

# The Analysis of Facets of Job Satisfaction of Police Personnel

Dr. G. Venkat Rao\*

## Key Words:

1. Job Satisfaction
2. Public service organization
3. Ambivalent satisfaction
4. Police Personnel
5. HRM

## Abstract

The Organization in manufacturing activities and service activities has different roles to perform. The bureaucratic organizations serve the interests of the society. The job satisfaction in such organizations derives from different perspectives.

The studies were conducted in different countries and cultures. The factors influencing Job satisfaction of the police are different. The study in India was carried on to examine extent of Job satisfaction, components of Job satisfaction and its impact on the police personnel of different ranks. The instrument developed by Paul E.Spector (1985) was adopted with modifications for conducting the Job Satisfaction Survey with 36 items and nine factors to assess the job satisfaction.

The results show ambivalence in the satisfaction and designation wise satisfaction level follows hierarchy with exception of Head constable. The nature of work is the attraction for police job in India. The ambivalence nature of satisfaction is worrisome trend, some inputs are required to address benefits, rewards and promotion issues.

## INTRODUCTION

Job satisfaction is an intriguing word with a resounding effect on the state of human performance. The Organizations place priority for enhancing the employee satisfaction with the job. The job satisfaction is assumed to improve engagement of the employee to the Organization. Keith Davies (1975) basis his definition on combination of psychological, physiological and environmental aspects on job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is the most widely researched job attitude and among the most extensively researched subjects in Industrial/Organizational Psychology (Judge & Church, 2000).

Some of the most commonly cited definitions on job satisfaction are of Hackman, J., & Oldham, G. (1980), Vroom (1964), Spector (1985), and Keith Davies (1975). Their approach considers the internal and external factors that cause a feeling of satisfaction.

The Organization in manufacturing activities and service activities has different nature of functions and roles to perform (P.F. Drucker, 1970). The HRD functions are relevant to service, bureaucratic organizations in Government and private sector. (T.V. Rao, 1996). The study

of job satisfaction is instrumental for any type of Organisation to make policy corrections. The policies on satisfaction in any Organisation whether bureaucratic, business, government or voluntary is to be evaluated to measure the Organisation health and wellness. The term is subjective, transient, temporary, permanent, holistic or partial. The bureaucratic organisations serve the interests of the society and not committal to profit earnings (Webber, 1947). Bowen and Ostroff (2004) reviewed the strength of HRM and its impact on performance. The studies on public service bureaucratic organization are typically at variance in comparison with the business oriented organisation. The public service bureaucratic organization focus on non-profit service, the compensation is not linked with profits (P.F. Drucker, 1970). The job satisfaction in such organizations derives from different perspectives.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

The job satisfaction for Vroom (1964) is an affective orientation on the part of individuals toward work roles which they are presently occupying. One of the most often cited definitions on job satisfaction is the one given by Spector (1997) according to whom job satisfaction has to do with the way how people feel about their job and its various aspects. Job satisfaction represents the extent to which expectations are and match the real awards. Job

\*Assistant Professor, Dr. L. Bullayya P. G. College, Resapuvanipalem and can be reached at gvr101@rediffmail.com

satisfaction is closely linked to that individual's behaviour in the work place (Davis Keith, 1975). Job satisfaction represents a combination of positive or negative feelings that workers have towards their work. Herzberg (1968) discussing the intrinsic and extrinsic job factors, has mentioned the rewarding factors such as recognition, achievement, responsibility, personal growth and development as contributors to job satisfaction. Hackman and Oldham (1980) measures job satisfaction with five job characteristics' as skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy and feedback. These are similar to motivating factors of Herzberg (1968). Job Satisfaction theories were tested with motivation theories, such as Maslow's (1943) Hierarchy of Needs, Adam's (1965) Equity Theory, Porter and Lawler's (1968) modified version of Vroom's (1964) Locke's (1976) Range of Affect Theory, Bandura's (1977) Social Learning Theory, and Landy's (1978) Opponent Process Theory.

