

University of Rajshahi

Rajshahi-6205

Bangladesh.

**RUCL Institutional Repository**

**<http://rulrepository.ru.ac.bd>**

---

Institute of Bangladesh Studies (IBS)

PhD thesis

---

2016

# Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment: A Study on Bangladesh Civil Service General Education Cadre

Wahiduzzaman, Md.

University of Rajshahi

---

<http://rulrepository.ru.ac.bd/handle/123456789/645>

*Copyright to the University of Rajshahi. All rights reserved. Downloaded from RUCL Institutional Repository.*

# Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment: A Study on Bangladesh Civil Service General Education Cadre

Researcher

Md. Wahiduzzaman

A Dissertation Submitted to the Institute of Bangladesh Studies,  
University of Rajshahi in the Fulfillment of the Requirements for the  
Degree of

*Doctor of Philosophy*  
*in*  
*Management Studies*



Institute of Bangladesh Studies (IBS)  
University of Rajshahi  
Rajshahi, Bangladesh.

January, 2016

# Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment: A Study on Bangladesh Civil Service General Education Cadre

Researcher

Md. Wahiduzzaman  
PhD Fellow (2011-12)  
Institute of Bangladesh Studies (IBS)  
University of Rajshahi,  
Rajshahi.

Supervisor

Dr. Md. Zafor Sadique  
Professor  
Department of Management Studies  
University of Rajshahi  
Rajshahi



Institute of Bangladesh Studies (IBS)  
University of Rajshahi  
Rajshahi, Bangladesh

January, 2016

---

---

**Ph.D.  
Dissertation**

---

---

**Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment: A Study  
on Bangladesh Civil Service General Education Cadre**

**Researcher**

**Md. Wahiduzzaman**

A Dissertation Submitted to the Institute of Bangladesh Studies,  
University of Rajshahi in the Fulfillment of the Requirements for the  
Degree of

*Doctor of Philosophy  
in  
Management Studies*



**Institute of Bangladesh Studies (IBS)  
University of Rajshahi  
Rajshahi, Bangladesh.**

**January, 2016**

**Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment: A Study  
on Bangladesh Civil Service General Education Cadre**

**Md. Wahiduzzaman**

---

---

**IBS, RU  
January 2016**

---

---

## **CERTIFICATE**

This is to certify that Md. Wahiduzzaman PhD fellow, session 2011-2012, Institute of Bangladesh Studies (IBS), University of Rajshahi, has prepared the dissertation entitled “**Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment: A Study on Bangladesh Civil Service General Education Cadre**” under my direct academic guidance and supervision. The researcher has himself prepared the dissertation, and this is not a conjoint work. He has contributed to the field of Management Studies through this original work. This dissertation or any part of it, as per as my knowledge, has not been submitted to any other university for any degree.

I have gone through the draft and the final version of the dissertation and found it satisfactory for submission to the Institute of Bangladesh Studies, University of Rajshahi in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of **Doctor of Philosophy in Management Studies**.

Supervisor

**(Dr. Md. Zafor Sadique)**  
Professor  
Department of Management Studies  
University of Rajshahi  
Rajshahi  
January, 2016

## DECLARATION

I do hereby declare that the dissertation entitled “**Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment: A Study on Bangladesh Civil Service General Education Cadre**” submitted to the Institute of Bangladesh Studies, University of Rajshahi in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of **Doctor of Philosophy in Management Studies** is exclusively my own and original work. No part of it, in any form, has been submitted to any other University or Institute for any degree, diploma, or for other similar purposes. All the evidences that have been taken from the published and unpublished works of other authors have been acknowledged, and references have been cited.

**(Md. Wahiduzzaman)**

PhD Fellow

Session: 2011-12

Institute of Bangladesh Studies

University of Rajshahi, Rajshahi

January, 2016

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and foremost, I would like to thank the almighty Allah who created and gave me the opportunity to be educated through acquiring knowledge, provided me courage and strength for preparing this dissertation.

To complete this thesis, I have taken assistance from a number of advisors, colleagues, friends, organizations and groups. It would have been quite difficult for me to prepare the dissertation without their help at different phases of conceptualizing and writing process. I have to acknowledge their contribution.

Then, I render my gratitude and appreciation to my supervisor Dr. Md. Zafor Sadique for his intellectual guidance, cooperation, and all out support to launch such a research from initial phases of framing ideas and designing structures of the research project to the final product as dissertation. I must thank him for his sincere and laborious efforts in editing with valuable critiques and finalizing the dissertation within the short span of time. I also acknowledge Professor Dr. Swarochish Sarker director of IBS, Dr. M. Zainul Abedin Professor of IBS, Dr. M. Mostofa Kamal, Associate professor of IBS, Dr. M. Nazimul Haque, Associate professor of IBS, Dr. Md. Kamruzzaman, Associate professor of IBS and Dr. Md. Ohidul Islam professor of Management Studies of the University of Rajshahi and other faculty officers of IBS for their intellectual contributions to enrich my knowledge on research processes.

My indebtedness goes to some institutions also. I am indebted to the Institute of Bangladesh Studies, University of Rajshahi and University Grant Commission (UGC) for institutional and financial support respectively that allowed me to have the opportunity of the study from the Ministry of Education (MoE) and Directorate of Secondary and Higher Education (DSHE).

A large number of IBS fellows, colleagues, teachers of RU and well wishers and friends of mine in particular Md. Abdullah Al Mamun, Md Nasiruddin Goni, Md. Atiqul Islam, Md Moniruzzaman, Md Monirul Islam, Md Nur Alam, S.M. Atiar Rahman, Abu Rusho Md. Toab Hossain, Aticus Samad, Mst. Masuma Pervin, Rashed Hossain, Md Motinur Rahman, Md. Sahedul Haque, Ahsanuzzaman, Habibur Rahman, Saju, Suzon, Ashraf, Mehedi, Saiful, Luthfunnahar, Moushumi, Shipon, and Asad have put ample contributions to my work. I acknowledge their contribution in gratitude.

I offer my cordial gratitude to my parents Md. Samsuddin and Most. Rumicha Begum who have shown me a good dream of bright future and brought me up in the way what just I am. I thank my wife Mahabuba Khanam who wanted me to be a PhD degree holder and was ready to be sacrifice of the time and attachment that was hers. My little lovely children—Wasif-ur-rahman has been deprived of the due time, attention and affection for my research work. I believe that once he will feel the cause of his deprivation and will understand that his sacrifice did not go in vain. May Allah bless him abundantly.

I am also thankful to my mother in law Mst. Afroza Khatun and brother in law Md. Juel who extended their helping hands to my family during my research work. Without their contributions it was not possible to complete this tremendous task.

Finally, I thank all the respondents for giving me their time, patience and cooperation in collecting primary data. All of the respondents shared me with their knowledge, attitude, and experience that helped me to write down such a dissertation.

Md. Wahiduzzaman  
Rajshahi  
January, 2016



## ABSTRACT

Job satisfaction and Professional commitment among public sector employees, specifically the education sector is becoming an area of major concern as highlighted by recent research. As there is no study found whether BCS general education cadre officers are satisfied with job and committed to their profession, this study aims to evaluate the levels of job satisfaction and levels of professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre and to analyze the factors that impact the job satisfaction and professional commitment of them.

Relevant literature has been reviewed to develop a conceptual framework and to identify the variables of the study. Job satisfaction and professional commitment are two dependent variables and identified independent variables are grouped under demographic, HRM, institutional, job stressors and job characteristics. Based on the objectives some hypothesis were developed which have been tested in this study.

Both primary and secondary data were used in this study. Primary data were collected using structured questionnaire by survey method from 374 BCS general education cadre officers from different types of government academic institutions and education management office. Four numbers of FGD have been conducted to justify the data. Secondary data was collected from related thesis, journals, books, authentic websites, newspaper etc. Data were analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS).

The findings indicate the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre are moderately satisfied considering every aspect of job into account on an average. But specifically, they are not satisfied regarding extrinsic and intrinsic aspects of their job. Results also indicate that high level of Affective Professional Commitment (APC), moderate level of Continuous Professional Commitment (CPC) and Normative Professional

Commitment are present among the education cadre officers. The independent variables (Demographic, HRM, Institutional, Job stressors and characteristics) strongly impact the job satisfaction and professional commitment of the BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre officers. Among the demographic factors, designation, appointment type, location of Institute, occupational group, age, and job tenure are significant influencing factors of job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. Female officers are more satisfied than male officers.

HRM factors are most significant predictors of job satisfaction and professional commitment of the BCS general education officers. The respondents are relatively satisfied with recruitment & selection procedure and their job security. On the other hand, they are dissatisfied with posting & transfer, promotion, training, and performance appraisal system of the education cadre. Result revealed that salary & benefits, career development, job security, promotion, justice & equity and posting & transfer factors have significant impact on job satisfaction and professional commitment.

The study has found that, from institutional factors interpersonal relation among the officers is good and logistic support, morality are important significant influencing factors of job satisfaction and professional commitment. Among the job related variables, job conflict, autonomy, task variety and support from the boss are most significant predictors of job satisfaction and professional commitment of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre officers.

Finally, the results of this study are significant for policy and practice. It may assist policy formulation and implementation to enhance job satisfaction and professional commitment of the BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre officers which ultimately improve performance.

## Table of Contents

| <b>Topics</b>  | <b>Page</b>  |
|--|--------------|
| Acknowledgement  | I            |
| Abstract   | III          |
| Table of Contents  | V-XI         |
| List of Tables   | XII          |
| List of Figures  | XVII         |
| List of the Abbreviation   | XVIII        |
| <br>   |              |
| <b>Chapter One: Introduction</b>   | <b>1-11</b>  |
| 1.1 Background   | 1            |
| 1.2 Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment of BCS (Gen. Ed.) Cadre       | 3            |
| 1.3 Problem statement  | 4            |
| 1.4 Research Question  | 6            |
| 1.5 Objectives of the Study  | 6            |
| 1.6 Specific objectives of the study   | 6            |
| 1.7 Significance of the Study  | 7            |
| 1.8 Operational Definitions  | 8            |
| 1.9 Organization of Thesis   | 10           |
| <br>   |              |
| <b>Chapter Two: Review of Literature and Theoretical Framework</b>             | <b>12-44</b> |
| 2.1 Introduction   | 12           |
| 2.2 Research on Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment in Global Context | 12           |
| 2.3 Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment in Bangladesh                 | 16           |
| 2.4 Justification of the Study   | 20           |
| 2.5 Theoretical Framework of Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment      | 21           |
| 2.5.1 Development of the concept of Job Satisfaction                           | 21           |
| 2.6 Defining Job Satisfaction  | 23           |
| 2.7 Theories of Job Satisfaction   | 25           |
| 2.7.1 Content Theories   | 25           |
| 2.7.2 Process Theory   | 28           |

|   |              |
|---|--------------|
| 2.8 Measuring Job Satisfaction                                      | 31           |
| 2.9 Development of the concept of Professional Commitment           | 33           |
| 2.10 Defining Professional Commitment                               | 34           |
| 2.11 Theories of Professional Commitment                            | 35           |
| 2.12 Consequences of Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment   | 38           |
| 2.12.1 Consequences of Job Satisfaction                             | 38           |
| 2.12.2 Consequences of Professional Commitment                      | 39           |
| 2.13 Determinants of Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment   | 40           |
| 2.14 Conceptual Framework and Hypothesis                            | 41           |
| 2.14.1 Conceptual Framework:  | 41           |
| 2.14.2 Hypothesis Development                                       | 43           |
| 2.15 Conclusion   | 43           |
| <b>Chapter Three: Research Methodology</b>                          | <b>45-57</b> |
| 3.1 Introduction  | 45           |
| 3.2 Research Design   | 45           |
| 3.3 Sampling Procedure  | 46           |
| 3.3.1 Population of the Study                                       | 46           |
| 3.3.2 Sample Frame  | 47           |
| 3.3.3 Identifying the sample units and Determination of Sample Size | 48           |
| 3.4 Procedure of Data Collection                                    | 52           |
| 3.4.1 Primary Data  | 52           |
| 3.4.2 Secondary Data  | 53           |
| 3.5 Field Work  | 53           |
| 3.5.1 Pilot Study   | 53           |
| 3.6. Data Reliability and Validity                                  | 54           |
| 3.6.1 Reliability   | 54           |
| 3.6.2 Validity  | 54           |
| 3.7 Data Processing, Analysis and Presentation                      | 55           |
| 3.8 Conclusion  | 57           |

## **Chapter Four: Bangladesh Civil Service and General Education**

|   |              |
|---|--------------|
| <b>Cadre: An Overview</b>                                   | <b>58-86</b> |
| 4.1 Introduction  | 58           |
| 4.2 Public sector Management in Bangladesh                  | 58           |
| 4.3 Bangladesh Civil Service                                | 59           |
| 4.4 Cadre Service in Bangladesh                             | 60           |
| 4.5 Recruitment and Selection System of Cadre Officials     | 61           |
| 4.6 BCS (Gen. Ed.) Cadre                                    | 63           |
| 4.6.1 Recruitment and Selection of BCS (Gen. Ed.) Cadre     | 64           |
| 4.6.2 Administration and Management                         | 67           |
| 4.6.3. Functional Structure                                 | 70           |
| 4.6.4 Promotion Scenario                                    | 76           |
| 4.6.5. Posting and Transfer                                 | 81           |
| 4.6.6. Some Burning Problems in BCS General Education Cadre | 84           |
| 4.7. Conclusion   | 86           |

## **Chapter Five: Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment**

|   |               |
|---|---------------|
| <b>differences in relation to Demographic Factors</b>                           | <b>87-142</b> |
| 5.1 Introduction  | 87            |
| 5.2 Important Demographic Factors   | 87            |
| 5.3 Data Analysis and Interpretation  | 90            |
| 5.3.1 Profile of the Respondents  | 90            |
| 5.3.2 Level of Job Satisfaction   | 93            |
| 5.3.3 Level of Professional Commitment  | 95            |
| 5.4 Exploring the Relationship and Test of Hypothesis                           | 97            |
| 5.4.1 Designation and Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment              | 98            |
| 5.4.2 Type of Appointment and Job Satisfaction and Professional<br>Commitment   | 102           |
| 5.4.3 Category of Institute and Job Satisfaction and Professional<br>Commitment | 106           |
| 5.4.4 Location of Institute and Job Satisfaction and Professional<br>Commitment | 110           |

|   |                |
|---|----------------|
| 5.4.5 Occupational Group and Job Satisfaction and Professional<br>Commitment  | 114            |
| 5.4.6 Gender and Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment   | 118            |
| 5.4.7 Age and Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment  | 121            |
| 5.4.8 Tenure of job and Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment  | 125            |
| 5.4.9 Education and Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment  | 129            |
| 5.5 Major Findings  | 133            |
| 5.5.1 Level of Job Satisfaction   | 133            |
| 5.5.2 Level of Professional Commitment  | 133            |
| 5.5.3 Job Satisfaction Differences in relation to Demographic Factors   | 133            |
| 5.5.4 Relationship between Demographic Factors and Job Satisfaction   | 136            |
| 5.5.5 Professional Commitment Differences in relation to Demographic<br>Factors                                     | 138            |
| 5.5.6 Relationship between Demographic Factors and Professional<br>Commitment                                       | 140            |
| 5.6 Conclusion  | 142            |
| <b>Chapter Six: Impact of Human Resource Management on Job<br/>        Satisfaction and Professional Commitment</b> | <b>143-167</b> |
| 6.1 Introduction  | 143            |
| 6.2 HRM Practices and Job satisfaction  | 143            |
| 6.3 HRM Practices and Professional Commitment   | 144            |
| 6.4 Important HRM Practices   | 144            |
| 6.5 Respondents' satisfaction regarding HRM factors   | 147            |
| 6.6 Analysis the impact of HRM practices on job satisfaction and professional<br>commitment and Test of Hypothesis  | 150            |
| 6.6.1 The extent to which HRM factors influenced job satisfaction and<br>professional commitment                    | 152            |
| 6.6.2 Test of Hypothesis  | 163            |
| 6.7 Major Findings  | 165            |
| 6.7.1 Perception of Officers to the HRM Factors   | 166            |
| 6.7.2 Impact of HRM Factors on Job Satisfaction   | 166            |
| 6.7.3 Impact of HRM Factors on Professional Commitment  | 167            |

|   |                |
|---|----------------|
| <b>Chapter Seven: Influence of Institutional Factors, Job Stressors and Job Characteristics on Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment</b>               | <b>168-199</b> |
| 7.1 Influence of Institutional Factors  | 168            |
| 7.1.1 Introduction  | 168            |
| 7.1.2 Internal Factors  | 168            |
| 7.1.3 External Factors  | 169            |
| 7.1.4 Respondents' satisfaction regarding Institutional (Internal and External) Factors.  | 170            |
| 7.1.5 Identify the influencing Institutional Factors of job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre                  | 171            |
| 7.1.6 Test of Hypothesis  | 180            |
| 7.2 Influence of Job Stressors and Job Characteristic on Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment   | 181            |
| 7.2.1 Introduction  | 181            |
| 7.2.2 Job Stressors   | 181            |
| 7.2.3 Perception of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre regarding Job Stressor   | 182            |
| 7.2.4 Job Characteristics   | 183            |
| 7.2.5 Perception of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre regarding Job Characteristic   | 184            |
| 7.2.6 Identify the influencing Job Stressors and Job Characteristics of job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. | 185            |
| 7.2.7 Test of Hypothesis  | 195            |
| 7.3 Major Findings  | 196            |
| 7.3.1 Perception to Institutional Factors   | 196            |
| 7.3.2 Identified Significant Institutional Factors of Job Satisfaction  | 196            |
| 7.3.3 Identified Significant Institutional Factors of Professional Commitment   | 197            |
| 7.3.4 Impact of Job Stressors and Job Characteristics on Job Satisfaction   | 198            |
| 7.3.5 Impact of Job Stressors and Job Characteristics on Professional Commitment  | 199            |
| 7.4 Conclusion  | 199            |

