pay and benefits. A significant difference could be seen between the attitudes of teachers and administrative staff of the colleges. While as, in correlation analysis, positive values were obtained which lead to conclude that job satisfaction and compensatory benefits were co-related with each other. This finding is somewhat similar to the earlier research of Luthans (1998) which concludes that salaries not only assist people to attain their basic needs, but are also instrumental in satisfying the higher level needs of people. Previous research (Voydanoff, 1980) has shown that monetary compensation is one of the most significant variables in explaining job satisfaction. In their study of public sector managers, Taylor and West (1992) found that pay levels affect job satisfaction, reporting that those public employees that compared their salaries with those of private sector employees experienced lower levels of job satisfaction.

According to Boone and Kuntz (1992), offering employees fair and reasonable compensation, which relates to the input the employee offers the organisation, should be the main objective of any compensation system. Included in the category of compensation are such items as medical aid schemes, pension schemes, bonuses, paid leave and travel allowances. Lambert, Hogan, Barton and Lubbock (2001) found financial rewards to have a significant impact on job satisfaction. Such findings are largely consistent with the idea that most employees are socialized in a society where money, benefits, and security are generally sought after and are often used to gauge the importance or the worth of a person. Thus, the greater the financial reward, the less worry employees have concerning their financial state, thereby enhancing their impression of their self-worth to the organisation. Groot and Maassen van den Brink (1999; 2000) provide contradictory evidence for the relationship between pay and job satisfaction. In their earlier research they did not find evidence for a relationship between compensation and job satisfaction, however, their subsequent research revealed the opposite. However, Hamermesh (2001) found that changes in compensation (increases or decreases) have concomitant impact on job satisfaction levels of employees. Several other authors maintain that the key in linking pay to satisfaction is not the absolute amount that is paid, but rather, the perception of fairness (Aamodt, 1999;

Landy, 1989; Robbins, 1998). According to Robbins et al. (2003), employees seek pay systems that are perceived as just, unambiguous, and in line with their expectations. When pay is perceived as equitable, is commensurate with job demands, individual skill level, and community pay standards, satisfaction is likely to be the result. Gunter and Furnham (1996) found employee perceptions concerning the equity with which the organisation rewards its employees to be better predictors of job satisfaction than is the case with gender, age, or actual salary. Similarly, Miceli, Jung, Near and Greenberger (1991) cited in Hendrix, Robbins, Miller & Summers (1998), validated a causal pathway leading from fairness of the pay system to improved job satisfaction. Sousa-Poza's (2000) research indicates that perceived income, that is, whether the respondent considered his income high or not, was found to have the third largest effect on the job satisfaction of male employees.

**Table-1 Chi-Square Test**

<b>Scale Statement</b>	<b>Chi-Square</b>	<b>DF</b>	<b>Sig.</b>
The wage rates of this organization are competitive with those of other institutions.	59.12	4	0.000
If given an opportunity to earn more money, you will leave this job for money.	4.68	4	0.000
The organization provides you with adequate job benefits. (e.g. medical, insurance, travel, accommodation and allowances)	79.37	4	0.000
The rewards in the organization are, equal for all of the employees.	35.31	4	0.000
You are satisfied with the present promotion opportunities.	28.93	4	0.000
The authority is fair in giving promotions.	42.50	4	0.000

A promotion is an increase in rank which may also be accompanied by a raise in pay, benefits, and responsibility. Robbins (2001) asserts that promotions create the opportunity for personal growth, increased levels of responsibility and an increase on social standing. It is in fact an extent that an organization provides to its employees for organizational growth and job satisfaction. It is a part of performance evaluation process where an employee is provided an opportunity for growth and development according to his or her abilities, skills and work. Promotional opportunities seem to have a varying effect on job satisfaction. This is because promotions take a number of different forms and have a variety of accompanying rewards. In recent years with the flattening of organizations and