Porter (1968) has done intensive study on job satisfaction and found variations across the levels. The studies of recent past concentrated on the nexus between changing work and job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction falls into two levels: affective job satisfaction and cognitive job satisfaction. Affective job satisfaction is a person's emotional feeling about the job as a whole. Cognitive job satisfaction is how satisfied employees feel concerning some aspect of their job, such as pay, hours, or benefits. Mueller & Kim (2008) mentions job satisfaction as a function of facets such as feelings regarding specific job aspects, such as salary, benefits, work hierarchy, growth opportunities, work environment and the quality of relationships with one's co-workers. According to Kerber and Campbell (1987), measurements of the above satisfaction helps identify specific aspects of a job that require improvement. The concept of job satisfaction finds application across the professions.

The professional challenges across the occupations made researchers to address the issues connected with job satisfaction; the link of job satisfaction with professional challenges is the unaddressed area for further research. The empirical research conducted on job satisfaction among police officers has been limited (Bennett, 1997) and neglected (Buzawa, 1984).

Dantzker (1994) argued that police job satisfaction literature is methodically and topically limited. Griffin, Dunbar, and McGill (1978) conclude that job satisfaction has been merely a slogan in police organizations. The research

shows inconclusive proof on the relationship between happiness, satisfaction and productivity (Syptak et al., 1999). The nature of job of police personnel is different from industrial employees.

The environment as a factor of job satisfaction was intensively researched and studies have found its impact on job satisfaction (Berry, 1997; Venkat, G., 2013). There are several reasons why job satisfaction is important, as negative attitude and poor performance can impact police relations with the wider society (Buzawa, Austin, & Bannon, 1994). Job satisfaction is an area where police organisation needs to concentrate for individual, organisational and society benefit (Carlan, 1999). The content for evaluation of job satisfaction is also an important area for research, Bowen and Ostroff (2004) has examined strength and content of HRM in relation to performance and organisational climate. Job satisfaction is wide concept. Job satisfaction is influenced by internal and external factors. Job satisfaction is not constant and varies with the environment. The outcome approach to evaluation oversees productivity, absenteeism, attrition and burnout.

The role of Police is classified as most stressful job in the world. Police officers can experience high rates of employee turn over due to their low job satisfaction (Zhao et al. 1999). Loo's (2004) study on Canadian police managers finds high burnout and low satisfaction. The police organization comprises of different hierarchy with distribution of power and authority for each cadre. Webber (1947) considered that bureaucratically arranged hierarchical set up is suitable to bring out efficiency, curb irrationality and promote discipline in the organization. But the studies show high bureaucratic control in police organization creates stress, harassment and dissatisfaction (Carlan, 2007).

Gerald Dapaah Gyamf (2014) conducted some studies on Ghana Police Service and results show significant influence of co-workers and supervisor support on Job Satisfaction. L. Lokesh, Swati Patra & S. Venkatesan (2016) examined job satisfaction with Spector (1985) Scale in Indian Police Service and found it is as ambivalence. Ercikti, Vito, Walsh, Higgins (2011) has identified positive feedback as significant contributor to satisfaction, years of service in the present department as the negative determinant of job satisfaction and organizational variables are the best predictors of Job Satisfaction.

### MEASUREMENT

Many measurement scales were developed by researchers to measure the job satisfaction. The earliest attempt was



made by Hackman and Oldham(1980) with three dimensions of overall job satisfaction which includes general satisfaction, internal work motivation and growth satisfaction. His measures include security, compensation, co-workers and supervision. Schriesheim and Tsue (1980) developed Job Satisfaction Index with criteria like work, supervision, co-workers, pay, promotion opportunities and the job. Job Satisfaction Survey was developed by Spector (1985) with nine criteria; pay, promotion, supervision, benefits, contingent rewards, operating procedures, co-workers, nature of work and communication. When it was initially developed, it was specific to job satisfaction in human service, nonprofit and public organizations. Dantzer(1994) has identified equipment, pay, promotion, work environment, skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, feedback, supervisor relations, work-family conflict, stress, and management policies as organizational variables to measure job satisfaction perceptions among police officers.

Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire with 100 questions and 20 sub-scales measure satisfaction with ability, utilization, achievement, activity, advancement, authority, company policies and practices, compensation, co-workers, creativity, independence, moral values, recognition, responsibility, security, social service, social status, supervision-human relations, supervision-technical variety, and working conditions. The scale made by Ironson, Smith, Brannick, Gibson and Paul (1989) is global satisfaction scale.

### **METHODOLOGY**

The studies discussed above were conducted in different countries and cultures. The Job satisfaction of the police and factors influencing them are different. The study in India was carried on with the objectives.

1. The extent of Job satisfaction of the police personnel.
2. The study focuses on the components of Job satisfaction and its impact on the police personnel of different ranks.

The present study has adopted a descriptive research design and was conducted on police personnel in Hyderabad metropolitan city. The Hyderabad police department consist of different zones namely East, South, North, West and Central zone. From Each zone one police station (East zone – Osmania University City Police station, South zone – Santoshnagar Police station, North zone – Karkhana Police station, West zone – Banjara hills Police station, Central zone – Narayanaguda Police station) was selected as a research area. From Hyderabad city, 120

(one hundred and twenty) police personnel of all the ranks were interviewed i.e. from Circle inspector to Home-guard rank. By applying stratified random sampling method, the respondents were selected for the research.

The instrument developed by Paul E. Spector (1985) was adopted with modifications for conducting the Job Satisfaction Survey with 36 items and nine factors to assess the job satisfaction. The scale is attitudinal based with each four items. The scale is summated rating scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree with reverse scoring. The nine factors are Pay, Promotions, Supervision, Fringe Benefits, Contingent Rewards, Operating Procedures, Co-workers, Nature of Work and Communication. This instrument was developed by Paul E. Spector (1985) for service organizations. The scoring for each item range from 4 to 24; while scores for total job satisfaction, based on the sum of all 36 items, can range from 36 to 216. In case of negative questions the scale is reversed.

For the 36-item total where possible scores range from 36 to 216, the ranges are 36 to 108 for dissatisfaction, 108 to 144 for ambivalent, and 144 to 216 for satisfaction. The analysis was made with percentage, means and standard deviation.

### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The data from the Job Satisfaction Survey were analyzed with the help of SPSS package version 21. The data was arranged into socio-economic details, employment details and job satisfaction results.

The socio-economic descriptive statistics (see table no. 1) of police personnel includes both males (80.8%) and females (19.2%), the mean Age profile of the respondents is 38.4 years. The religion and caste wise distribution of the respondents were shown to understand the characteristics of the population. The mean monthly salary of the respondents is Rs. 22,500.

The educational qualification(see table no.2) of the police personnel reveal the distribution trend as Under Graduation(39.2 %) followed by S.S.C, Intermediate and Post-Graduation and above (10.0 %, 38.3% & 12.5%). The respondents were Police Constables (40.0%) followed by Circle Inspector(4.2%), Sub Inspector(12.5%), Assistant Sub Inspector(8.3%), Head Constable(8.3%), Women Police Constable(10.0%) and Home-guard ( 16.7%).

Job Satisfaction of the Police Personnel:

The trends of job satisfaction level of the different rank



police personnel's shows increase up the hierarchy (see table no.3). The Circle Inspector (127.8) has higher job satisfaction than Head constable (120.5), the home guard (114.25) with rank 7 has lowest satisfaction. The police department has been completely involved with the community in their profession. They involve themselves with different groups of people in their work situation as a victim, as a complainant, as accused, each group's expectation has been differ to accomplish their needs, the police official need more cooperation from the community, to do their service effectively and efficiently to bring justice to the legal system.