|  |                |
|--|----------------|
| <b>Chapter Eight: Combined Influence of Demographic Factors, HRM Practices, Institutional Factors, Job Stressors and Job Characteristics on Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment</b>                     | <b>200-220</b> |
| 8.1 Introduction   | 200            |
| 8.2 Impact of Independent Variables on Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment of the Officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) Cadre.   | 201            |
| 8.2.1 Predictors of Job Satisfaction   | 202            |
| 8.2.2 Predictors of Professional Commitment  | 210            |
| 8.3 Major Findings   | 219            |
| 8.4 Conclusion   | 220            |
| <br>   |                |
| <b>Chapter Nine: Summary of Findings, Conclusion and Implication</b>   | <b>221-239</b> |
| 9.1 Introduction   | 221            |
| 9.2 Summary of Findings  | 221            |
| 9.2.1 The level of job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre and the relationship between demographic factors with job satisfaction and with professional commitment. | 221            |
| 9.2.2 The relationship between HRM factors with job satisfaction and with professional commitment.   | 224            |
| 9.2.3 The relationship between Institutional factors with Job satisfaction and with Professional commitment.   | 227            |
| 9.2.4 The relationship between Job Stressors and Job Characteristics with Job satisfaction and with Professional commitment.   | 228            |
| 9.2.5 Combined influence and Common Factors of job satisfaction and Professional Commitment  | 229            |
| 9.3 Conclusion   | 233            |
| 9.4 Policy Implication   | 234            |
| 9.5 Limitations of the Study   | 237            |
| 9.6 Contribution to Knowledge  | 238            |
| 9.7 Directions for Future Research   | 238            |



|   |                |
|---|----------------|
| <b>Bibliography</b>   | <b>240-250</b> |
| <b>Appendix</b>   | <b>251-268</b> |
| <b>Appendix A:</b> Letter of Introduction and Questionnaire   | 251            |
| <b>Appendix B:</b> Session of Focus Group Discussion (FGD) and Checklist  | 258            |
| <b>Appendix C:</b> Summary of Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients for study<br>Variables                                      | 260            |
| <b>Appendix D:</b> Correlation Matrix for HRM factors and Job satisfaction and<br>professional commitment                         | 261            |
| <b>Appendix E:</b> Correlation Matrix for Institutional factors and Job satisfaction<br>and professional commitment               | 262            |
| <b>Appendix F:</b> Correlation Matrix for Job stressors & Job characteristics and<br>Job satisfaction and professional commitment | 263            |
| <b>Appendix G:</b> BCS Composition and Cadre Rules of 1980<br>(General Education Part)  | 264            |

## List of Tables

| <b>Table No.</b>   | <b>Page No.</b> |
|--|-----------------|
| Table 3.1: The numbers of sampled institutions are as follows  | 48              |
| Table 3.2: The Selected Institutions and numbers of the officers are as follows                            | 49              |
| Table 3.3: The Selected Institutions and sample size of the study are as follows                           | 51              |
| Table 4.1: Recruitment Procedure of BCS (Gen. Ed.) Cadre   | 66              |
| Table 4.2: Service Length of different batch   | 78              |
| Table 4.3: Subject-wise Promotional Picture  | 80              |
| Table 5.1: Summery of Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents                                       | 91-92           |
| Table 5.2: Overall Job Satisfaction of the Respondents   | 94              |
| Table 5.3: Summary Results of level of Job Satisfaction of the officers of<br>BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.        | 94              |
| Table 5.4: Summary Results of level of Professional Commitment of the officers of<br>BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. | 96              |
| Table 5.5: Designation and Level of Job Satisfaction and Level of Professional<br>Commitment               | 98              |
| Table 5.6: Designation and Job Satisfaction (ANOVA)  | 100             |
| Table 5.7: Designation and Professional Commitment (ANOVA)   | 101             |
| Table 5.8: Type of appointment and level of Job Satisfaction and Level<br>of Professional Commitment       | 102             |
| Table 5.9: Appointment type and Job Satisfaction (ANOVA)   | 104             |
| Table 5.10: Appointment type and Professional commitment (ANOVA)   | 105             |
| Table 5.11: Category of Institute and Level of Job Satisfaction and Level<br>of Professional Commitment    | 107             |
| Table 5.12: Institute category and Job Satisfaction (ANOVA)  | 108             |
| Table 5.13: Institute category and Professional Commitment (ANOVA)   | 109             |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Table 5.14: Location of Institute and Level of Job Satisfaction and Level<br>of Professional Commitment        | 111 |
| Table 5.15: Location of Institute and Job Satisfaction (ANOVA)   | 112 |
| Table 5.16: Location of Institute and Professional Commitment (ANOVA)  | 113 |
| Table 5.17: Occupational Group and Level of Job Satisfaction and Level<br>of Professional Commitment           | 114 |
| Table 5.18: Occupational Group and Job Satisfaction and Professional commitment<br>(ANOVA)                     | 116 |
| Table 5.19: Gender and Level of Job Satisfaction and Level of Professional<br>Commitment                       | 118 |
| Table 5.20: Gender and Job Satisfaction (ANOVA)  | 119 |
| Table 5.21: Gender and Professional Commitment (ANOVA)   | 120 |
| Table 5.22: Age and Level of Job Satisfaction and Level of Professional<br>Commitment                          | 121 |
| Table 5.23: Age and Job Satisfaction (ANOVA)   | 123 |
| Table 5.24: Age and Professional commitment (ANOVA)  | 124 |
| Table 5.25: Tenure of job and Level of Job Satisfaction and Level of Professional<br>Commitment                | 125 |
| Table 5.26: Tenure of job and Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment<br>(ANOVA)                          | 127 |
| Table 5.27: Highest Education and Level of Job Satisfaction and Level<br>of Professional Commitment.           | 129 |
| Table 5.28: Educational level and Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment<br>(ANOVA)                      | 131 |
| Table 5.29: Summary of Level of Job Satisfaction in relation to Demographic Factors<br>of BCS (Gen. Ed.) Cadre | 134 |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Table 5.30: Relationship between Demographic Factors and Job Satisfaction   | 137 |
| Table 5.31: Summary of Level of Professional Commitment in relation to<br>Demographic Factors of BCS (Gen. Ed.) Cadre | 139 |
| Table 5.32: Relationship between Demographic Factors and Professional<br>Commitment                                   | 141 |
| Table 6.1: Level of Satisfaction regarding HRM Factors  | 148 |
| Table 6.2: Multiple Regression Predicting Overall Job Satisfaction  | 152 |
| Table 6.3: Rank order of HRM Factor according to significance level   | 153 |
| Table 6.4: Multiple Regression Predicting Extrinsic Job Satisfaction  | 154 |
| Table 6.5: Rank order of HRM Factor according to significance level   | 155 |
| Table 6.6: Multiple Regression Predicting Intrinsic Job Satisfaction  | 156 |
| Table 6.7: Rank order of HRM Factor according to significance level   | 157 |
| Table 6.8: Multiple Regression Predicting Affective Professional Commitment   | 158 |
| Table 6.9: Rank order of HRM Factor according to significance level   | 159 |
| Table 6.10: Multiple Regression Predicting Continuous Professional<br>Commitment                                      | 160 |
| Table 6.11: Rank order of HRM Factor according to significance level  | 161 |
| Table 6.12: Multiple Regression Predicting Normative Professional Commitment  | 162 |
| Table 6.13: Rank order of HRM Factor according to significance level  | 163 |
| Table 6.14: Impacting HRM Factors of Job Satisfaction   | 166 |
| Table 6.15: Impacting HRM Factors of Professional Commitment  | 167 |
| Table 7.1: Level of Satisfaction Regarding Institutional (Internal and External)                                      | 170 |
| Table 7.2: Multiple Regression Predicting Overall Job Satisfaction  | 173 |
| Table 7.3: Multiple Regression Predicting Extrinsic Job Satisfaction  | 174 |
| Table 7.4: Multiple Regression Predicting Intrinsic Job Satisfaction  | 175 |
| Table 7.5: Multiple Regression Predicting Affective Professional Commitment   | 177 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Table 7.6: Multiple Regression Predicting Continuous Professional Commitment   | 178 |
| Table 7.7: Multiple Regression Predicting Normative Professional Commitment  | 179 |
| Table 7.8: Level of Perception to the Job Stressor   | 182 |
| Table 7.9: Level of Perception to the Job Characteristics  | 184 |
| Table 7.10: Multiple Regression Predicting Overall Job Satisfaction  | 186 |
| Table 7.11: Multiple Regression Predicting Extrinsic Job Satisfaction  | 188 |
| Table 7.12: Multiple Regression Predicting Intrinsic Job Satisfaction  | 189 |
| Table 7.13: Multiple Regression Predicting Affective Professional Commitment   | 191 |
| Table 7.14: Multiple Regression Predicting Continuous Professional Commitment  | 192 |
| Table 7.15: Multiple Regression Predicting Continuous Professional Commitment  | 194 |
| Table 7.16: Significant Institutional Factors of Job Satisfaction  | 196 |
| Table 7.17: Significant Institutional Factors of Professional Commitment   | 197 |
| Table 7.18: Impact of Job Stressors and Job Characteristics on Job Satisfaction  | 198 |
| Table 7.19: Impact of Job Stressors and Job Characteristics on Professional<br>Commitment  | 199 |
| Table-8.1: Hierarchical Multiple Regression Predicting Overall Job Satisfaction<br>(OJS)   | 202 |
| Table 8.2: List of Significant Variables of Overall Job Satisfaction   | 204 |
| Table-8.3: Hierarchical Multiple Regression Predicting Extrinsic Job Satisfaction<br>(EJS) of the Officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.        | 205 |
| Table 8.4: List of Significant Variables of Extrinsic Job Satisfaction   | 207 |
| Table-8.5: Hierarchical Multiple Regression Predicting Intrinsic Job Satisfaction<br>(IJS) of the Officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.        | 208 |
| Table 8.6: List of Significant Variables of Intrinsic Job Satisfaction   | 210 |
| Table-8.7: Hierarchical Multiple Regression Predicting Affective Professional<br>Commitment (APC) of the Officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. | 211 |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Table 8.8: List of Significant Variables of APC   | 213 |
| Table-8.9: Hierarchical Multiple Regression Predicting Continuous Professional<br>Commitment (CPC) of the Officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. | 214 |
| Table 8.10: List of Significant Variables of Continuous Professional Commitment<br>(CPC)  | 216 |
| Table-8.11: Hierarchical Multiple Regression Predicting Normative Professional<br>Commitment (NPC) of the Officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. | 217 |
| Table 8.12: List of Significant Variables of Continuous Professional Commitment<br>(CPC)  | 219 |

## **List of Figures**

| <b>Figure No.</b>   | <b>Page No.</b> |
|---|-----------------|
| Figure 2.1: Equity Theory of Job Satisfaction   | 29              |
| Figure 2.2: Discrepancy Theory of Job Satisfaction  | 30              |
| Figure 2.3: Equity-Discrepancy Theory of Job Satisfaction   | 31              |
| Figure 2.4: Conceptual Framework of the Research  | 42              |
| Figure-4.1: Steps of Direct Recruitment Process of BCS Cadre  | 62              |
| Figure-4.2: Administrative and Management Structure of BCS general education<br>cadre.                                    | 67              |
| Figure-4.3: Administrative & Management Structure of BCS general education cadre<br>in Ministry of Education.             | 68              |
| Figure-4.4: Administrative & Management Structure of BCS general education cadre<br>in DSHE.                              | 69              |
| Figure 4.5: Administrative & Management Structure of BCS general education cadre<br>in Academic Institution.              | 70              |
| Figure-4.6: Functional Structure of BCS general education cadre   | 72              |
| Figure- 9.1: Model of Common Significant Predictors of Job Satisfaction of the<br>Officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre        | 230             |
| Figure- 9.2: Model of Common Significant Predictors of Professional Commitment of<br>the Officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre | 232             |

## **List of Abbreviation**

|          |   |
|----------|---|
| ACR      | Annual Confidential Report                                  |
| ANOVA    | Analysis of Variance  |
| AOC      | Affective Organizational Commitment                         |
| APC      | Affective Professional Commitment                           |
| BANBEIS  | Bangladesh Bureau of Educational Information and Statistics |
| BISE     | Board of Intermediate and Secondary Education               |
| BCS      | Bangladesh Civil Service                                    |
| BMTTI    | Bangladesh Madrasha Teachers Training Institute             |
| BPATC    | Bangladesh Public Administration Training Centre            |
| BPSC     | Bangladesh Public Service Commission                        |
| COC      | Continuance Organizational Commitment                       |
| CPC      | Continuance Professional Commitment                         |
| CSP      | Civil Service of Pakistan                                   |
| DCC      | Dhaka City Corporation                                      |
| DG       | Director General  |
| DD       | Deputy Director   |
| DIA      | Directorate of Inspection and Audit                         |
| DSHE     | Directorate of Secondary and Higher Education,              |
| FGD      | Focus Group Discussion                                      |
| Gen. Ed, | General Education   |
| GGC      | General Government College                                  |
| HSTTI    | Higher Secondary Teachers Training Institute                |



|       |  |
|-------|--|
| ICS   | Indian Civil Service   |
| JDI   | Job Descriptive Index  |
| JS    | Job Satisfaction   |
| MoEd  | Ministry of Education  |
| MoPA  | Ministry of Public Administration                                    |
| NAEM  | National Academy for Education Management                            |
| NCTB  | National Curriculum and Textbook Board                               |
| NOC   | Normative Organizational Commitment                                  |
| NPC   | Normative Professional Commitment                                    |
| NTRCA | Non-Governmental Teachers' Registration &<br>Certification Authority |
| OCQ   | Organizational Commitment Questionnaire                              |
| OSD   | Officer in Special Duty  |
| PCQ   | Professional Commitment Questionnaire                                |
| PCA   | Principal Component Analysis   |
| SPSS  | Statistical Package for the Social Science                           |
| TTC   | Teachers Training College  |

# Chapter One

## Introduction

### 1.1 Background

Right man in right place and fostering them efficiently are important principles for the smooth functioning and development of any institution. To understand the attitude of a person is most important for fostering them effectively. Job satisfaction, commitment (organizational, professional and union) and Job involvement are three components of attitude which are widely discussed in human resource management and organizational behavior.<sup>1</sup> For that reason, Job satisfaction and Professional commitment have received a lot of attention by researchers over the last three decade.

The popularity of the issues has come forward for the crucial impact of job satisfaction and professional commitment on performance of the organization or individual. For instance, different studies show that job satisfaction and professional commitment have positive impact on job performance, employee staying and negative impact on poor performance, intention to leave, tardiness.<sup>2</sup> Therefore, job satisfaction and professional commitment of human assets of an institution is important because without them all other assets are useless. So, employee satisfaction and commitment become more critical in organizational behavior for achieving the goal successfully.

Job Satisfaction is one of the widely discussed issues in organizational behavior and human resource management. Job satisfaction is defined as the extent to

---

<sup>1</sup> Stephen P. Robbins and Timothy A. Judge, *Organizational Behavior* (13<sup>th</sup> ed.; New Delli: Printic Hall of India Private Ltd., 2009), p. 113.

<sup>2</sup> E. G. Lambert and N. Hogan, "The importance of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in shaping turnover intent: A test of a causal model," *Criminal Justice Review*, vol.34, No.1 (March, 2009), pp. 96-118.

which people like or dislike their jobs.<sup>3</sup> Job satisfaction has been considered as a component of organizational commitment. Numerous studies have shown that satisfied employees are more likely to perform better, to stay in profession and be committed than dissatisfied employees. Job satisfaction is related to the motivation and performance of the employees. A group of satisfied workforce can help to attain the objectives of any organization.

The concept of commitment in the job place has been a phenomenon of ongoing interest to the researchers. The psychological attachment between an employee and the focus of their commitment assumes three distinct forms which are organizational, professional and union. Professional commitment refers to the psychological attachment to and identification with one's profession. Professional commitment is an important aspect of organizational behavior that promotes the attachment of the individual to the profession. Professional commitment means a person's belief in and acceptance of the values of his or her chosen profession or line of work, and a willingness to maintain officership in that occupation.<sup>4</sup> Professional commitment is also a significant determinant of job satisfaction.