accompanying empowerment strategies, promotion in the traditional sense of climbing the hierarchical corporate ladder of success is no longer available as it once was. Employees operating in the new paradigm know that not only are traditional promotions not available, they are not even as desired. A positive work environment and opportunities to grow intellectually and broaden their skill base has for many become more important than promotion opportunities. The two statements were revealed to the employees regarding the current promotion opportunities. In response to first statement 23.3% respondents disagreed strongly, 10% disagreed and 58.3% agreed with the existing system of promotion in the colleges from among the teachers. From among the non-teaching staff 61% respondents were satisfied with the existing promotion opportunities. Another statement was asked about the fairness of authorities involved with promotions. 8.3% teachers disagreed strongly, 28.3% disagreed while as 58.3% agreed that the authorities are fair enough to make promotion from among the teachers. When the same statement was repeated before the non-teaching staff 21% respondents disagreed strongly, 33% disagreed and 15% respondents only agreed with the statement. The calculated chi-square values were greater than the table value at 4 degrees of freedom for two statements related to promotion opportunities. There is also a positive degree of correlation between job satisfaction and promotion opportunities because of the positive values were obtained from the co-relation analysis.

The results are somehow similar to the research of Drafke and Kossen(2002) who postulate that many people experience satisfaction when they believe that their future prospects are good. This may translate into opportunities for advancement and growth in their current workplace, or enhance the chance of finding alternative employment. They maintain that if people feel they have limited opportunities for career advancement, their job satisfaction may decrease. Similarly, Landy (1989), Larwood(1984), Moorhead & Griffen (1992),Vecchio (1988) state that, “An employee’s opportunities for promotion are also likely to exert an influence on job satisfaction”. Robbins (1998) maintains that promotions provide opportunities for personal growth, increased responsibility, and increased social status. According to McCormick and Ilgen (1985), employees’ satisfaction with promotional opportunities will depend on a number of factors, including the probability that employees will be promoted, as well as the basis and the fairness of such promotions. Visser (1990) indicates that such an individual’s standard for promotion is contingent on personal and career aspirations. Moreover, not all employees wish to be promoted. The reason therefore is related to the fact that promotion entails greater responsibility and tasks of a more complex nature, for which the individuals may consider themselves unprepared. If employees perceive the promotion policy as unfair, but do not desire to be promoted, they may still be satisfied. Nonetheless, opportunities for promotion appear to have a significant positive correlation with job satisfaction (Tolbert & Moen, 1998). In a study by Jayaratne and Chess (1984 cited

in Staudt, 1997), the opportunity for promotion was found to be the best and only common predictor of job satisfaction in child welfare, community mental health, and family services agencies. Luthans (1992) further maintains that promotions may take a variety of different forms and are generally accompanied by different rewards. Promotional opportunities therefore have differential effects on job satisfaction, and it is essential that this be taken into account in cases where promotion policies are designed to enhance employee satisfaction.

**Table-2 Correlation Analysis**

		<b>Pay and Benefits</b>	<b>Promotion Opportunities</b>
<b>Job Satisfaction</b>	$\gamma$	.326	.326
	<b>Sig.</b>	.000	.000
	<b>N</b>	160	160

## 5. Conclusion

Organizations must offer fair and reasonable compensation to the employees to increase the level of motivation. The fringe benefits such as, medical aid, insurance, flexible time hours etc. are the key actors of motivation and can lead to an improvement in the performance. Monetary rewards had an impact on the job satisfaction and differ significantly among teachers and administrative staff members. Growth opportunities and career advancement provides job satisfaction to most of the employees. Reward system helps generate work motivation among employees. Performance based pay is one of the reward system innovations in which individuals are compensated based on their work output. Furthermore, organizations are required to reward their employees equitably, fairly and consistently in accordance with their value to the enterprise. However, positive motivation technique encourages employees to produce more and quality work. This study attempted to measure the level of satisfaction and motivation among the teachers in higher education and suggest the measures for an effective and aligned reward system in teaching industry of Kashmir.