The mean scores of facets of job satisfaction (see table no.4) are provided with rank in order. The Job satisfaction scale consists of nine major facets such as Pay, Promotion, Supervision, Benefits, Rewards, Operating conditions, Co-workers, Nature of work and Communication. The 'nature of work' was the main contributor to the Job satisfaction with a mean score of 17.73. The 'communication' emerged as the second with the mean score of 15.97. The third highest mean score was for 'supervision'(15.27) followed by 'operating conditions'(14.87), Co-workers(13.71), Pay(12.55), Rewards(12.51), Promotion(10.63) and 'Benefits'(9.66). The percentage contribution ranges from 14.42 percent to 7.86 percent.

The study corroborates with results of Lokesh, Swati Patra & S. Venkatesan(2016), however the ranking of facets of job satisfaction differ with Nature of Work (1), Supervision (2), Co-Workers(3), Communication(4), Benefits(5), Pay(6), Rewards (7), Work Condition(8) and Promotion(9). The overall Job Satisfaction (122.88) is ambivalence as the scoring in the scale. The benefits are the main area of concern with very low contribution to job satisfaction. The work derives more satisfaction than any other variable for the police personnel.

In the next stage job satisfaction relation with designation is tested with chi-square statistic. The facets of job satisfaction i.e. Pay, Promotion, Operating Condition, Co-Workers and Communication were significant whereas Supervision, Benefits, Rewards and Nature of work were insignificant(see table no.5). The Chi-square result reveals that significant association ( $P < 0.001$ ) observed between the designation and pay, designation and promotion, designation and operating condition, designation and co-workers, and designation and communication. The ambivalence is high in all the facets

with promotion as exemption. The satisfaction is low across the designation for Pay, Promotion, Operating Condition and Co-Worker except Communication.

The regression result (see table no.6) also reveals that there is significant correlation between Job satisfaction and designation, income ( $P < 0.0001$ ) because of difference in salary structures of the police personnel's. There is significant correlation observed between in different dimensions of job satisfaction such as; pay & designation, pay & income, promotion & designation, promotion & income, co-workers & designation, and co-workers & income ( $P < 0.0001$ ).

### CONCLUSION

The results show ambivalence in the satisfaction of the police personnel. The designation wise satisfaction level follows hierarchy with exception of Head constable. The nature of work is the attraction for police job in India. The job enriched with authority, power and control at the respective level in the hierarchy. The nature of work is impacting job satisfaction to the maximum extent. The benefits are the least contributors to job satisfaction. The service benefits are based on pay commission recommendations and do not reflect the hardships and stress nature of work.

The closer examination establish classification of benefits based on hierarchy and grade is decreasing the job satisfaction. Herzberg(1968) two factor theory gives precedence to motivating factor, the nature of work is a motivating factor. Porter(1961) analysis of Job Satisfaction differed level wise, in this analysis the Job Satisfaction varied level wise with exemption of Head constable. The results have corroborated with the findings of L. Lokesh, Swati Patra & S. Venkatesan(2016) in India and Gerald Dapaah Gyamf (2014) in Ghana.

This aberration is to be verified by further studies, the power and authority in the nature of work in public service functions of the Government is high, this may be the reason why people prefer particular job in Government Service. The ambivalence nature of satisfaction is worrisome trend, some inputs are required to address benefits, rewards and promotion issues.

### REFERENCE

- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental and social psychology* (276-299). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of



- behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191-215.
- Bennett, R.R. (1997). Job satisfaction among police constables: A comparative study in three developing nations. *Justice Quarterly*, 14, 295-323.
- Berry, L. M. (1997). *Psychology at work*. San Francisco, CA: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
- Bowen & Ostroff (2004). Understanding HRM–Firm Performance Linkages: The Role of the “Strength” Of The HRM System. *Academy of Management Review*, 29(2), 203–221.
- Buzawa, A., Austin, T., & Bannon, J. (1994). The role of selected socio-demographic and job specific variables in predicting patrol officer job satisfaction: A reexamination ten years later. *American Journal of Police*, 13(2), 51-75.
- Buzawa, S. E. (1984). Determining patrol officer job satisfaction: The role of selected demographic and job-specific attitudes. *Criminology*, 22, 61-81.
- Carlan, P. E. (1999). Occupational outcomes of criminal justice graduates: Is the master's degree a wise investment? *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 10(1), 39-55.
- Dantzker, M. L. (1994). Measuring job satisfaction in police departments and policy implications: An examination of a mid-size, southern police department. *American Journal of Police*, 13, 77-101.
- Ercikti, Vito, Walsh, Higgins (2011). Major Determinants of Job Satisfaction Among Police Managers. *Southwest Journal of Criminal Justice*, 8(1), 97–XX.
- Gerald Dapaah Gyamf (2014). Influence of Job Stress on Job Satisfaction: Empirical Evidence from Ghana Police Service. *International Business Research*, 7, (9).
- Griffin, R. G., Dunbar, R.L.M., & McGill, M.E. (1978). Factors associated with job satisfaction among police personnel. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 6, 77-85.
- Hackman, J., & Oldham, G. (1980). *Work Redesign*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Henne, D., & Locke, E. (1985). Job dissatisfaction: What are the consequences? *International Journal of Psychology*, 20(2), 221.
- Herzberg, F. (1968). One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review*, 52-62.
- Ironson, G., Smith, P., Brannick, M., Gibson, M., & Paul, K. (1989). Construction of a job in General Scale: A comparison of global, composite and specific measures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 193-200.
- Judge, T. A., & Church, A. H. (2000). Job satisfaction: Research and practice. In C. L. Cooper & E. A. Locke (Eds.), *Industrial and organizational psychology: Linking theory with practice* (pp. 166-198). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Keith, Davis (1975). *Human Behavior at Work*. New Delhi: Tata McGraw Hill.
- Kerber, K. W., & Campbell, J. P. (1987). Job satisfaction: Identifying the important parts among computer sales and service personnel. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 1(4), 337-352.
- L. Lokesh, Swati Patra & S. Venkatesan (2016). Job Satisfaction among Police Personnel: A Socio-Demographic Study. *G.J.I.S.S.*, 5(4), July, 56-62.
- Landy, F. J. (1978). An opponent process theory of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63(5), 533-547.
- Locke, E. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M.D. Dunette (Ed.), *Hand book of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (1247-1349). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Loo, R. (2004). A typology of burnout types among police managers. *Policing*, 27, 156-165.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50, 370-396.
- Webber, Max. (1947). *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. Free Press.
- Mueller, C. W., & Kim, S. W. (2008). The contented female worker: Still a paradox?. In K. A. Hegtvedt & J. Clay-Warner (Eds.), *Justice: Advances in group processes*, 25 (117-150). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Paul E. Spector (1985). Measurement of Human service staff satisfaction: Development of the Job satisfaction survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 13(6).
- Paul E. Spector (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, cause and consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Porter, Lyman W. (1961). A Study of Perceived Need Satisfaction in Bottom and Middle Management Jobs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 45, 1-10.
- Porter, L. W., & Lawler, E. E. (1968). Managerial attitudes and performances. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.
- Schriesheim, C., & Tsui, A. S. (1980). Development and validation of a short satisfaction instrument for use in survey feedback interventions. Paper presented at the Western Academy of Management Meeting.
- Syptak, J.M., Marsland, D.W., & Ulmer, D. (1999). Job satisfaction: Putting theory into practice. *Family Practice Management*. Retrieved from <http://www.aafp.org/fpm/991000fm/26.html>.
- Rao, T.V. (1996). *Human resource development, experiences, interventions, strategies*. New Delhi: Sage Publications India Pvt. Ltd.
- VenkatRao, Gudivada (2013). A Study on Predictor Variables of Organizational Climate in Educational Institutes. *Acta Universitatis Danubius Economica*, 10(6), 33-47.
- Vroom, V. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York, NY: Wiley.