Bangladesh Civil Service (BCS) General Education (Gen. Ed.) cadre is one of the important and numerous civil service workforces in Bangladesh. The officers of the cadre are recruited through a competitive exam conducted by Bangladesh Public Service Commission (BPSC) and mainly appointed in Government Colleges, commercial institutes, government madrasahs, and Teacher's Training Colleges (TTC) for teaching and developing the quality of education. Hierarchy of this cadre is

---

<sup>3</sup> P. E. Spector, *Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes, and Consequences. Advanced Topics in Organization Behavior* (Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc., 1997), p. 2. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781452231549>. (Accessed on 14 July, 2012).

<sup>4</sup> R. J. Vandenberg and V. Scarpello, "A longitudinal assessment of the determinant relationship between employee commitment to the occupation and the organization," *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, vol.15, No.6 (Nov, 2006), p. 535.

Lecturer, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor. Though the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre are appointed in different academic institutes for the purpose of teaching, they have to work in different administrative posts of the education sector.

The quality of education depends on the effective education system and quality of the teachers. Students, the valuable assets of the society are the main concern of the educational institution. Students are the future leaders who will take the responsibility of the society. Teachers play an important role to develop competent human resource as prime sources of knowledge and guidance of the society. So, societal development depends on the successful functioning of the educational system.

## **1.2 Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment of BCS (Gen. Ed.) Cadre**

Teaching is the largest profession in the world and teacher is called nation builder. No other profession has a responsibility as teaching to progress a society. BCS general education cadre officer, professionally known as teacher plays a vital role for development of a nation through his noble profession. But an officer cannot perform his/her multifarious tasks and responsibilities until he/she is satisfied and is committed to his/her profession. A satisfied and committed officer enjoys his/her tasks as a teacher, and his/her colleagues, students and officers of the community know that he/she enjoys teaching profession. He/she is concerned with the total development of the student and wellbeing of the society.

Since the education cadre is directly involved in secondary (administrative officers), higher secondary and partially higher education; the involvement, contribution and effort of the officers are the most important aspects for effective

educational system. Extensive study has explained that job satisfaction and professional commitment have a direct impact on the contribution and performance of the officers in different levels of profession. So the education system of Bangladesh is extensively influenced by the officers of the education cadre.

### **1.3 Problem statement**

A common perception of the citizen to the civil service employees of the country is not up to the mark. Unnecessary harassment, discourteous and arrogant behavior, delay in attending, absence from office, ignoring accountability, unwilling to correct mistakes, and making unabashed approaches for pecuniary benefits are the common behavior of the civil servant of Bangladesh.<sup>5</sup> As a whole it is not satisfactory to the general citizens.

Perception of citizens is not different regarding the officers of general education cadre and their service that they provide. Even the perception of academic officers to the administrative officers and the service they provide is negative. The most important complains against the officers of education cadre are absence from class and engagements in private tuition and coaching business. Another major problem in education system is that teachers are reluctant to serve in field level. Private tuition and coaching business have become the concern of the policy maker and guardian. As a result Ministry of Education has formulated a policy to control private tuition and coaching business and it has circulated at 20 June, 2012.

Most of the studies tend to ignore the facts that the working condition of civil service cadres is not congenial; as a result the outcome is less satisfactory.<sup>6</sup> Civil

---

<sup>5</sup> H. Zafarullah and A.S. Haque, "Public Management for Good Governance: Reforms, Regimes, and Reality in Bangladesh," *International Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. 24, No. 12, (2001), pp. 1379-1403.

<sup>6</sup> A. M. M. Shawkat Ali, *Bangladesh Civil Service: A Political Administrative Perspective* (Dhaka: University Press Limited, 2004), p. 2.

service officers are low paid compared to most of the private and multinational organizations. Moreover, lack of timely promotion, ineffective transfer policy, political influence, insufficient training facilities, poor working environment and no career plan are the common problems that de-motivate the education cadre servants and also affect their performance. Job satisfaction and commitment increase performance in classroom; reduce absenteeism in the office. As the important predictors of performance, job satisfaction and professional commitment of education cadre officers should be examined.

Bangladesh government has taken much initiative to improve quality of education in government educational institutions. The present government has formulated an education policy named, “National Education Policy 2010” for building moral, technological experts, a responsive and patriotic nation. Satisfied and committed officers of education cadre are one of the important preconditions for successful implementation of the government effort. Logically the question arises in front of us, **“whether the officers of general education cadre are satisfied with their job and committed to their profession** for attaining the goals of the government. So, to find out the answer to this question, the study is targeted.

A career in education cadre service is challenging and its impact is important for the nation. As the profession requires a great deal of thoroughness and commitment, in this profession it is important to have job satisfaction and professional commitment. But, if these education cadre officers are not satisfied and committed, they will not be able to contribute education sector of Bangladesh. Therefore, this study aims to understand the job satisfaction and commitment level with analyzing the factors that affect the satisfaction and commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre in Bangladesh.

## **1.4 Research Question**

In the light of the problem statement some specific questions have been raised which are as follows:

- a) What is the present status of job satisfaction and professional commitment levels of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) Cadre?
- b) Whether there are any differentiation in levels of job satisfaction and commitment in relation to the demographic factors of the officer of BCS (Gen. Ed.) Cadre?
- c) What are the factors that influence the job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre and to what extent?

## **1.5 Objectives of the Study**

The main objective of this study is to evaluate the levels of job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre and to analyze the factors that impact the job satisfaction and professional commitment of them.

## **1.6 Specific objectives of the study**

To attain the main objective of this study, some specific objectives are formulated which are as follows:

- a) To measure the level of job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre and to examine whether there were any differentiation in levels of satisfaction and commitment in relation to their demographic factors.
- b) To examine the human resource management factors those influence the job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

- c) To identify the institutional (internal and external) factors that influences the job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.
- d) To analyze the job stressors and job characteristics that impacts the job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed) Cadre.
- e) To find out the major contributing factors (Demographic, HRM, Institutional, Job stressors and Job characteristics) of the job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

## **1.7 Significance of the Study**

Education sector is one of the most key sectors for developing a nation. The teacher is the heart of this education process, and the success of an educational institution depends largely upon its faculty. BCS general education cadre officers are major role player of education sector in Bangladesh. Officers of this cadre are teaching mainly in government colleges, TTC, madrasha and commercial institute, and popularly known as ‘teacher’ of Govt. College. As a major part of the education sector, they are responsible for implementing government educational program. But information regarding job satisfaction and professional commitment of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre is not available due to lack of study on this respect.

This study focuses on job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS general education cadre because these are most important workplace attitudes. The study measure the level of job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers. The study also highlights what factors determining the satisfaction and commitment of the officers. Thus, this study is significant because it



assists policy maker in identifying the ways to support and enhance BCS general education cadre officers' satisfaction and commitment.

## **1.8 Operational Definitions**

**Overall Job Satisfaction:** Generally job satisfaction means the fulfillment of expectations from the job. Spector (1997) refers to job satisfaction in terms of how people feel about their jobs and different aspects of their jobs. It is the extent to which people like or dislike their jobs. It is the combination of individual's feelings and emotions about how their job affects their personal lives. Overall job satisfaction means the individual's feeling considering every aspects of the job in an average. In this study, job satisfaction is analysed in terms of extrinsic and intrinsic job satisfaction.

**Extrinsic Job Satisfaction:** Extrinsic satisfaction means the respondents satisfaction regarding extrinsic factors of the job. Herzberg (1966) termed these factors as hygiene factors such as working condition, job security, salary, status, co-workers etc. These factors do not increase satisfaction but absence of these factors could cause dissatisfaction.

**Intrinsic Job Satisfaction:** Satisfaction regarding motivational factors is intrinsic job satisfaction. A set of factors that contribute job satisfaction is called motivators such as recognition, responsibility, achievement etc. Absence of these factors does not cause dissatisfaction but their presence increase job satisfaction.

**Professional Commitment:** Professional commitment is a kind of work commitment that emphasizes the importance of a profession in one's total life. It is a high level of attachment to a profession and willingness to maintain officership in that Profession. This study examines professional commitment in terms of affective, continuance and normative commitment.

**Affective Professional Commitment (APC):** Affective professional commitment refers to involvement in, identification with and emotional attachment to the profession.

**Continuance Professional Commitment (CPC):** Continuance commitment means the employees' feelings to gain certain rewards from the profession.

**Normative Professional Commitment (NPC):** Normative commitment refers to the officers feeling of obligation to remain the profession. They feel that they ought to do so.

**Bangladesh Civil Service (BCS):** BCS generally includes all the functionaries of the government excepting those in the military service. The employees of the functionaries of the government are classified as class-I officer, class-II officer, class-III employee and class-IV employee. All the civil servant is also broadly classified as gazetted and non-gazetted employees. All class- I and most of the class-II government employees are treated as gazetted officer. Within the class- I officers, some belong to the cadre services.

**General Education (Gen. Ed.) Cadre:** Cadre service refers to those services which are constituted under law with a number of positions, recruitment and promotion rules. According to BCS (Gen. Ed.) Composition and Cadre Rules-1980, general education cadre consists of (a) person who were appointed substantively to class-1 permanent posts on the education side in or under the Central Government in the Ministry of Education and non-teaching posts in the technical institutions of the East Pakistan on or before 25/3/1971; (b) person appointed on or after 26/3/1971 to the post or posts which are included in the cadre; and (c) persons appointed to the cadre after 1/9/1980.

## 1.9 Organization of Thesis

This study is organized in nine chapters and presented as following sequence.

**Chapter one** introduces the study by outlining the main theme of the research. In this chapter, background and problem of the study is discussed. The chapter also includes research questions, objectives of the study, significance of the study, operational definition.

**Chapter two** provides a thorough review of relevant literature and theoretical assessment of major concept of job satisfaction and professional commitment. The relevant theories, models and findings related to job satisfaction and professional commitment are discussed. It also explains the instrument used for the measurement of job satisfaction and professional commitment. A conceptual framework and some testable hypothesis have been developed in this chapter.

**Chapter three** focuses on the methodology adopted for the study. The research design, population, sampling procedure, data collection methods, questionnaire development, reliability and validity of the measurement scale and data analysis techniques are presented in this chapter.

**Chapter four** discusses a snapshot on the Civil Service and BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre in Bangladesh. Introduction of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre, recruitment procedure, structure of management, promotion and transfer system are presented in the chapter.

**Chapter five** deals with the relationship between demographic factors and job satisfaction and professional commitment of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre officers. Measuring the level job satisfaction and professional commitment, variation of satisfaction and commitment level among BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre officers and important impacting personal variables are presented in the chapter.

**Chapter six** presents impact of Human Resource Management (HRM) practice on job satisfaction and professional commitment of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. Perception to HRM factors and interpretation of relationships among the variables are discussed. The significant factors are identified in the chapter.

**Chapter seven** focuses on the influences of institutional factor, job stressors and characteristics on job satisfaction and professional commitment of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre officers. Multiple regression analysis is used to find the predictors of job satisfaction and professional commitment.

**Chapter eight** analyses the impact of independent variables on dependent variables jointly. The common impacting factors are presented in this chapter.

**Chapter nine** is final chapter and presents summary of findings, policy implications, limitations, direction for further research. It also presents models representing the most important common impacting factors of job satisfaction and professional commitment among the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

# Chapter Two

## Review of Literature and Theoretical Framework

### 2.1 Introduction

Review of literature provides relevant information regarding the research topic and knowledge gap. The various researchers who have contributed relevant task on job satisfaction and professional commitment have been chosen to get insight of the contribution. The researches in the area of job satisfaction and professional commitment have conducted on different aspects in different context. On the other hand, many scholars have provided theoretical analysis regarding the aspects. To acquire sufficient knowledge about the constructs, it is important to study related articles, books, reports, journals, thesis etc. This chapter provides a review of both empirical and theoretical literature on the key dependent variables of the study namely: job satisfaction and professional commitment. The following sections provide some contributions of different researchers to find out the research gap and develop a research frame work.

### 2.2 Research on Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment in Global Context

**Kabungaidze et al (2013)**<sup>7</sup> studied on the impact of job satisfaction and some demographic factors on employee turnover intention and discussed about attraction to the job, retention of teachers in rural school are the important issues in the education sectors today. The research found that age, tenure and specialization can predict

---

<sup>7</sup> Trust Kabungaidze, Nomakholwa and Ngirande, "The impact of job satisfaction and some demographic variables on employee turnover intention" *International journal of business administration*, Vol. 4, No. 1 pp. 53-65 2013.

employee turnover intention. The finding indicates that the authorities should develop strategies to deal with the need of less satisfied teachers.

**Rehman et al (2012)**<sup>8</sup> conducted the study on “The Impact of Job Stress on employee Job satisfaction: A study on Private College of Pakistan” and contradict with the prior result that job stress positively relate to the employee job satisfaction. The study reinforces the importance of employee job satisfaction which is essential for successful organization.

**Naeem et al (2011)**<sup>9</sup> investigated the level of job satisfaction of civil servants of Maldives and explain the relationship between job satisfaction and salary, supervision and coworkers. The findings indicated that civil servants were satisfied with their job and statistically positive relationships existed between the dependent variable and the aspects of job satisfaction.

**Dinah (2010)**<sup>10</sup> conducted a study on organizational commitment and job satisfaction in higher education in Kenyan perspective. The findings indicated that Meyer and Allen’s multidimensional organizational commitment was applicable in the Kenyan context. She found that personal characteristics, job and role-related factors, professional commitment and HR practices were the stronger predictors of organizational commitment, job satisfaction and turnover intentions for academics than for the administrative employees. She concluded that age, education, professional commitment, role overload, supervisory support, job security,

---

<sup>8</sup> Mutie ur Rehman, Rabbia Irum, Namra Tahir and Umme Salma, The Impact of Job Stress on Employee Job Satisfaction: A Study on Private College of Pakistan”, *Journal of Business Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 3, No. 3, pp. 50-56.

<sup>9</sup> Hussain Naeem, et al, “Job Satisfaction of Civil Servants (An Evidence from the Republic of Maldives)” *2<sup>nd</sup> International Conference on Business and Economic Research*, 2011, pp.1330-1345, <http://www.academia.edu/919310/>, (accessed on 18 September, 2012).

<sup>10</sup>Dinah Jeruto Kipkebut, “Organisational Commitment and Job satisfaction in higher educational institutions: the Kenyan case”, PhD diss. Middlesex University, 2010, pp. 1-310, <http://eprints.mdx.ac.uk/6509/> (accessed on 26 June,2012)

promotional opportunities, distributive justice and participation in decision making were the most important predictors of organizational commitment, job satisfaction and turnover intentions among employees in Kenyan universities.

**Nilufar et al (2009)**<sup>11</sup> studied an empirical study about the impact of job stress on job satisfaction of university staff in Malaysia. They investigated the relationship between job stress and job satisfaction. The determinants of job stress that have been examined under this study include, management role, relationship with others, workload pressure, homework interface, role ambiguity, and performance pressure. The results show there is a significant relationship between four of the constructs tested. The results also show that there is significant negative relationship between job stress and job satisfaction.

**Zahi Uddin Butt (2009)**<sup>12</sup> studied on the relationship between occupational stress and organizational commitment. Similar with prior research, an inverse relationship was found between occupational stress and organizational commitment. The level of occupational stress experienced by NGO employees was found to be high. The occupational roles that employees play were reported as the main source of stress. Normative commitment was reported as the strongest form of commitment. Demographic variables of age, experience, job position and income as well as gender significantly influenced the relationship between occupational stress and organizational commitment.

---

<sup>11</sup> Nilufar Ahsan et al, "A Study of Job Stress on Job Satisfaction among University Staff in Malaysia: Empirical Study" *European Journal of Social Sciences* – Volume 8, Number 1 (2009), pp. 121-131.

<sup>12</sup> Zahir Uddin Butt, "The Relationship between Occupational Stress and Organizational Commitment in Nongovernmental Organization of Pakistan." PhD diss. National University of Modern Language Islamabad, 2009, pp. 1-208. <http://eprints.hec.gov.pk/7207/> (accessed on 16 June 2012).

**Tahir (2006)**<sup>13</sup> examined the effects of job characteristics on organizational citizenship behaviors. He also considered the role of job characteristics, job satisfaction and organizational commitment in order to better understanding of citizenship behaviors. The study was aim to investigate the effects of job characteristics on job satisfaction and organizational commitment. In general, the findings showed that some job characteristics might be the antecedents of job satisfaction and commitment. Specifically, the job characteristics of task identity, autonomy, and aggregate job scope were positively associated with the work attitude of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. In turn, job satisfaction and organizational commitment were positively associated with the citizenship behavior.

**Karen S Myers (2005)**<sup>14</sup> studied on a combination of factors that affect teacher satisfaction and retention .In this study, researcher grouped the influencing factors which are: emotional factors; school and community support; instructional support; preparation in teaching curriculum, managing students, and assessing students; collaboration; compensation and benefits; motivation to teach; and culture shock. Results of the discriminant analysis indicated that the best predictor in choosing to leave or stay in the teaching profession was emotional factors followed by compensation and benefits and culture shock.