Satisfaction has been set forth as one of the goals of human adjustment and as one of the factors to be reckoned with an acceptable concept of efficiency. A glow of satisfaction may prevail in the days work and make events seem to run smoothly and a cloud of dissatisfaction may descend and envelop the individual in a fog of discontentment. Whatever nature of one's philosophy of life may be, it would be reasonable to assume that one is entitled to a certain minimum level of satisfaction as a part of the product of his work.

## 6. Suggestions for further research

This research was intended to employees of B.Ed. colleges only which limits the reliability and the validity of the results obtained. Thus the study paves way into other research opportunities in the field to stretch the depth of knowledge into the institutions functional in various other parts of the state, a larger sample may be taken in future. New dimensions could be added to assess the level of motivation among employees of teaching industry in Jammu and Kashmir and the existing dimensions need a continuous refinement. This study provides insight into organizational factors that impinge on job satisfaction and motivation is focused to a limited degree. The findings of the research is an attempt to make a contribution to the awareness of understanding the concept of Reward system and the association between job satisfaction and organizational climate. However, additional research is needed to further investigate the potential relationship and effect reward system and other variables have on job satisfaction.

## 7. References

- 1) Aamodt, M.G. (1999). *Applied Industrial/Organisational Psychology* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.) Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- 2) Atkinson, E. (1985). *The Distribution of Products*. New York: G.P. Putnam & Sons.
- 3) Boone, L., & Kuntz, D. (1992). *Contemporary marketing*. Texas: Dryden Press.
- 4) Briggs, A. (1969). *How They Lived*\_(Vol. 3). Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- 5) Campbell, D. J., Campbell, K. M. & Chia, H. (1998). *Merit pay, performance appraisal, and individual motivation: An analysis and alternative*, Department of Organizational Behavior, National University of Singapore.
- 6) Diaz-Serrano, L. and Cabral Vieira, J.A (2005)., Low pay, higher pay and job satisfaction within the European Union: Empirical evidence
- 7) Furtado, F. Aquino, G. & Meira, S. (2009). Incentive Systems in Software Organizations,
  - a. ICSEA 2009 - *The Fourth International Conference on Software Engineering Advances*.
  - b. Porto, Portugal. September, 2009.
- 8) Gazioglu, S. and Tansel, A (2000)., Job satisfaction in Britain: Individual and job-related factors Economic Research Centre Working Papers in Economics 03/03, Ankara.
- 9) Glisson, C., & Durick, M. (1988). Predictors of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in human service organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 33(1): 61-81.
- 10) Groot, W., & Maassen van den Brink, H. (1999). Job satisfaction and preference drift. *Economics letters*, 63: 363-367.
- 11) Groot, W. & Maassen van den Brink, H. (2000). Job satisfaction wages and allocation of men and women. In D. Kluwer (Ed). *Advances in Quality of Life Theory and Research*. Netherlands: Kluwer.
- 12) Gruneberg, M.M. (1979). *Understanding job satisfaction*. New York: The Macmillan Press, Ltd.
- 13) Hamermesh, D. (2001). The changing distribution of job satisfaction. *Journal of Human Resources*, 56(1): 1-30.