**Annexure****Table No 1: Socio-economic status of the Respondents**

Variable	(N = 120)		mean
	N	%	
Gender			
Male	97	80.8	
Female	23	19.2	
Age(years)			
18 - 30	59	49.2	38.4
31 - 45	43	35.8	
46 and above	18	15.0	
Religion			
Hindu	92	76.6	
Christian	8	6.7	
Muslim	20	16.7	
Caste			
F.C	16	13.3	
B.C	53	44.2	
S.C	22	18.3	
S.T	9	7.5	
Minorities	20	16.7	

**Table No 2: Employment details of the Respondents**

Variable	(N = 120)	
	N	%
Education qualification		
S.S.C	12	10.0
Intermediate	46	38.3
U.G	47	39.2
P.G and above	15	12.5
Designation		
C.I	5	4.2
S.I	15	12.5
A.S.I	10	8.3
H.C	10	8.3
P.C	48	40.0
W.P.C	12	10.0
Home-guard	20	16.7

**Table No 3: Job Satisfaction of the Police Personnel**

Variable	Designation	Rank	Mean ± SD
Job Satisfaction	Circle Inspector	1	127.8 ± 4.44
	Sub -Inspector	2	125.8 ± 8.49
	Assistant Sub -Inspector	3	124.3 ± 3.74
	Head Constable	6	120.5 ± 3.44
	Police Constable	4	122.69 ± 6.58
	Women Police Constable	5	121.91 ± 4.10
	Home -guard	7	114.25 ± 3.27



**Table No 4: Mean scores of facets of Job satisfaction of the Police personnel**

Subscale	Mean	Percent	Rank	SD
Pay	12.55	10.21	6	2.308
Promotion	10.63	08.65	8	2.158
Supervision	15.27	12.42	3	1.895
Benefits	9.66	07.86	9	1.737
Rewards	12.51	10.18	7	1.501
Operating conditions	14.87	12.09	4	4.008
Co -workers	13.71	11.15	5	2.636
Nature of work	17.73	14.42	1	1.228
Communication	15.97	12.99	2	1.489
Job satisfaction	122.88	100		7.2
n	120			120

**Table No 5: Job satisfaction level of the Police personnel in different dimensions**

JSS subscales	Dissatisfied (4 – 12)	Ambivalent (12 – 16)	Satisfied (16 – 24)	Result (Chi - square value)
Designation Vs Pay	50(41.67%)	66(55.00%)	4(3.34%)	*P < 0.001
Designation Vs Promotion	99(82.5%)	20(16.67%)	1(0.83%)	*P < 0.001
Designation Vs Operating condition	11(9.16%)	98(81.67%)	10(8.33%)	*P < 0.001
Designation Vs Co -workers	37(30.83%)	65(54.17%)	18(15%)	*P < 0.001
Designation Vs Communication	1(0.84%)	76(63.33%)	43(35.83%)	*P < 0.001

**Table No 6: Regression Values**

Dependent Variable	Predictor Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Significant
		Beta	Std.Error			
JS	(Constant)	129.352	1.825		70.871	.000
	Designation	-1.394	.370	-.328	-3.771	.000
JS	(Constant)	107.864	8.620		12.514	.000
	Designation	.613	.866	.144	.707	.481
	Income	5.868	2.303	.519	2.548	.012
Pay	(Constant)	15.204	.562		27.053	.000
	Designation	-.572	.114	-.420	-5.025	.000
Pay	(Constant)	8.555	.613		13.964	.000
	Income	1.926	.282	.532	6.820	.000
Promotion	(Constant)	5.082	2.698		1.883	.062
	Designation	.395	.271	.310	1.455	.148
	Income	1.789	.721	.528	2.481	.015
Co-Workers	(Constant)	18.423	2.996		6.149	.000
	Designation	-.869	.301	-.559	-2.886	.005
	Income	-.328	.801	-.079	-.410	.683
Nature of Worker	(Constant)	13.544	1.546		8.761	.000
	Designation	.379	.155	.522	2.437	.016
	Income	1.172	.413	.608	2.837	.005