**Jeffry J Bagraim (2003)**<sup>15</sup> examined the dimensionality of professional commitment. Researcher collected data from 240 South African actuaries via a mailed

---

<sup>13</sup> Tahir Gokhan, “An Integrative Model of Job Characteristics, Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment and Organizational Citizenship Behavior”, PhD diss. Middle East Technical University, 2006. pp. 1-190 <https://etd.lib.metu.edu.tr/upload/12607347/index.pdf>, ( accessed on 26 June 2012)

<sup>14</sup> Karen S Myers, “Factors Affecting Job Satisfaction and Retention of Beginning Teacher”, PhD diss. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 2005, pp. 1-180, <http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/theses/available/etd-11152005-172907/unrestricted/final.pdf>, ( accessed on 9 May, 2012)

<sup>15</sup> Jeffry J Baraim, “The Dimensionality of Professional Commitment”, *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 2003, 29 (2),pp 6-9.



questionnaire. The respondents were officers of the South African Actuarial Society employed in the financial services industry. Statistical analysis conducted on the data showed that the 3-component model first proposed by Meyer, Allen and Smith (1993) is appropriate for understanding professional commitment amongst South African professionals. The analysis also showed that South African actuaries are highly committed to their profession.

**Ronald (1997)**<sup>16</sup> studied on the teacher commitment in public school in Saskatchewan. Researcher found that the three dimension of commitment; organizational, professional and union have present in the teacher. Work experience, job characteristic and leadership style are the prominent factors that affect teacher commitment.

## **2.3 Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment in**

### **Bangladesh**

**Taifa Siddika (2012)**<sup>17</sup> studied on the job satisfaction of civil servant working at field level in Bangladesh. Civil Servants from 6 cadres: administration, health, family planning, agriculture, fisheries and livestock were the sample of that study. The results of the study indicate that the civil servants at field level are moderately satisfied. She also found that transfer and posting, work and working environment and promotion and recognition are the significant predictor of Job Satisfaction.

---

<sup>16</sup> Ronald Kadyschuk, "Teacher Commitment: A study of the Organizational Commitment, Professional Commitment, and Union Commitment of Teachers in Public Schools in Saskatchewan", PhD diss, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, 1997, pp. 1-296. <http://library.usask.ca/theses/available/etd-10212004-000011/unrestricted/nq23977.pdf>, (accessed on 20 July, 2012).

<sup>17</sup> Mir Taifa Siddika, "Job Satisfaction : A study on Civil Servant Working at Field Level in Bangladesh", Masters Thesis, North South University, Bangladesh, 2012, pp. 1- 85.

**Mizanur Rahman and Solaiman Chowdhury (2012)**<sup>18</sup> studied on private university in Bangladesh to find out the important factors which determine job satisfaction of university teachers. Empirical result reveals that job satisfaction and turnover happen due to job security, promotional opportunity, working autonomy, professional development, working environment, compensation package, and financial benefits.

**Rifayat Islam, Tauhid Rasul and Wali Ullah (2012)**<sup>19</sup> tried to find out the main factors of job satisfaction and the impact on the job satisfaction of the employee of private companies. The employees were selected through convenience sampling. The result indicated that coordination and leave facility, work process, reward & future opportunities, company vision, and health & insurance policy have significant influence on Job satisfaction.

**Bala Pronay (2011)**<sup>20</sup> studied to assess job satisfaction of non government college teachers in Bangladesh. The findings of the study show that teachers are not satisfied with their job without work place and training. Based on the findings, researcher suggested that some existing policies should be changed in case of promotion, equity of justice maintained in promotion and pay determination system.

**Debnath, Burmon and Biswas (2011)**<sup>21</sup> showed the differences between the administrative cadres and technical cadres considering the motivational level and performance. They found administrative cadres are more motivated than the technical

---

<sup>18</sup> Md Mizanur Rahman and Md. Solaiman Chowdhury, "Job Satisfaction and Teachers Turnover: A Study on Private Universities in Bangladesh", *Bangladesh Research Publications Journal*, Vol. 7, Issues. 2, Agust,2012, pp. 142-152.

<sup>19</sup> Md. Rifayat, Md. Tauhid Rasul and G.M. Wali Ullah, "Analysis of the Factors that Affect on Satisfaction Case Study on Private Companies Employees of Bangladesh", *European Journal of Business and Management*, V. 4 No. 4, 2012, pp. 35-46, [www.iiste.org](http://www.iiste.org), ( accessed on 10, Nov,2012)

<sup>20</sup> Bala Pronay, "Job Satisfaction of Non-government College Teacher in Bangladesh", *Journal of Education and Practice*, Vol. 2 No. 4, 2011, pp. 87-91.

<sup>21</sup> Ashok Kumar Debnath, Basanta Kumar Barman and Mrityunjoy Biswas, "Motivation of Civil Servant in Bangladesh: A Comparative Study of Technical Cadres and Administrative Cadres", *World Review of Business Journal*, Vol. 1, No. 4, September 2011, pp. 1-17.

cadres. Working condition, promotion, and recognition are the important motivating factors for technical cadres. On the hand, training facilities, promotion, compensation and status are important motivating factors for the administrative cadres.

**Hasan, et al (2010)**<sup>22</sup> investigated to find out job satisfaction-dissatisfaction impact on organizational effectiveness. They analyzed some factors such as work place, the role of training and development and its impact at work place, the relationship among the variables. They also identified some key factors which will be given policy guideline for organizational effectiveness. They revealed that job satisfaction has positive impact on organizational effectiveness and Job dissatisfaction has negative impact on organizational effectiveness.

**K. E. Hoque et al (2010)**<sup>23</sup> have conducted a study on the impact of professional development and described the teachers' professional development activities in Bangladesh. The study found significant impacts of some of teachers' professional development activities on school improvement. The study also found that the maximum school improvement can be achieved if schools give more emphasis on teachers' collaboration, in-service training and classroom observation. The study has provided some important information for concern body to improve teacher quality at school level.

**Mir Mohammad Nurul Absar et al (2010)**<sup>24</sup> conducted a study on manufacturing firms for exploring the impact of human resource practices on job satisfaction in the context of Bangladesh. The study has claimed that human resource practices have significant association with job satisfaction. In addition, human

---

<sup>22</sup> M. S Hasan, et al. "Job satisfaction and Training for Organizational Effectiveness: An Empirical Study on Bangladesh Civil Service Officers, BPATC, Dhaka. 2010.

<sup>23</sup> K. E. Haque et al, "Impact of Teachers' Professional Development of School Development- An Analysis on Bangladesh Standpoint", *Asia Pacific Educ. Rev.* (2011) 12: pp.337-348.

<sup>24</sup> Md. Nurul Absar, et al, "Impact of Human Resource Practice on Job Satisfaction: Evidence from Manufacturing Firms in Bangladesh", *Economic Science Series*, Vol.12, No.2, 2010, pp. 31-42.

resource planning, and training have positive impact on job satisfaction. It was also found that training and development has the greatest impact on job satisfaction.

**Taskina and Ireen 2009)**<sup>25</sup> studied on Job Satisfaction of Faculty Officers in Private Universities. They investigated the present level of job satisfaction among the faculty officers of private universities in Bangladesh. The attempt was to gain insights into the satisfaction levels the private university teachers. The study found that the faculty officers are overall satisfied with their present condition. But the factors like-training facilities, physical facilities and distribution of courses are dissatisfactory. It also found that there is no significant difference between male and female faculty officers regarding job satisfaction. The researchers summed up with view that universities should give more attention to motivate and maintain the human resources to make them more efficient.

**Karim (2009)**<sup>26</sup> studied on the motivational factors of civil servant and reveal that most of civil servants in Bangladesh joined the civil service motivated by public service and job security rather than salary and other career benefits. But, at present the service is not motivated by the job seeker. He opined that motivational intervention with market based salary, timely promotion based on merit and performance, rational transfer and posting policy, recognition for good work, reward and punishment would help to regain the motivation for improving and achieving result oriented organizational performance.

---

<sup>25</sup> Taskina Ali and Ireen Akther, "Job Satisfaction of Faculty Officers in Private University-In Context of Bangladesh", *International Business Research*, vol. 2, no. 4, (October, 2009), pp. 167-175.

<sup>26</sup> M. R Karim, "*Enhancing Performance through Motivation: A Study of Bangladesh Civil Service.*" MA Thesis (unpublished), Institute of Governance Studies, Brac University: Dhaka. 2009.

**Jahan (2006)**<sup>27</sup> identified some motivating and de-motivating factors of the BCS. She found that job security, status and power are the most important motivating factors to join and work in civil service. On the other hand working environment, salary, political pressure are the main de-motivating factors of the BCS. The interesting finding of the study is that despite the different de-motivating factors, meritorious students are attracted to BCS.

**Mamun, Hossai and Islam (2005)**<sup>28</sup> conducted a comparative study on senior male and female executives in Bangladesh. Both male and female executives expressed relatively higher level of agreement about their liking of coworkers and enjoying their jobs and company. Respondents confirmed that their company recognized their good work and they are aware of the goals of the company. They also claimed that male executives are enjoyed easy and direct communication comparing to the female for social and cultural reason.

## **2.4 Justification of the Study**

The review of literature reveals that large numbers of studies have been conducted on job satisfaction and professional commitment at home and abroad. Due to cultural, socio-economic and political dissimilarities, the result cannot be generalized. Several researches have conducted on the job satisfaction and professional commitment in Bangladesh which are mainly business organization and higher educational institution oriented. Researches on job satisfaction and professional commitment of BCS cadres are very few in Bangladesh. Maximum of the researchers conducted the research in general and tried to generalize the findings

---

<sup>27</sup> F.Jahan, "Public Administration in Bangladesh", CGS Working Paper-1, BRAC University, Dhaka. Available at: <(www.egs-bu.com)> (Accessed 20 March 2012).

<sup>28</sup> Md. Ziaul Haque Mmun, Anwar Hossain and Nazrul Islam, "A Comparative Study of Job Satisfaction of the Senior Male and Female Executives I Bangladesh", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 7, 2005, Dept. of Business Administration, Jahangirnagar University, Dhaka. Pp. 1- 15.

for all cadres of civil service. But every cadre has its own rules and regulations. The rules and regulation provide separate entity, hierarchy, responsibility, facility for each cadre. So, individual study is needed to explore the actual scenario of job satisfaction and professional commitment of the civil servants. Although, BCS (Gen. Ed.) is the most important cadre in terms of number and profession, research on job satisfaction and professional commitment of this cadre is scanty. Hence, a scope of in-depth study on job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre exist. So this study was aim to understand the job satisfaction and commitment level analyzing the factors that affect the satisfaction and commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre in Bangladesh.

## **2.5 Theoretical Framework of Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment**

Job satisfaction and Professional commitment have been two phenomenon of ongoing interest to researchers. These are the most important researched attitudes in the literature of industrial psychology and organizational behaviour. These two things are certainly the vital components to measure and monitor the employee in workplace for the employer. This section discuss concept, theories, measuring process, consequences of job satisfaction and professional commitment. Finally, the chapter presents a review of studies on job satisfaction and professional commitment in relation to this study.

### **2.5.1 Development of the concept of Job Satisfaction**

#### **2.5.1.1 Taylor's Scientific Management**

The importance attached to job satisfaction was already significant during the first part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The biggest foundation to the study of job satisfaction was the Taylor's *Principle and Scientific Management* (1911) that focused on the

motivation and job satisfaction of the workmen. Taylor's outlined four principles of management: "the development of true science, the scientific selection of the workman, the scientific education and development of the workman, and intimate and friendly cooperation between the management and the workman" in his renowned scientific management theory which is well-known to management scholar<sup>29</sup>. He believed that employer and employee think about the same interest, desire to prosper of each. Taylor opined that prosperity of both party is interdependent. He also suggested that prosperity will not exist long term for one party unless it exists for other party. Worker under this management should be rewarded and punished for their work. Taylor advised that it is important to provide some special incentives to the employee, such as promotion, higher wages, and better working condition if the employer demands any effort from the employee. Taylor's belief that, the workers who were rewarded, tended to report higher job satisfaction and thus maximize his/her potential.

#### **2.5.1.2 Hawthorne Studies**

The Hawthorne studies served as a prelude to the study of job satisfaction. Elton Mayo (1933) of Harvard Business School conducted the study to find out the effects of various conditions (physical, economical, social) on workers' productivity. The studies were an attempt to apply the concept of Taylor's scientific management system and the work being done at the Bell Telephone Western Electric manufacturing plant in Hawthorn. The study investigated that changes in the work conditions can have an impact on a worker's productivity. It was also found that the increase of productivity not from the changes of work conditions but from the knowledge of being observed. This impact is known as "Hawthorne Effect" in

---

<sup>29</sup> F. W Taylor, Principal of Scientific Management, New York, Harper & Brothers, p 130

organizational behavior. Those workers that were observed during the experiments worked at maximum levels to show themselves positively.<sup>30</sup> These findings provided strong evidence that employee work for purposes other than pay, which paved the way for researcher to identify other factors in job satisfaction. The importance of employee job satisfaction today gets its root from the development of this theory.

Walter Dill Scott, Hugo Munsterberg and Shoura & Sing (1998) argue that Maslow's hierarchy of need theory outlines that how people satisfy various needs in the context of their work.<sup>31</sup> This theory explains that people want to satisfy five basic needs in life: physiological needs, safety needs, social needs, esteem needs and self development needs respectively. Beside the above two theories, Maslow's need hierarchy theory served as a good foundation of the concept of job satisfaction.

## **2.6 Defining Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction is one of the most employee attitudes, which is essential for organizations in developing and retaining committed workforce for organizational success. It is the end feeling of a person after performing a task. The feeling would be positive or negative depending upon the fulfillment of need.

Despite the wide usage in industrial psychology, in behavioral science, as well as in human life, there is no generalized consensus regarding the definition of job satisfaction. Different authors have explained differently considering the various aspect of job. Hoppock (1935) defined job satisfaction as any combination of physiological, psychological and environmental circumstances that inspire a person truthfully to say I am satisfied with my job.<sup>32</sup> According to this approach, job satisfaction is influenced by different internal and external factors that cause a feeling

---

<sup>30</sup> A Brannigan & W Zwerman, 2001 The Real Hawthorne Effect, Society 38(2), p.56

<sup>31</sup> Tonia Toinette Howard Baldwin, 'Administrator Job Satisfaction in Higher Education', PhD, Thesis, Auburn University, Alabama, 2009, p. 14. Accessed on

<sup>32</sup> Hoppock, R. "Job Satisfaction", Harper and Brothers, New York, 1935, p. 47



of satisfaction. Vroom (1964) defined job satisfaction as the optimistic orientation of a person towards his or her current work role.<sup>33</sup> The definition focuses on the role of the employees in the workplace. Another scholar Locke (1976) defined job satisfaction as a pleasurable and positive emotional state caused by the appraisal of one's job or job experience.<sup>34</sup> This definition suggests that job satisfaction contains an affective component and a non affective component.

According to Davis and Nestrom (1985) job satisfaction refers to a combination of positive and negative feelings that employee have towards their job.<sup>35</sup> Job Satisfaction represents the extent to which expectations are and match in the real awards in the work place. P. E. Spector (1997), another well known scholar believed that job satisfaction is based on the level of which he or she likes their job.<sup>36</sup> It implies that job satisfaction depends on the various aspects of the job to which people like or dislike.

Weiss (2002) contended that job satisfaction is an attitude, as a positive (or negative) evaluative judgment one makes about one's job or job situation.<sup>37</sup> Mullins (2005) outlined that job satisfaction is a multifaceted and complex term which expresses different meaning to different people.<sup>38</sup> He explained that job satisfaction is usually related to motivation of the worker. It could be associated with a personal feeling of achievement, either quantitative or qualitative.

---

<sup>33</sup> Victor H. Vroom "Work and motivation", John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1964, p. 99

<sup>34</sup> E.A Locke, The Nature and causes of Job Satisfaction, In MD Dunnette ,(ED) Handbook Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Chicago Rand McNally.1976 p. 1300.

<sup>35</sup> Davis K. and Nestrom, J. W "Human Behavior at work: Organizational Behavior", Seventh Ed, McGraw Hill, New York, 1985. p. 109.

<sup>36</sup> Spector p.E. "Job satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes and Consequences", Thousand Oask, CA, Sage Publication, Inc, 1997,p.

<sup>37</sup> Weiss, H. M. "Deconstructing job satisfaction: Separating Evaluations, Beliefs and Affective experiences", Human Resource Management Review, 12(2), 2002,p 175.

<sup>38</sup> Mullins, J.L. "Management and Organizational behavior", seventh Edition, Pearson Education Limited, Essex, 2005, p. 700

George and Jones (2008) define job satisfaction is a set of feelings and beliefs that a person has about his job.<sup>39</sup> Levels of one's job satisfaction can range from extreme satisfaction to extreme dissatisfaction. Another contemporary scholar, Robbins & Judge have defined job satisfaction as a positive feeling about a job resulting from an evaluation of its characteristics.<sup>40</sup> Basically, job satisfaction links with the expectation and the aspects of job from which one can fulfill his/ her need. Different aspects, associated with job have a great impact of people's personal lives which create positive or negative feelings and belief.

## **2.7 Theories of Job Satisfaction**

Theories have been used by researcher to explain the concept of job satisfaction, are categorized in two groups. These are: a) content theories and b) process theories.