- 14) Gunter, B., & Furnham, A. (1996). Biographical and climate predictors of job satisfaction and pride in organisation. *Journal of Psychology*. 130(2) :193-209.
- 15) Hendrix, W.H., Robbins, T., Miller, J., & Summers, T.P. (1998). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on factors predictive of turnover. *Journal of Social Behavior & Personality*, 13(4) :611-633.
- 16) Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and the nature of man*. New York: World Publishing.
- 17) Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. E. (1996). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice* (5th Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- 18) Knouse, Stephen B. (1995). Variations on skill-based pay for total quality management. *SAM Advanced Management Journal*: 34-38.
- 19) Lambert, E.G., Hogan, N.L., Barton, A., & Lubbock, S.M. (2001). The impact of job satisfaction on turnover intent: A test of a structural measurement model using a national sample of workers. *Social Science Journal*, 38(2): 233-251.
- 20) Landy, F.J. (1989). *Psychology of work behavior* (4th ed.). Belmont: Wadsworth.
- 21) Landy, F.J. (1989). *Psychology of work behavior* (4th ed.). Belmont: Wadsworth.
- 22) Larwood, L. (1984). *Organisational behavior and management*. Boston: Kent Publishing Company.
- 23) Lawler, E. E. (1990). *Strategic Pay: Aligning Organizational Strategies and Pay Systems*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- 24) Lawler, E. E. and Cohen, S. G. "Designing Pay Systems for Teams", *ACA Journal*, 1992, 1(1), 6-19.
- 25) Locke, Edwin A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*: 1297-1349.
- 26) Luthans, F. (1992). *Organisational behavior*.(6th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- 27) Luthans, F. (1998). *Organisational behavior*.(8th ed.). India: McGraw- Hill,126
- 28) Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and Personality*. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers.
- 29) McCormick, E.J.,& Ilgen, D.R. (1985). *Industrial and Organisational Psychology*. (8th ed.).
- 30) Miceli, M., Jung, I., Near, J. and Greenberger, D. (1991). Predictors and outcomes of reactions to pay-for-performance plans. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76: 508-521.
- 31) Miceli, M.P. and Near, J.P. (1987). Correlates of satisfaction with pay level and pay system in pay for performance plans. *Working Paper 87-92*. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University.
- 32) Mirabella, J.W. (1999). Employee references for pay systems as a function of personal job inputs and job characteristics. (Unpublished)
- 33) Moorhead, G. & Griffen, R.W. (1992). *Organisational behavior*.(3rd ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- 34) Nguyen, A.N., Taylor, J. and Bradley, S (2003), Relative pay and job satisfaction: Some new evidence, Working Paper 045, Department of Economics, Lancaster University Management School.
- 35) Peach, E.B. and Wren, D.A. (1992). Pay for performance from antiquity to the 1950s. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*: 5-26.
- 36) Quarstein, V. A., McAfee, R. B., & Glassman, M. (1992). The situational occurrences theory of job satisfaction. *Human Relations*, 859-873.
- 37) Oshagbemi, T. (1998), "The impact of age on the job satisfaction of university teachers", *Research in Education*, Manchester, 59, 95-107.

- 38) Oshagbemi, T. (2000) “Gender Differences in the Job Satisfaction of University Teachers”. *Women in Management Review*. 15: 331-343.
- 39) Robbins, S.P. (1998). *Organisational behaviour: Concepts, controversies, applications.* (8th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- 40) Schuster, J. R. and Zingheim, P. K. *The New Pay*, New York: Lexington, 1992.
- 41) Schuster, M. and Kesler, G. (2012). Aligning Reward systems in organizational design: How to activate the Orphan star point. *People and Strategy* 34(4). HR People and Strategy.
- 42) Sousa-Poza, A. (2000). Well-being at work: A cross-national analysis of the levels and determinants of job satisfaction. *Journal of Socio-Economics*, 29(6) : 517-539.
- 43) Smith, P.C ; Kendall, L.M &Hulin, C.L (1969). *The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement*. Chicago: R and McNally.
- 44) Spector, P. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- 45) Taylor, S. L., & Cosenza, R. M. (1997). Internal marketing can reduce employee turnover. *Supervision*, 58: 3-5.
- 46) Tolbert, P.S., & Moen, P. (1998). Men’s and women’s definitions of “good” jobs. *Work & Occupations*, 25(2): 168-195.
- 47) Voydanoff, P. (1980). Perceived job characteristics and job satisfaction among men and women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 5: 177-185.
- 48) Vecchio, R.P. (1988). *Organisational behavior*. New York: Dryden Press.
- 49) Visser, P., Breed, M., & van Breda, R. (1997). Employee satisfaction: *A triangulation approach*. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 23(2): 19-24.
- 50) Vroom, Victor H. (1964). *Work and Motivation*. New York: Wiley, 1964.
- 51) Wahba, M. A., & Bridwell, L. G. (1976). Maslow reconsidered: A review of research on the need hierarchy theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 15(2): 212-240.