### **2.7.1 Content Theories**

Content theories aims to identify the different factors which contribute to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. These theories are:

#### **a) Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs**

Abraham Maslow, in 1954 developed hierarchy of need theory on the basis of basic human needs. He shows five basic needs that a person want to fulfill. Maslow's five levels of needs as described below in hierarchical order:

**1. Physiological needs:** Physiological needs are the primary needs or basic needs for existence. These are air, water, food, sex, etc., which are basic and most

---

<sup>39</sup> George, J.M and Jones, G.R. "Understanding and Managing Organizational Behavior", Fifth Ed. Prentice Hall, Newjersey, 2008, p. 78.

<sup>40</sup> Stephen P. Robbins and Timothy A. Judge, *Organizational Behavior* (13<sup>th</sup> ed.; New Delli: Printic Hall of India Private Ltd., 2009), p. 113

powerful. Once the primary needs are satisfied, the next need follows in the order of security, affiliation, self esteem and self actualization.

**2. Safety needs:** Safety needs are relate to individual's desires to assurance of survival and continuing satisfaction of basic needs. It also refers to safe from harm and danger.

**3. Affection or belongingness needs:** It is related to the individual's emotional and social grouping, loving, being loved, and friendship with others.

**4. Esteem needs:** The need for esteem is about respect by others. It is related to an individual's self confidence and belief in oneself.

**5. Self-actualization needs:** The last need is that of self-actualization and it relates to the need to reach one's highest potential and to attain a sense of fulfillment.<sup>41</sup> This set includes the characteristics and conditions for advancing every areas of growth including spiritual that propel a drive for oneness, justice, perfection, and beliefs.

Maslow depicted the need as pyramid style and placed the deficiency needs on the bottom, which he explains need to be satisfied first before those on the upper level can be met and satisfied. In addition, once a need has been satisfied, another emerges to take its place. The higher order needs (esteem and self actualization) are not easily satisfied in an ordinary employee unless the elements of the hierarchy of needs are met.

## **b) Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory**

Fredrick Herzberg developed Motivation-Hygiene theory, also known as two factor theory. This theory focuses on the factors of motivation that are essential for

---

<sup>41</sup> Riggio, R. E. (2003). *Introduction to Industrial/Organisational Psychology*. (4th ed). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Pearson Education Inc. p185

the employee to achieve the goals in an organization. He explained the theory in two parts by focusing the factors and paying the attention on the factors. In part one; job related factors are divided into two sets. One set of factors were related to the content of the job that provided satisfying experiences for employees. These factors include achievement, advancement, recognition, work itself, growth and responsibility which are called motivators. These factors contribute to job satisfaction and their absence does not result in job dissatisfaction of the employee. The other set of factors are non job related factors that can cause dissatisfaction of the employee, like company policy and administration, supervision, interpersonal relationships, working condition, salary, status, job security and personal life. This set of factors act as dissatisfiers and are called hygiene factors. Their absence causes dissatisfaction but their presence does not result in positive satisfaction. In second part, the theory describes which factors are important for what purpose. Paying attention on the motivators will increase job satisfaction with no impact on dissatisfaction. On the other hand, hygiene factors will not increase satisfaction but will decrease job satisfaction. This means paying attention to motivators is important to improve the organizational efficiency. Herzberg's pointed out that job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction are best viewed as two separate and parallel continua. Job satisfaction is related to content of the job and job dissatisfaction is related to context of the job.

Herzberg's Two Factor Theory has received praise and criticism in the area of job satisfaction. The same factors may serve as a satisfier for one but a dissatisfier for another. Despite this criticism, Herzberg extended Maslow's needs hierarchy concept and made it more applicable to work motivation.

### **c) McGregor's 'Theory X and Y'**

In 1960, Douglas McGregor proposed a theory depending on the views of employee which is known as theory x and y. he opined that employees are passive to their job unless they are intervened by management. This is known as Theory X. This theory suggests that by nature, people dislike work, for that reason they must be forced into doing their job to achieve goals. The theory also outlined that people will avoid responsibilities, and show little ambition.<sup>42</sup> On the other hand, theory Y is a more positive view and is based upon the assumptions that employees can view work as play and they will exercise self-direction. Although he proposed both views, McGregor believed that Theory Y assumptions were more valid than Theory X. From an employee motivation perspective, practices of theory y can increase the satisfaction of the employee.

### **2.7.2 Process Theory**


Process theories attempt to describe the interaction among variables in their relationship to job satisfaction. These theories include equity theory, expectancy theory, discrepancy theory, and equity-discrepancy theory among others.

**a) Adam's Equity Theory of Job Satisfaction:** Adam's theory of equity (1963) describe that a person's job satisfaction depends upon his perceived equity as determined by his input-output balance in comparison with the input-output balance of other's. Every individual compare the rewards that he gets from work place with 'reference group'. If he feels his reward is equitable in comparison with other contemporaries, he feels satisfied. Adams elaborated this principle into his equity theory. There he proclaimed that employees have a sense of equity in contributions to the organization on the one hand and personal rewards on the other hand.

---

<sup>42</sup> Stephen P. Robbins and Timothy A. Judge, Ibid 2007

**Figure 2.1: Equity Theory of Job Satisfaction**




Adam’s theory suggests balance between outputs like salary, benefits, responsibility, reputation, praise, and sense of achievement and inputs like hard work, skill, effort, flexibility, and adaptability is important for motivating the employees. The theory of equity implies that balance between Inputs and Outputs might enhance employees’ level of satisfaction.

**b) Vroom’s expectancy theory:** Victor Vroom’s Expectancy Motivation Theory has been used by psychologists and industrial sociologists to predict performance, effort, and job satisfaction. There are three concepts important to the Expectancy Theory: valence, instrumentality, and expectancy. Valence is the outcome an individual wishes to obtain. Instrumentality is the extent to which an individual sees an outcome leading to other outcomes. Expectancy is the likelihood of the individual obtaining the outcome they desire. Vroom’s theory starts with the idea that people tend to prefer certain goals or outcomes over others. The term *valence* is applied to this feeling about specific outcomes. If there is positive valence, having the outcome is preferred to not having it. If negative valence exists, not having the outcome is preferred. Outcomes may acquire valence either in their own right or because they are expected to lead to other outcomes that are anticipated sources of

satisfaction or dissatisfaction.<sup>43</sup> According to Vroom’s expectancy theory, the success of motivation is dependent on two factors, namely, that the value of the outcome should be high and that the individual should be of the opinion that the task undertaken is attainable and will lead to the expected outcome.<sup>44</sup> In this regard, Vroom’s theory links expectation and task accomplishment to the probability of recognition.

**c) Discrepancy Theory:** Edwin A. Locke believed that job satisfaction depends on two factors: the have-want discrepancy and the importance of satisfaction. The have-want discrepancy is determined through what a person actually receives from a job and what he expects to receive. When the rewards actually received are less than the expected rewards it causes dissatisfaction. In the word of Locke, “job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are function of perceived relationship between what one wants from job and what one perceive it is actually offering”.

**Figure 2.2: Discrepancy Theory of Job Satisfaction**




**d) Equity- Discrepancy Theory:** This theory is combination of Equity and Discrepancy theories. Lawler has adopted the difference approach of discrepancy theory rather than the ratio of equity theory. Concept of comparison from the equity

<sup>43</sup> Miner, J.B. (2007). *Organizational Behavior: From Theory to Practice*. M.E. Sharpe: New York.

<sup>44</sup> Dessler, G. (1988). *Personnel management*. (4th ed.). New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

theory is used as an intervening variable in this theory. This theory outlined that satisfaction is the difference between the outcomes one actually received and outcomes that he feels he should receive in comparing to others.

**Figure 2.3: Equity-Discrepancy Theory of Job Satisfaction**



This model reveals that a person’s perception of what s/he should receive is influenced by the inputs and outputs of others. If the inputs are similar to those of referent groups but the outcomes are less s/he is likely to be dissatisfied.

## 2.8 Measuring Job Satisfaction

Though, measuring job satisfaction is difficult, it is important for the organization. It is important to understand the level of satisfaction of the employee for better management of the institute and to achieve the goal. Several measures have been developed over the years to measure the job satisfaction. The majority of job satisfaction measures are self-reports and based on multi-item scale. The widely used instruments are as follows.

a) **The Brief Index of Affective Job Satisfaction (BIAJS):** It is a 4-item affective measure of overall affective job satisfaction. It is differ from others considering validation index. The instrument ensures comprehensive validation not



for internal consistency reliability but for cross-population invariance by nationality, job level, and job type. The measure suggested internal consistency reliability range between 0.81 and 0.87.

**b) Job Descriptive Index (JDI):** This is a well-known method to measure job satisfaction. The scale provides a multifaceted approach to the measurement of satisfaction in terms of specific identifiable characteristics related to the job.<sup>45</sup> It measures one's satisfaction in five facets: pay, promotion and promotion opportunities, co-workers, supervision, and work itself. The scale has a total of 72 items with either 9 or 18 items per scale. Each item is an evaluative adjective or short phrase that is descriptive of the job. Each of the items or phrases has a numerical value that reflects how well it describes a typical satisfying job. The scale also contains both favorable or positively worded and unfavorable or negatively worded items. The scale is simple, participant answer either yes, no or uncertain.

This scale has been used extensively in various job satisfaction surveys. Internal consistency reliabilities for JDI facets are in the .8s, and mean test-retest reliability coefficients averaged across multiple studies range from .56 to .67 across the facets. The biggest limitation of the JDI is that it has only five subscales. The JDI helps identify the strong and weak points in the principal areas of job satisfaction but does not do so for overall satisfaction.

**c) Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ):** This is another instrument to measure the job satisfaction developed by Weiss et al in 1967. The MSQ has two form of measuring satisfaction. The MSQ measure job satisfaction in 20 facets and has a long form with 100 questions (five items from each facet) and a short form with 20 questions (one item from each facet). Limitations of this scale are that it has a long

---

<sup>45</sup> Luthans, F. (2002). *Organizational behavior* (9th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

list of items and some of the items were similar to other constructs which have been used elsewhere in the questionnaire and therefore, likely to confuse the respondents.

**d) Faces Scale:** The faces scale is the easiest scale to measure job satisfaction. The measure provides overall satisfaction with just one item which participants respond to choosing a face presented by Kunin.<sup>46</sup> According to this measure some facial expression are presented to the respondent and the respondent should put a tick mark to the expression that describe his/her feeling and opinion the best.

**e) Satisfaction-Dissatisfaction statement (S-D):** In India, Pestonjee (1973) developed a S-D inventory consisting of co-interrogatory statements, the items leading to yes/no type of response. The items included four areas of both on the job and off the job factors. Each area includes 20 items some of which are job, management, social relation, personal adjustment etc.

Besides the above measurement instrument of job satisfaction, Semantic Differential Scale (SDS), Smith and Porter method are also used to measure satisfaction in different perspective.

## **2.9 Development of the concept of Professional Commitment**

The concept of commitment has a large body of research literature. Research studies initially had an organizational focus then expanded to include other dimensions such as professional commitment and union commitment. At the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, the main focus of the management was to maximize productive and profit by using the Taylor's scientific management. Although Taylor's method resulted in increased productivity and higher pay, the workers and the labour unions opposed the approach. After Hawthorne studies, manager realized that employees' productivity depends on the personal attention received by the employees. Because of

---

<sup>46</sup> Kunin T. "The construct of a new type of attitude measure", *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 8, pp. 65-67.

this characteristic, social psychologist began to pay attention to the employee behavior and developed several theories of motivation and satisfaction. Interest in studies of commitment developed from the successful Japanese management practices whereby employee commitment was seen to be a central driver to organisational success. This commitment has three dimensions such as organizational commitment, Professional commitment and union commitment. As an important factors determining people's work behavior, the topic of Professional Commitment has been attracting many researchers' attention.

## **2.10 Defining Professional Commitment**

Professional commitment has been regarded as a concept separate from organizational commitment. Professional commitment is a kind of work commitment that emphasizes the importance of a profession in one's total life.<sup>47</sup> Decades of research on professional commitment and the widespread use of professional commitment shows that researchers treats the professional commitment as uni-dimensional and multidimensional concept. Several definitions imply the uni-dimensionality of the concept. For example Vandenberg and Scarpello defined professional commitment as "a person's belief in and acceptance of the values of his or her chosen occupation or line of work, and a willingness to maintain officership in that occupation".<sup>48</sup> But the recent studies emphasize the multidimensionality of the professional commitment and the concept is well established.

The psychological attachment of an employee and focus of commitment has described in three forms. The forms are organizational commitment, professional

---

<sup>47</sup> Morrow, P. C. (1993). *The Theory and Measurement of Work Commitment*. Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press Inc.

<sup>48</sup> Vandenberg, R.J. & Scarpello, V. (1994). A longitudinal assessment of the determinant relationship between employee commitment to the occupation and the organization. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 15, 535-547.

commitment and union commitment. Each of the form has different antecedents. Professional commitment is the relative strength of identification with and involvement in one's profession. Among them organizational commitment was best explained by three distinct components. Many researchers argue that professional commitment should similarly be explained by three distinct component measures. They contended that a multidimensional understanding of professional commitment could have important implications for understanding the psychological bond between a professional and their particular profession. Meyer et al. (1993) defined three distinct components of professional commitment. In this study, these components are called affective professional commitment (APC), continuance professional commitment (CPC), and normative professional commitment (NPC). APC refers to identification with, involvement in and emotional attachment to the profession. CPC means commitment based on the employee's recognition of the cost associated with leaving their profession. Finally NPC refers to commitment based on a sense of obligation to the profession.

## **2.11 Theories of Professional Commitment**

Professional commitment has been studied from different perspective by different researchers. Many researchers have explained it by the use of social exchange theory and others have used the behavioral approach to discuss the professional commitment. Some researchers have explained it considering multi-dimensional nature. These different approaches are discussed below in brief.

**a) Social Exchange Theory:** This theory of commitment focuses to develop the relationship by considering the economic and social exchange between the employee and employer. Economic exchange relationships involve the exchange of economic benefits in return for employees' effort and are often dependent on formal

contracts. On the other hand, social exchanges are ‘voluntary actions’ which may be initiated by an organisation’s/ profession treatment of its employees, with the expectation that the employees will be obligated to reciprocate the good deeds of the organization. This approach suggests that employee attach themselves to their profession in return for certain reward from the profession. According to the view, employees enter in a profession with specific skill, desire and goals, and expect an environment where they can use their skill, satisfy their desires and achieve the goals. Employees’ perceptions of (un)favourable exchange results the level of commitment to the profession. If the perceived reward is more than the employees’ effort, the greater the professional commitment. On the other hand, failure by the organisation to provide sufficient rewards in exchange for the employees’ efforts is likely to result in decreased organisational commitment.

From the perspective of the employer-employee relationship, social exchange theory suggests that positive perception to the working conditions benefit to organization as well as employees. It also suggests that negative perception of the employee results negative work attitudes such as job dissatisfaction, absenteeism, lateness, low morale and low professional commitment. In summary, the exchange theory posits that commitment develops as a result of an employee's satisfaction with the rewards the profession offers to the employees.

**b) The Attitudinal Commitment:** This approach refers to the commitment as an individual’s psychological attachment to the profession. Many researchers of human resource management comment that, attitudinal commitment is related to the employees’ values and goals. This approach, now commonly referred to as affective commitment, has dominated most of professional commitment. Meyer and Allen defined it as an employee’s emotional attachment to, identification with, and

involvement in the profession. These definitions imply that, professional commitment as involving some form of psychological bond between the employees and the profession. According to the exchange perspective, employees exchange their identification, loyalty and attachment to the profession in return for incentives from the profession. This implies that an individual's decision to become and remain a member of a profession is determined by their perception of the fairness of the balance of professional inducements and employee contribution. This theory suggests that the employee develops attitudinal commitment when they perceive that their expectations are being met by the profession.

**c) The Behavioural Approach:** This approach developed from Howard Becker's studies in 1960 which described commitment as a disposition to engage in maintaining membership in the profession resulting from the accumulation of 'side bets' which would be lost if the activity was discontinued. The behavioural approach explains commitment as being purely instrumental and not psychological. The assumption of this approach is that employees remain in their profession with a profession because the perceived cost of doing otherwise is likely to be high. This approach is now referred to as continuance commitment.

According to this approach, individuals may be unwilling to quit their profession easily. Professions have also been found to keep employees to remain in a profession through rapid promotion, pension plans, specific training. Instead, some employees may find that they have little desire to remain with the profession. Such employees may be motivated to do little more than perform at the minimum level required to maintain the job they have become dependent on.

## **2.12 Consequences of Job Satisfaction and Professional**

### **Commitment**

Many researches have shown that result of job satisfaction and commitment are both positive and negative. Positive consequence includes better performance, regularity, increase productivity, intention to stay. On the other hand negative consequence includes absenteeism, tardiness, and turnover. Employees with low commitment levels and who are dissatisfied with their jobs are expected to report high turnover rates, absenteeism and poor job performance. Employees, who are highly committed to their organizations and identify with the goals of the organization, have little reason to want to leave.

Job satisfaction and professional commitment have great impact on organizational performance. It is clear that different factors lead to job satisfaction and commitment, and have consequences for both individual and organizational performance. Several studies have shown that the consequence of job satisfaction and professional commitment include productivity, absenteeism, tardiness and turnover.

#### **2.12.1 Consequences of Job Satisfaction**

Managers' interest in job satisfaction tends to centre on its effect on employee performance. Researchers have shown many consequences of job satisfaction include performance, absenteeism, and turnover.

Satisfaction and Performance: Job satisfaction has positive correlation with the individual performance. Employees with high satisfaction are expected to report high performance and with low job satisfaction are expected to poor performance. When satisfaction and performance data are collected for the organization as a whole, rather than at the individual level, we find that organization with more satisfied employees tend to be more effective than organization with less satisfied employees.

Satisfaction and Absenteeism: Many research outlined that there is a negative relationship between job satisfaction and absenteeism. Employees with low satisfaction are frequently absent from the job. This absenteeism causes serious additional cost for the organization. Probably the best way of reduce absenteeism would be through a increase in the level of satisfaction.

Satisfaction and Tardiness: Tardiness of the employees is one of the significant causes of organization's low performance. Dissatisfied workers are tend slow to his job.

Satisfaction and Turnover: Satisfaction is also negatively related to turnover of the employee. Employee turnover is costly to organisations, in terms of recruitment and selection costs, training of new employees, loss of the performance and expertise of skilled employees.

### **2.12.2 Consequences of Professional Commitment**

Professional commitment has great influences on the successfulness of a profession and an organization. The commitment level of the employee causes high or poor performance of an employee. The consequences of professional commitment are productivity, absenteeism, tardiness and turnover. Employee's commitment is positively related to the productivity. A highly committed worker performs better than a low committed worker. Studies have shown that commitment is negatively related to the absenteeism, to tardiness and to turnover. Meyer and Allen (1997) argue that the three components of professional commitment, namely; affective, normative and continuance commitment will have different effects on the outcomes of professional commitment. For instance, a committed workforce desire to contribute meaningfully to the profession. Such an employee will continue his job and perform their duties well. Finally, the feeling of indebtedness or obligation to the professional arising from



normative commitment may create some resentment which may affect the employee's performance.

In summary, it is expected that employees in BCS general education cadre who are satisfied with their jobs and committed to their profession are less likely to intend to turnover.

## **2.13 Determinants of Job Satisfaction and Professional**

### **Commitment**

A lot of studies have been carried out relating to job satisfaction and professional commitment to analyze their determinants and consequences. From the review of the literature it is found that the determinants of job satisfaction and professional commitment are more varied and inconsistent. Additionally, the outcome of satisfaction and commitment are consistent but studies showed a 'laundry list' of determinants variables. The variation may be the result of different operational definition and different type organization/ profession that have been researched extensively. Many studies found that employee's personal factors such as age, education, marital status, group, experience, and gender played a significant role to satisfaction and commitment. These personal variables are grouped as demographic characteristics.

Different studies suggested that management practice in the organization may cause of satisfaction and commitment of the employees. Faruqui and Shoma found that the most dissatisfactory issues for faculty are salary structure and untimely payment, students' quality, and the prolonged working hours.<sup>49</sup> Shamima Tasnim in

---

<sup>49</sup> G. A. Faruqui, and S. Islam, Evaluation of faculty's job satisfaction in private universities, *Journal of Business Studies*,1(2):67-82.2005.

her study found that one of the main purposes of job is to get the payment or salary and it is very natural that a handsome salary will bring job satisfaction.<sup>50</sup> Taskina and Ireen studied in 2009 on Job Satisfaction of Faculty Officers in Private Universities - In Context of Bangladesh. Mohamed Imran Rasheed found that the factors like job design, work environment, feedback, recognition, decision making participation are the potential factor for satisfying teachers in higher education.

Job satisfaction and commitment are also influenced by the various forces of the institute. Research shows that internal organizational culture and some social views such as staff moral, culture, administration, infrastructure, technical support, parental support, society attitude are determinants of satisfaction and commitment.

## **2.14 Conceptual Framework and Hypothesis**


### **2.14.1 Conceptual Framework**

From the literature review, a conceptual framework has been developed by the researcher. Job satisfaction and professional commitment are the two important predictors of employee performance. Job satisfaction and Professional commitment are the dependent variables in this study. Identified independent variables are grouped under demographic, human resource management, institutional (internal and external) factors, job stressor and job characteristics.

---

<sup>50</sup> Shamima Tasnim, "*Job Satisfaction among Female Teachers: A study on primary schools in Bangladesh.*" M.Phil. 2005. The University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway.

**Figure 2.4: Conceptual Framework of the Research**



**Conceptual Framework:** Developed by Researcher

## 2.14.2 Hypothesis Development

From the review of literature based on the objectives, some broad hypothesis have been formulated which will be tested in this study.

**Hypothesis One (H1):** Demographic factors are not significantly related to job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

**Hypothesis Two (H2):** Individually HR factors have significantly positive impact on job satisfaction, and on professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

**Hypothesis Three (H3):** Institutional factors (Internal & External) have significant impact on job satisfaction and on professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

**Hypothesis Four (H4):** Job stressors and Job characteristics have significant impact on job satisfaction and on professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

## 2.15 Conclusion

Job satisfaction and Professional commitment are identified two important parameters for organizational success by several researches. This chapter has reviewed literature relation to job satisfaction and commitment and has found out many determinants. The influencing factors are grouped as demographic, HRM, Institutional and job & role related factors. The literature has shown that demographic factors (age, gender, group, education, marital status etc) have a direct impact on job satisfaction and professional commitment. This chapter has also shown the impact of HRM practices on the job satisfaction and professional commitment. Studies have shown that fair and supportive HRM practices develop loyalty and motivate employee

to stay in the profession. The literature has shown that enriched jobs characterized by job autonomy, adequate feedback, task variety, supervisory and co-worker support have a direct positive effect on job satisfaction and professional commitment. On the other hand job stressors like role overload, role conflict has negative effect on job satisfaction and professional commitment. From the extensive review of literature we have noticed that different internal and external forces of the institute effect the job satisfaction and commitment of the employee. However, it is clear from literature review that most of the studies have been carried out using sample from business organization. So the result may not be same at the case of this study.

## **Chapter Three**

### **Research Methodology**

#### **3.1 Introduction**

The previous chapter provided a review of literature and building a conceptual framework on job satisfaction and professional commitment. This chapter describes the research design and procedure of the study for achieving the objectives of the study. In this chapter the details of the research design and methodology which is carried out prior, during and after field work have been described. Research design deals with purposes and justification of the design, population and sample, and methodology includes procedure of data collection, methods of data analysis and instrumentation of the study.

#### **3.2 Research Design**

Research design refers the plan and structure of the study that enables the researcher to find out answers to the research question. Selection of the design depends on the purpose of the research, type of the study, and type of the analysis (quantitative or qualitative) to be done.

This research is both exploratory and descriptive in nature. It is exploratory in the sense that the study explores the influencing factors of job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. The study also attempted to explore the relationship between factors and job satisfaction & commitment, and to develop a general understanding about the level of job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. It is descriptive in the sense that the research portrays accurately the characteristics of a group.

A quantitative research technique is predominantly used in this study of job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. Quantitative research is the numerical representation and manipulation of observations for the purpose of describing and explaining the phenomena that those observations reflect. The study however has used both quantitative and qualitative technique for validity and reliability of data.

Both techniques have their drawback. In case of qualitative methods, selected sample is small, and usually use purposive sampling procedure instead of probability sampling. Additionally the findings of qualitative techniques are influenced by skills, experience of the researcher. On the other hand, the main limitation of the quantitative methods is that the results of the study are confined to the objectives of the study because of closed type of questions in the instrument.

Reviewing the approaches of the methods, quantitative method is appropriate for this study for some reasons: collecting data using this method is time consuming and cost effective, collected data are easy to replicate and have a high reliability, and helpful to analysis data through statistical tools. To attain the objectives of this research, the study is mainly based on primary data, secondary data is also be used.

### **3.3 Sampling Procedure**

Sampling procedure consists of defining population, identifying the sampling frame, determining the sample size, and identifying the sample units.

**3.3.1 Population of the Study:** The population is all elements that meet certain criteria for inclusion in study. The population for this study is the entire officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre in Bangladesh both academic and administrative. Academic officers include teaching professionals of government colleges, government commercial institutes, government madrasha and TTC. Administrative

officers include principal and vice-principal of government colleges, commercial institutes, madrasa, TTC and education cadres posted in administrative structure of education management. The nationalized teachers and the officers, recruited under 10% provision, who have been included in cadre by meeting the conditions, are included in this study.

**3.3.2 Sample Frame:** The target population of this study consists of all the officers of education cadre who are providing service mainly at 252 government colleges, 13 commercial institutions, 4 madrasahs, 14 TTC and different administrative institutions under education ministry, such as Directorate of Secondary and Higher Education (DSHE), 8 Education Board, National Academy for Education Management (NAEM) etc.<sup>51</sup> Government colleges are categorized into Masters College, Degree (hons') college, Degree (pass) college and higher secondary college on the basis of its academic level. It was difficult to collect data from each of the institution. Therefore, sample institutions were needed to be select for collecting primary data. In this regard, Multi-stage sampling procedure has been used to select respondents in this study. At the first stage, the numbers of sample institutions has been determined from different categories and then the institutions have been selected from each level so that representation from different types of institutions can be ensured.

---

<sup>51</sup> Bangladesh Bureau of Educational Information and Statistics (BANBEIS), *Basic Education Statistics 2012* (Dhaka: Statistical Division, BANBEIS, 2012).



**Table-3.1: The numbers of sampled institutions are as follows:**

| Type of Institution             | Total No.*<br>(as on 2014) | Sample No. |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|
| DSHE                            | Central + 9 Zonal office   | 1          |
| Masters College                 | 81                         | 7          |
| Degree (Hons') College          | 92                         | 12         |
| Degree (Pass) College           | 82                         | 7          |
| Govt. Commercial Institute      | 13                         | 2          |
| Govt. Teachers Training College | 14                         | 2          |
| Govt. Madrasha                  | 4                          | 1          |
| General Education Board         | 8                          | 1          |
| <b>Total</b>                    | <b>283</b>                 | <b>33</b>  |

\***Source of Total No.:** Bangladesh Bureau of Educational Information and Statistics (BANBEIS), Ministry of Education, Dhaka

At the general college level, only masters and degree colleges have been considered because it represents about 96.43% of total general government college. Besides, these are the type of institutions where maximum officers of the BCS general education cadre are providing their service.

### **3.3.3 Identifying the sample units and Determination of Sample Size:**

At the second stage, 33 sample institutions, the primary sample units have been selected by considering the level of education, students' type (boys, girls or co-education) and age of the institutions so that the result can be generalized. Researcher has selected the institutes purposively by considering budgetary and time constraint, and accessibility to the area for collection of necessary information.

**Table 3.2: The Selected Institutions and numbers of the officers are as follows:**

| Type of Institution  | Name of Institution                                    | *Officer of BCS general education cadre ( as on 30 June, 2014) |
|--|--|--|
| Administrative   | DSHE   | 51   |
| Masters Colleges   | Dhaka College, Dhaka                                   | 227  |
|  | Bhawl Badre Alam College, Gazipur                      | 92   |
|  | Govt. Muminunnisa Mohila college, Mymensingh,          | 72   |
|  | Rajbari Govt College, Rajbari                          | 66   |
|  | B. L. College, Khulna                                  | 155  |
|  | Rajshahi College, Rajshahi                             | 238  |
|  | Joipurhat Govt College, Joipurhat                      | 52   |
| Degree (Hons') Colleges  | Govt. Saroda Sundory Mohila College, Faridpur          | 58   |
|  | Kushtia Govt Girls College, Kushtia                    | 34   |
|  | Chuadanga College, chuadanga                           | 49   |
|  | Ishwardi Govt. college, Ishwardy, Pabna                | 33   |
|  | Pabna Govt. Girls College, Pabna                       | 31   |
|  | Rani Bhawani Govt. college, Natore                     | 27   |
|  | Abdulpur Govt. College, Natore                         | 34   |
|  | New Govt. Degree College, Rajshahi                     | 67   |
|  | Govt. Shah Sultan College, Bogra                       | 46   |
|  | Joypurhat Govt. Mohila College, Joypurhat              | 22   |
|  | Rangpur College, Rangpur                               | 66   |
|  | Lalmonirhat Govt. College, Lalmonirhat                 | 34   |
|  | Degree (pass) Colleges                                 | Amla Degree college, Kushtia                                   |
| Darshna Govt. College, Chuadanga                                 |  | 28   |
| Khondokar Mosharraf Hossain Govt College, Kotchandpur, Jhenaidha |  | 30   |
| Shahjadpur Govt College, Shahjadpur, Sirajgang                   |  | 30   |
| Jahangirpur Govt. College, Mohadebpur, Naogaon.                  |  | 10   |
| Gabtolli Govt. College, Gabtolli, Bogra                          |  | 15   |
| Palashbari Govt College, Palashbari, Gaibandha                   |  | 25   |
| Govt. Commercial Institute                                       | Govt. Commercial Institution, Faridpur                 | 7  |
|  | Govt. Commercial Institution, jessore                  | 6  |
| Govt. T. T College   | Teachers Training College, Kulna                       | 32   |
|  | Teachers Training College, Rajshahi                    | 30   |
| Govt. Madrsha  | Govt. Mustafabia Alia Madrasha, Bogra                  | 10   |
| Gen. Education Board   | Board of Intermediate & Secondary Education, Rajshahi. | 6  |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>33</b>  | <b>1692</b>  |

**\*Source: Office of the respective Institution**

After identifying the institute, researcher has contacted the office of each of the institutes in order to get the list of the officers of BCS general education cadre. Then the researcher has found that there were a total of **1692** officers of BCS education cadre from all the 33 institutes.

Then, Sample size of this study is obtained using the following formula developed by Krejcie and Morgan (1970).

$$n = \frac{\chi^2 NP (1-P)}{d^2 (N-1) + \chi^2 P (1-P)}$$

where:

n = the required sample size

$\chi^2$  = the table value of chi-square for the 1 degree of freedom at the desired Confidence level (3.841)

N = the population size =12,958

P = the population proportion (assumed to be 0.50 since this would provide the maximum sample size if other variables of right side remain constant)

d = the degree of accuracy expressed as a proportion (in this study, it is set at 5%).

Sample size of this study has been calculated as **374**.

Then, the number of respondents has been determined proportionally from the each institution for this study. Finally, the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre, the actual sample units are selected **randomly** in the institution. This method is considered a reliable method for reducing sampling bias and achieving a high level of representation.

**Table-3.3: The Selected Institutions and sample size of the study are as follows:**

| Type of Institution  | Name of Institution                                    | *Officer of BCS general education cadre ( as on 30 June, 2014) | Sample     |
|--|--|--|------------|
| Administrative   | DSHE   | 51   | 11         |
| Masters Colleges   | Dhaka College, Dhaka                                   | 227  | 50         |
|  | Bhawl Badre Alam College, Gazipur                      | 92   | 20         |
|  | Govt. Muminunnisa Mohila college, Mymensingh,          | 72   | 16         |
|  | Rajbari Govt College, Rajbari                          | 66   | 14         |
|  | B. L. College, Khulna                                  | 155  | 34         |
|  | Rajshahi College, Rajshahi                             | 238  | 53         |
|  | Joipurhat Govt College, Joipurhat                      | 52   | 11         |
| Degree (Hons') Colleges  | Govt. Saroda Sundory Mohila College, Faridpur          | 58   | 13         |
|  | Kushtia Govt Girls College, Kushtia                    | 34   | 8          |
|  | Chuadanga College, chuadanga                           | 49   | 11         |
|  | Ishwardi Govt. college, Ishwardy, Pabna                | 33   | 7          |
|  | Pabna Govt. Girls College, Pabna                       | 31   | 7          |
|  | Rani Bhawani college, Natore                           | 27   | 6          |
|  | Abdulpur Govt. College, Natore                         | 34   | 8          |
|  | New Govt. Degree College, Rajshahi                     | 67   | 15         |
|  | Govt. Shah Sultan College, Bogra                       | 46   | 10         |
|  | Joypurhat Govt. Mohila College, Joypurhat              | 22   | 5          |
|  | Rangpur College, Rangpur                               | 66   | 14         |
|  | Lalmonirhat Govt. College, Lalmonirhat                 | 34   | 8          |
|  | Degree (pass) Colleges                                 | Amla Degree college, Kushtia                                   | 09         |
| Darshna Govt. College, Chuadanga                                 |  | 28   | 6          |
| Khondokar Mosharraf Hossain Govt College, Kotchandpur, Jhenaidha |  | 30   | 7          |
| Shahjadpur Govt College, Shahjadpur, Sirajgang                   |  | 30   | 7          |
| Jahangirpur Govt. College, Mohadebpur, Naogaon.                  |  | 10   | 2          |
| Gabtolli Govt. College, Gabtolli, Bogra                          |  | 15   | 3          |
| Palashbari Govt College, Palashbari, Gaibandha                   |  | 25   | 6          |
| Govt. Commercial Institute                                       | Govt. Commercial Institution, Faridpur                 | 7  | 2          |
|  | Govt. Commercial Institution, jessore                  | 6  | 1          |
| Govt. T. T College   | Teachers Training College, Kulna                       | 32   | 7          |
|  | Teachers Training College, Rajshahi                    | 30   | 7          |
| Govt. Madrsha  | Govt. Mustafabia Alia Madrasha, Bogra                  | 10   | 2          |
| Gen. Education Board   | Board of Intermediate & Secondary Education, Rajshahi. | 6  | 1          |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>33</b>  | <b>1692</b>  | <b>374</b> |

### **3.4 Procedure of Data Collection**

The study used some important tools for collecting both quantitative and qualitative data from primary and secondary sources. Questionnaire survey and Focus Group Discussion (FGD) are used to collect data from respondent in this study. Literature review is used to collect secondary data.

**3.4.1 Primary Data:** Primary data for the research have been collected through questionnaire by survey method and Focus Group Discussion. The period of data collection was from 01 July to 30 December, 2014.

**a) Questionnaire Survey:** Researcher used questionnaire to collect data at the first phase. A structured questionnaire has been developed after a thorough review of literature. The questionnaire consists of dependent variables (Job satisfaction and Commitment) and independent variables (Demographic, HRM, Internal & External factors, and Job stressors & characteristics). The questionnaire consists six sections according to the variables. The questionnaire has been developed by following the items developed by Warr, Cook and Wall (1979) for job satisfaction section, and Professional Commitment Questionnaire (PCQ), modified from Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) of Allen and Meyer (1990) for professional commitment section. Rest of the section has developed by reviewing different literature.

5 point Rensis Likart Scale has been used in this studies ranging as 1-strongly disagree, 2-disagree, 3-neutral, 4-agree and 5- strongly agree.

The questionnaire method is suitable for this study because it helps to gather sufficient data from a large number of respondents within a short time and a minimal cost. In addition, as the respondents were highly educated, it was expected that questionnaire survey provided quality data.

b) **FGD:** Researcher has conducted and moderated four number of FGD sessions for collecting more meaningful and valid data. There was a checklist to crosscheck the result of analysis of data of questionnaire efficiently. (Appendix B) Primary data have been also collected by reviewing officials' records, Government circular, gazettes, and different rules regarding BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

**3.4.2 Secondary Data:** Review of relevant and reliable literature is the main tools for collecting secondary data. Secondary data sources include official records and relevant research works. These data was collected through desk work and content analysis from relevant reports, published books, articles, journals, newspapers, authentic websites, periodicals and dissertation.

### **3.5 Field Work**

The researcher started fieldwork with a pilot study and correction of the questionnaire in this study. This process ensures the feasibility and the relevance of the study.

**3.5.1 Pilot Study:** After development the questionnaire, a pilot study was conducted to ensure that the items of the questionnaire were clear to the respondents and also to estimate the time to be taken to complete the questionnaire. A total of 30 questionnaire were distributed to academic (25) and administrative (5) BCS general education cadre officials. These officials were not included in the main study to avoid contamination of the respondents. The respondents were asked to indicate the duration to complete the questionnaire and mark the ambiguous items of the questionnaire. The respondents indicated that it took them between 25 and 30 minutes to complete the questionnaire. The respondent's complaints were about the confusion of reverse items of the questionnaire. Questions that were ambiguous and confusing were refreshed. The measurement scales in the pilot study were also tested for internal consistency by using the Cronbach alpha coefficient and found that the reliability of

the satisfaction items were as follows: Overall Job Satisfaction,  $\alpha=.75$ , Extrinsic Job Satisfaction,  $\alpha=.70$ , Intrinsic Job Satisfaction,  $\alpha=.70$  and the commitment items were as follows: Affective Professional Commitment,  $\alpha=.68$ , Continuance Professional Commitment,  $\alpha=.72$ , Normative Professional Commitment,  $\alpha=.70$ . It indicates that the instrument was reliable.

### **3.6 Data Reliability and Validity**

Reliability and validity in research are the two important issues that the researcher should use in the study for claiming the quality research.

**3.6.1 Reliability:** Reliability means the ability of a measurement instrument to provide same answer in the same circumstances. There are three different methods for assessing reliability in data. These are test-retest, split-half and internal consistency. Internal consistency method was used to test the reliability of data in this study. Cronbach's alpha coefficient measure was used for determining internal consistency. The test of reliability was calculated using the SPSS.

The Cronbach's alpha coefficient ranges between 0 and 1. Higher alpha coefficient values means that scales are more reliable. Many researcher suggested the acceptable alpha should be at least .70 or above. However, other researchers suggested that the values of alpha may vary for different studies, for instance, in exploratory research a Cronbach alpha value of .60 is accepted. Some other studies recommended that the alpha value at least 0.30 is acceptable for exploratory research work. Therefore, items with coefficient below 0.30 are considered unreliable in this study.

**3.6.2 Validity:** Content and face validity were used in this study. The influencing variables of Job satisfaction and professional commitment were ensured by a thorough review of literature and examined by experts. Content validity is a

measure of the degree to which data collected using a particular instrument represents the content of the concept being measured. To ensure content validity, the researcher carried out a thorough review of literature to identify the important items relating to the concept. For face validity of the items, the questionnaire was given to teachers and some Ph.D students who read and critiqued it in order to give face validity. The questionnaire was also critiqued by the BCS general education cadre officer during the pilot study ensuring validity.

### **3.7 Data Processing, Analysis and Presentation**

Collected data from the questionnaire were scrutinized and edited for avoiding inconsistency and then classified for analysis. Data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) 17 version software in this study. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used to get the answer of the research question. Descriptive statistics like mean, standard deviation, minimum, maximum, frequency, percentage were used to compute for general understanding of respondents' characteristics such as age, gender, job tenure, education, designation, occupational group. Inferential statistics like, correlation, analysis of variance (ANOVA) and regression analysis were conducted to explain the relationship among the variables and to examine how the dependent variables can be influenced by the independent variables. Results and findings are presented in narrative and descriptive form in this study. The results are presented by tables, graphs, and charts for more meaningful and for clear understanding to readers.



Statistical techniques were used to achieve the objectives of this research as follows:

- a) To measure the level of job satisfaction and professional commitment of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre officers and to examine whether there were any differentiation in level of satisfaction and commitment in relation to demographic factors.-----*Descriptive, ANOVA*
- b) To examine the impact of human resource factors on the job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.----- *Descriptive, Pearson Correlation, Multiple regression analysis,*
- c) To analyze the institutional (internal and external) factors that influences the job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. ----  
- *Descriptive, Pearson Correlation, Multiple regression analysis.*
- d) To analyze the job stressors and job characteristic that impact the job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.----*Descriptive, Pearson Correlation, Multiple regression analysis.*
- e) To find out the major contributing factors (Demographic, HRM, Institutional, Job stressors and Job characteristics) of the job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.----*Hierarchical Multiple regression analysis.*

The independent variables (namely; HRM, Institutional, Job stressors and Characteristics) and dependent variables (namely: Job satisfaction and Professional commitment) were all interval scale. On the other hand, designation, appointment type, location, institution type, age, tenure and education were ordinal scales. Finally, occupational group, gender and marital status were all nominal scales in this study.

### **3.8 Conclusion**

This chapter has presented the research methodology used in this study and its justification. It has discussed the research design, sampling techniques and procedure of data collection in details. Questionnaire survey method was to collect the data and this tool was more convenient to get more data from a geographical scattered sampler. In addition, FGDs were carried out with some officers of BCS general education cadre to clarify issues arising from the questionnaire. The reliability and validity of questionnaire, methods of statistical analysis were also discussed in this chapter.

## **Chapter Four**

### **Bangladesh Civil Service and BCS General Education**

#### **Cadre: An Overview**

##### **4.1 Introduction**

This chapter aims to present an overview of the civil service of Bangladesh and BCS general education cadre. The government initiatives are implemented by a pool of important workforce in a country. Civil service workforce is the most important part of the public sector that plays a vital role for the overall development of a country either directly or indirectly. Civil servants are the agents of government for providing the government service to the citizens at the field level of the country. So the success of the government initiative largely depends upon the performance of the civil service employees. The performance of the employees is influenced strongly by the satisfaction with and commitment to their job. Therefore, it is important to have a clear understanding about the civil service and BCS general education cadre before analyzing the factors of job satisfaction and professional commitment.

##### **4.2 Public sector Management in Bangladesh**

Bangladesh has a parliamentary form of government. Prime minister is the head of government and the president, elected by the parliament is the constitutional head of the state. All the activities of national government are carried out by different ministries and divisions. At present the business of national government is carried out by 44 ministries.<sup>52</sup> There are also autonomous bodies and corporations that have been

---

<sup>52</sup> Cabinet Division, Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh. [http://www.cabinet.gov.bd/view\\_present\\_portfolios.php?page=ministry\\_list](http://www.cabinet.gov.bd/view_present_portfolios.php?page=ministry_list) (accessed on 12 July, 2013).

established under special president orders, ordinance and act to execute the government policies and decision.

Bangladesh has basically a two-tier administrative system. All ministries and divisions are located in the central secretariat, and they are engaged in policy and clearing house functions. On the other hand, government organizations, representing the ministry and division at the division, district, thana and union levels, discharge general administrative, service providing and different project implementation functions. The overall activities of the ministries, divisions, departments and the affiliated organizations at the field level are governed with the aid of the civil service officer recruited by the Bangladesh public service commission.

### **4.3 Bangladesh Civil Service**

The civil service of a country is an indispensable part of the government. It generally includes all the functionaries of the government excepting those in the military service. The present Bangladesh civil service is the inheritor of the British Colonial administration. The Indian Civil service was established in around 1878 and the employees started to use the ICS designation<sup>53</sup>. It was an elite colonial cadre that served colonial rule in India. They worked in administration, judiciary and policy making at the highest level. After the independence of Pakistan in 1947, Pakistan Civil service was derived from the ICS. Finally, Bangladesh inherited the civil service system developed from Civil Service of Pakistan (CSP) which was a legacy of Indian civil service.

---

<sup>53</sup> Ranak Jahan, "Poblems of Working in the Field Level: A Study of Women Civil Servant in Bangladesh," (Dhaka: North South University, Bangladesh, 2010), p. 28.

The civil service of Bangladesh has differences in natures in its organization, composition and classification.<sup>54</sup> The government employees have been classified vertically into four categories namely class-I officer, class-II officer, class-III employee and class-IV employee, based on such variables as levels of responsibility, educational qualification and pay range.

All the government employees are also broadly classified as gazetted and non-gazetted employees. The employees whose appointment, posting, transfer, promotion and so on are notified in the official government gazette are known as gazetted officer. All class- I and most of the class-II government employees are treated as gazetted officer.<sup>55</sup> As a result, they enjoy better privileges than the non-gazetted employees. Within the class- I officers, some belong to the cadre services.

#### **4.4 Cadre Service in Bangladesh**

Cadre services are those services which are constituted under law with a number of positions and recruitment and promotion rules. Cadre service is the distinct functional sub-division of the government bureaucracy. It entails organization of civil servant into semi-functional occupational groups. Rule 5(7) of the Bangladesh service rules part-I defines cadre as the strength of a service sanctioned as a separate unit.<sup>56</sup> Each cadre consists of a certain number of posts.

Section 4 of the Services (Reorganization and Condition) Act 1975 empowered the government to reorganize the services of the Republic and the purpose was to create new services and to unify existing services. Accordingly, cadre service

---

<sup>54</sup> Morshed, *Bureaucratic Response to Administrative decentralization* (Dhaka: University Press Ltd., 1987), p. 77.

<sup>55</sup> Ahmed, *Public Personnel Administration in Bangladesh* (Dhaka: The City Press, 1986), p. 185.

<sup>56</sup> Firoz Mia, *Bangladesh Service Rules Part-1 & Part-2* (16<sup>th</sup> ed.; Dhaka: Raddur Publisher, 2008), P. 23.

in Bangladesh was first officially recognized in 1981.<sup>57</sup> There were 14 cadre and 22 sub-cadres in 1980 reform and it was changed into 30 cadres in 1987. Currently there are 28 cadres in Bangladesh Civil Service (BCS). BCS (Secretariat) was merged to BCS (Administration) in 1990 and BCS (Judiciary) has become a separate service known as judicial service because of the separation of judiciary from the executive in November 2007.<sup>58</sup> Generally these cadres can be classified in two major groups, e.g. general cadres and technical cadres. All these cadres have been introduced under one single service namely, Bangladesh Civil Service (BCS). Every cadre has its own composition and cadre rules that provide separate entity, hierarchy, and responsibility.

#### **4.5 Recruitment and Selection System of Cadre Officials**

Recruitment process of the cadre service is done through the Public Service Commission (PSC) on the basis of open competition. The PSC along with different ministries organize the recruitment activities of the cadre personnel. There are three types of recruitment process in the cadres of the BCS: 1) Direct recruitment through open competitive examination, 2) Recruitment through promotion, and 3) Recruitment through transfer or deputation.<sup>59</sup> Another appointment system is “ad-hoc basis” and then the recruits are regularized through PSC.

Recruitment at the entry level of the cadre service is mainly done through direct recruitment and basically, the largest numbers of officials are recruited through this procedure.

---


<sup>57</sup> M. Abdul Wahhab Mia, “Civil Service Recruitment Policy in Bangladesh: A Critical Analysis,” (Paper submitted for NAPSIPAG International Conference 2009, Universiti Utara Malaysia), P.4. [http://www.napsipag.org/pdf/ABDUL\\_WAHHAB.pdf](http://www.napsipag.org/pdf/ABDUL_WAHHAB.pdf) (accessed on 10 August, 2013).

<sup>58</sup> M. Abdul Wahhab Mia, *ibid*.

<sup>59</sup> Kashem et. al, “Review of Quota Utilization Reserved for Women,” (Dhaka: Policy Leadership and Advocacy for Gender Equality Project, Ministry of Women & Children’s Affairs, GoB, 2002), p. 31.

PSC is primarily responsible for selecting the qualified officers at the entry of cadre service. Generally, the concern ministry informs the PSC about the required posts through the ministry of public administration (MoPA). PSC announces recruitment advertisement through the national newspaper and website, inviting eligible candidates. After sorting the application, eligible applicants are invited to appear at a preliminary test of 100 marks. The qualifying applicants are then invited to appear in written test. Candidates who are able to obtain a standard level marks are qualified for viva-voce. In case of special BCS, a preliminary test and viva-voce maybe conducted. After viva-voce, a merit list is prepared by adding the marks of the written test and viva.

**Figure-4.1: Steps of Direct Recruitment Process of BCS Cadre:**



Finally, the candidates are selected by calculating the quota according to the government rules. Then the lists of selected candidates are sent to MoPA for appointment. MoPA conduct medical test and police verification through concern ministry and then final appointment are given by gazette notification.

## 4.6 BCS (Gen. Ed.) Cadre

The national development of a country depends largely upon the advancement of the education. Proper education can solve the hundreds of problem of the country and makes our future generation morally elevated. An effective education management and a couple of committed human resource in this sector can ensure to build a developed nation.

A significant level of changes and development has been done in the education sector after the independence of Bangladesh. Government nationalized a good number of schools and colleges for providing better education. Government not only nationalized the educational institutions, but also reorganized the service posts of the institution with the rules named “Bangladesh Civil Service (General Education) Composition and Cadre Rules, 1980”. According the rules, BCS general education cadre consists of (a) person who were officers of the erstwhile EPJES, EPES and EPSES and who were appointed substantively to class-1 permanent posts on the education side in or under the erstwhile Central Government in the Ministry of Education and non-teaching posts in the technical institutions of the erstwhile East Pakistan on or before 25/3/1971; (b) person appointed on or after 26/3/1971 to the post or posts which are included in the cadre; and (c) persons appointed to the cadre after 1/9/1980.<sup>60</sup> The rule described recruitment procedure and schedule posts of the cadre.

Although Bangladesh Civil Service (General Education) Composition and Cadre Rules, 1980 defined education cadre, the cadre was officially introduced in

---

<sup>60</sup> Ministry of Establishment, *BCS composition and Cadre Rules of 1980* (First ed., Dhaka: GoB, 1988), p. 15.



1983.<sup>61</sup> The hierarchy of the cadre is Lecturer, Assistant professor, Associate Professor and Professor. Government also formed another rules to appoint personnel in different positions of the education sector named: “The Teachers and Non-Teaching Staff of Nationalised Colleges (Directorate of Public Instruction) Absorption Rules, 1981”. Consequently, the government college teachers came under the cadre service. Now this cadre has become the largest civil service unit with 12,958 teachers against total 14,550 posts (750 professors, 2200 associate professors, 4600 assistant professors, and 7000 lecturers) among all the 28 cadres.<sup>62</sup> They are providing service to expand the proper education at higher secondary and higher education level.

#### **4.6.1 Recruitment and Selection of BCS (Gen. Ed.) Cadre**

Recruitment and selection procedure for the education cadre is generally same as that of other cadres. The only specialty is that, as a professional cadre it requires additional educational qualification and the applicants had to sit for examination for additional two papers for post related subject of 100 marks each. Before inclusion in cadre service, the civil servants in education sector were recruited either only with interview or with short written examination and interview by the PSC. Besides, a sufficient number of officers were appointed on ad-hoc basis and later they were regularized by PSC as per the rules “The Teachers and Non-Teaching Staff of Nationalised Colleges (Directorate of Public Instruction) Absorption Rules, 1981”.<sup>63</sup> Regular competitive examination began since 1983 when government introduced

---

<sup>61</sup> Directorate of Secondary and Higher Education, Ministry of Education (DSHE), *History of DSHE* (Dhaka: DSHE).

<sup>62</sup> Directorate of Secondary and Higher Education, Ministry of Education (DSHE)(as on June, 2013)

<sup>63</sup> M. Abdul Wahhab Mia, *ibid*, P.5. [http://www.napsipag.org/pdf/ABDUL\\_WAHHAB.pdf](http://www.napsipag.org/pdf/ABDUL_WAHHAB.pdf) (accessed on 10 August, 2013)

BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre following the BCS recruitment rules 1981. That examination was conducted only for education cadre and it was continued till 7<sup>th</sup> BCS.

The BCS recruitment rules suggest two types of recruitment procedure: a) direct recruitment through competitive examination mainly at entry level and b) recruitment through promotion at mid/top level post. Appointment through transfer at mid/top level, and appointment on ad-hoc basis in case of nationalization also exist in the education cadre. As a result absorption rule-1981 was cancelled by the rule “The Teachers and Non-Teaching Staff of Nationalized Colleges Absorption Rules, 1998” on 26 October 1998. Finally, absorption rule-1998 was again repealed by the rule “The Teachers and Non-Teaching Staff of Nationalized Colleges Absorption Rules, 2000” in November 2000. Recruitment procedures of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre at different administrative and academic position are given bellow.

**Table 4.1: Recruitment Procedure of BCS (Gen. Ed.) Cadre**

| Name of post                                | Age limit for direct recruitment.              | Recruitment procedure  |
|---|--|--|
| Director- General DG (DSHE)                 |  | By promotion/ Transfer   |
| Director                                    |  | By promotion/ Transfer   |
| Deputy Director                             |  | By promotion/ Transfer   |
| Assistant Director                          |  | By promotion/ Transfer   |
| A) Education Officer<br>B) Research Officer |  | By transfer of Lecturer  |
| Principal                                   |  | By promotion/ Transfer   |
| Vice-Principal                              |  | By promotion/ Transfer   |
| Professor                                   | 45 years, 50 years for departmental candidates | 90% by promotion<br>10% by direct recruitment  |
| Associate Professor                         | 40 years, 45 years for departmental candidates | 90% by promotion<br>10% by direct recruitment  |
| Assistant professor                         | 35 years, 40 years for departmental candidates | 90% by promotion<br>10% by direct recruitment  |
| Lecturer                                    | 30 years, 32 for freedom fighter quota         | 100% direct for other than science subject<br>For science, 94 % direct and 6% by promotion from among the demonstrator of relevant subject.<br>b) Ad-hoc basis and then regularized in case of Nationalization of college. |

Source: Bangladesh Civil Service Recruitment Rules 1981, Part- VII.

From 1982 to 2013, the PSC conducted 31 BCS examination which were appointed but the appointment of BCS education cadre started inclusively from 7<sup>th</sup> BCS<sup>64</sup>. Of the total 31 BCS, 3 were special for education cadre.

<sup>64</sup> Ministry of Public Administration, GOB.


## 4.6.2 Administration and Management

Education system in Bangladesh is being administered and managed by two ministries: a) Ministry of Education and b) Ministry of Primary and Mass Education. Ministry of Education is responsible for secondary, vocational and tertiary level and Ministry of Primary and Mass education is responsible for primary education and mass literacy. These two Ministries are also responsible to manage the personnel of respective sector.

### 4.6.2.1 Ministry of Education

Ministry of Education is the apex body for administration and management of the BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. MoEd. Is responsible for recruitment, posting, transfer and personnel matters of the BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre officers. Minister, the executive head of the ministry conducts the function of the ministry with the assistance of secretary and other civil service officers. The ministry is operating its administrative function in association with the attached Departments and Directorates as well as a number of autonomous bodies.


**Figure-4.2: Administrative and Management Structure of BCS general education cadre.**



Secretary of the ministry controls all the important cadre related functions like first posting, attachment posting, regularization, promotion, transfer and deputation in different attached bodies. Transfer and posting at the colleges in Dhaka City

Corporation and of principal, vice-principal, professor, and associate professor are directly monitored by the ministry.<sup>65</sup> One joint secretary, one deputy secretary and four senior assistant / assistant secretaries assist secretary for executing such kind of task.

**Figure-4.3: Administrative & Management Structure of BCS general education cadre in Ministry of Education.**




#### 4.6.2.2 The Directorate of Secondary & Higher Education (DSHE)

The Directorate of Secondary & Higher Education (DSHE) is another institution for administrating and managing the BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadres under the direct supervision and guidance of the ministry of Education. Director General (DG) is the head of the directorate and also it is the highest post of the education cadre. DG is assisted by 4 directors with the help of deputy directors, assistant directors, education officers and research officers at its head office and field level office. The 4 directors are: 1) Director, college and general administration, 2) Director, secondary

<sup>65</sup> Ministry of Education, *Circular, No.6/2a-5/2007/1039-ed.dated on 6/11/2008* (Dhaka: College Division, MoEd., 2008).

and special education, 3) Director, planning and development, and 4) Director, Training.

**Figure-4.4: Administrative & Management Structure of BCS general education cadre in DSHE.**




College and General Administration wing is the most important division of the DSHE. Overall management, supervision, controlling and all the activities relating to colleges (Government and Non-government) are conducted by this wing. Government college sub-division headed by a deputy director deal with posting, transfer and personal matters of the cadre officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.).

#### **4.6.2.3 Field Level Management of BCS general education cadre**

Government colleges, TTC, Commercial Institutes, Government Madrasha all these academic institutions are inseparable from the BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre, because, the journey to the profession starts from college. Although the cadre officers are administered by the central management, their activities in the field level are controlled by the head of the institution. Principal and vice-principal are the administrative posts of the college who are responsible for management of the cadre

officers at college. Head of the department also conducts deferments types of administrative activities such as Annual Confidential Report (ACR).

**Figure 4.5: Administrative & Management Structure of BCS general education cadre in Academic Institution.**



Since the majority cadre officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) are serving at the government colleges, the effective and justice management of them can ensure quality education for the students.

### **4.6.3. Functional Structure**

The civil servants of the education management sector are categorized into administrative employee and academic employee considering the nature of the function. The administrative and management function of secondary and higher education (excluding university) are being conducted by different bodies under education ministry like DSHE, Education Board, NCTB, BANBEIS etc. On the other hand, academic functions are operated by the colleges and schools all over the country. A few numbers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre officers are working at administrative position, on the other hand large number of officers are engaged in teaching, main academic activities at colleges all over the country.

#### 4.6.3.1 Directorate of Secondary and Higher Education (DSHE)

DSHE is the top body, where the BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre officers are doing administrative function for administration and management of the academic functions under the guidance of ministry.<sup>66</sup> For the purpose of effective functioning, DSHE has four functional divisions.

**a) College and General Administration Division:** This division, headed by director is divided into 3 sub division named 1) General Administration, 2) Government College Administration, and 3) Non-government College Administration. An account section under general administration sub-division and an Education Management Information System (EMIS) cell are also working in this division. Three Deputy Directors (DD), five Assistant Directors (AD), one library development officer, four Education officers (EO), one administrative officer and one account officer assist the director to operate this division. The important functions of this division are as:

- All the human resource management functions such as recruitment, posting, transfer, promotion, regularization etc of the employee of head office and government school, college, madrasa and commercial institution.
- Circulation and maintenance of all education related circular and notice.
- Dealings with the budget, finance, accounts of the directorates, its subordinates offices and institutions.
- All the service related activities of the class-3 and class-4 employees of the directorate and government school, college, madrasa, commercial institutions.
- Government college wing deals with the posting, transfer, regularization, lien, deputation, and ACR related function of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre officers.

---


<sup>66</sup> Directorate of Secondary and Higher Education, *Introduction and Rules of Business 2011* (Dhaka: Planning and Development Wing, DSHE, 2011) p. 7.



- The Non-government College sub-division deals mainly with Monthly Pay Order (MPO) of non-government colleges.

This division also maintains several databases in its EMIS cell for providing essential information to the stakeholder.

**Figure-4.6: Functional Structure of BCS general education cadre**



**b) Secondary Division:** This division is responsible for the administration of government and private secondary schools through the field offices situated in the zones and districts. This division is divided into three sub-divisions viz. (a) Secondary Section -1 which deals with government secondary schools; (b) Secondary Section -2 which deals with non-government secondary schools and (c) Special Education Section which deals with Religious education and (d) Physical Education Division

administers and monitors the physical and extra-curricular activities related to secondary and higher secondary level institutions.

**c) Training Division:** This division controls the training programs for the teachers and officials of DSHE, Government Colleges, Teachers Training Colleges (TTC), Higher Secondary Teachers Training Institute (HSTTI), Bangladesh Madrasha Teachers Training Institute (BMTTI) and secondary schools. The division is directed by one director, one deputy director, two assistant directors and a research officer who are the cadre officer of BCS (Gen. Ed.).

**d) Planning and Development Division:** This division formulates policy regarding the development of secondary and higher education. It prepares project proposals and monitors and evaluates the performances of the projects. Director, head of division administers all the activities with the help of a pool of deputy director, assistant director and research officer. It also liaises with donor agencies and prepares Annual Development Program (ADP) and Revised Annual Development Program (RADP) of the development projects.

#### **4.6.3.2. Attached Bodies**

There are several attached bodies of the MoEd perform specialized functions assigned them. The officers of general education cadre are also serving in these bodies on deputation. Some of them are:

**1) National Academy for Educational Management (NAEM):** This is the main training institution under the MoEd for providing foundation training to BCS (general education) cadre officers and it also provides in-service training to senior educational administrators and teachers.

**2) National Curriculum and Textbook Board (NCTB):** This is an autonomous Board under MoEd which is responsible for the development of

curriculum for primary, secondary and higher secondary levels. It also concern for production and distribution of textbooks.

**3) Bangladesh Bureau of Educational Information and Statistics (BANBEIS):** BANBEIS collects and disseminates the educational information and statistics at various levels of education. It is also responsible for publication of educational data.

**4) Directorate of Inspection and Audit (DIA):** This body is responsible for inspection and audit for improving the standard of education of the Non-governmental institutions at the secondary level.

**5) Board of Intermediate and Secondary Education (BISE):** Eight general education boards of Intermediate and Secondary Education are mainly responsible for conducting the public examinations at Secondary and Higher Secondary level public examinations.

**6) Madrasha Education Board:** Public examinations from Dakhil to Kamil levels and recognition of the Non-government madrashas are conducted by this board..

**7) Technical Education Board:** This Board is responsible for conducting certificate and diploma examinations in technical education and for the recognition of the Non-government technical and vocational educational institutions.

**8) Non-Governmental Teachers' Registration & Certification Authority (NTRCA):** The NTRCA is mainly responsible to conduct examination for the registration of successful candidates who would be eligible for appointment in the non-government educational institutions.

**9) Higher Secondary Teachers Training Institute (HSTTI):** There are five HSTTI under education ministry that providing training for development the quality and skill of the teachers of secondary and higher secondary level.

**10) Bangladesh Madrasha Teachers Training Institute (BMTTI):** This is the training institute which is offering pedagogical training to the teachers of madrashas. The institute is responsible for increasing the efficiency and quality of madrasha teachers through training.

#### **4.6.3.3 Academic Institution Level Structure (College, Madrasha, Commercial Institution, TT College)**

BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre officers are appointed mainly for academic purposes and generally they are posted in government colleges, government commercial institutes and government madrasha. They are being used to serve in different government colleges, government commercial institutes and government madrasha for enhancing the quality education in the higher secondary and higher education level. According to BANBEIS, there are 252 general government colleges, 13 government commercial institutes, 4 government madrasha and 14 TTC in Bangladesh as on December, 2012. The Ministry of Education on May 22, 2013 has nationalized another eight private colleges.<sup>67</sup> Previously, another four private colleges were nationalized during the past four years of current government. These academic institutes are offering higher secondary, bachelor's (pass), bachelor's (hon's) and master's course. The academic and related non-academic activities in a college/ madrasa/ commercial institute are conducted by a pool of BCS (Gen. Ed) cadre officers. Principal, the administrator monitors the all academic and non-academic activities within the college. Vice-Principal, the second administrator typically works at a college and helps the principal

---

<sup>67</sup> EduIcon.com <http://www.eduicon.com/News/Details/2655.html> ( accessed on May 25, 2013)

in dealing with behavioral problems with students, evaluating teachers, and dealing with certain other college functions such as some extracurricular activities. Teaching and Examination, the basic responsibilities of the institution are performed by a qualified academic staff through different departments. Principal also makes some committees to conduct of examination, extra curricular activities tender & purchase, internal audit, student counseling, course plan etc.

#### **4.6.4 Promotion Scenario**

Promotion is the ultimate desire for an employee for service rendered by him in the institution. Promotion means giving higher position to the employee in the hierarchy of the job with high pay, status and more responsibility. Promotion is the only way for BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre officer's career development in their service sector. It is the ultimate motivating factor for the cadre officer because promotion added higher respect and honor to him.

##### **4.6.4.1 General Rules for Promotion**

Appointment by promotion to a specified post of the service shall be made on the accordance to the rules of BCS recruitment Rules-1981. Some common rules are:

- The candidate shall have requirement, experience and completion of feeder period according to recruitment rules.
- Promotion within the same cadre can be done without consultation with the PSC.
- Promotion of the officer on deputation need to join the promoted post unless s/he will not get the financial benefit before joining.

- Minimum 85 average numbers will be needed in Annual Confidential Report (ACR) of immediate previous five year.<sup>68</sup>

#### **4.6.4.2 Specific Promotion Rules for BCS (Gen. Ed.) Cadre Officers**

Part-VII of the BCS recruitment rules-1981, and Bangladesh Civil Service (General Education) Composition and Cadre Rules, 1980 specifies the promotion policy of the BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre officers. Some specific rules that require for the specific position are as follows:

##### **1. Promotion to the assistant professor from lecturer requires**

- Satisfactory permanence of the service
- 5 years' experience in the post of lecturer.
- 5 years' service length after regularization as per absorption rule 2000 in case of nationalization.
- Passed in the senior scale examination, or  
Participated in the examination but not passed and completion of 15 years' service length, or  
Do not participated in the examination but age of the officer reached to 50 years'.

##### **2. Promotion to the associate professor from assistant professor requires**

- 10 years' experience in the service including 3 years' experience in the feeder post of assistant professor.
- In the case of direct recruitment (10%), 3 years' experience in the feeder post of assistant professor after appointment as assistant professor.

##### **3. Promotion to the professor from associate professor requires**

---

<sup>68</sup> Firoz Mia, *Service Rules* (40<sup>th</sup> ed.; Dhaka: Raddur Publisher, 2010), P. 432.

- 12 years' experience in the service including 2 years' experience in the feeder post of associate professor.
- In the case of direct recruitment (10%), 5 years' experience in the post of associate professor after his/her appointment.

#### 4.6.4.3 Present scenario of promotion

Absence of timely promotion has become a common phenomenon in BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre service. Maximum batch of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre has not got promotion on due time. Although the officers of education cadre of different batch have fulfilled the criteria of promotion, they are not given promotion. The service lengths of different batch are presented here for better understanding.

**Table 4.2: Service Length of different batch**

| BCS Batch        | Date of Joining | Length of Service as on 30/06/2013 |
|------------------|-----------------|------------------------------------|
|                  |                 | Y: M: D                            |
| 7 <sup>th</sup>  | 15/02/1988      | 25:4:15                            |
| 8 <sup>th</sup>  | 20/12/1989      | 23:6:10                            |
| 9 <sup>th</sup>  | 26/01/1991      | 22:5:4                             |
| 10 <sup>th</sup> | 12/12/1991      | 21:6:18                            |
| 11 <sup>th</sup> | 01/04/1993      | 20:5:26                            |
| 13 <sup>th</sup> | 23/04/1994      | 19:2:7                             |
| 14 <sup>th</sup> | 17/11/1993      | 19:7:13                            |
| 15 <sup>th</sup> | 05/11/1995      | 17:7:25                            |
| 16 <sup>th</sup> | 08/08/1996      | 16:10:22                           |
| 17 <sup>th</sup> | 22/02/1998      | 15:4:8                             |
| 18 <sup>th</sup> | 25/01/1999      | 14:5:5                             |
| 20 <sup>th</sup> | 31/05/2001      | 12:0:30                            |
| 21 <sup>st</sup> | 31/05/2003      | 10:1:1                             |
| 22 <sup>nd</sup> | 10/12/2003      | 9:6:21                             |
| 23 <sup>rd</sup> | 18/05/2008      | 5:1:13                             |
| 24 <sup>th</sup> | 02/07/2005      | 7:11:29                            |
| 25 <sup>th</sup> | 31/08/2006      | 6:10:1                             |
| 26 <sup>th</sup> | 02/04/2006      | 7:2:29                             |
| 27 <sup>th</sup> | 31/12/2008      | 4:5:30                             |

The above table indicates that the batches from 7<sup>th</sup> to 14<sup>th</sup> have already completed service length of 25, 23, 22, 21, 20, 19, 19 years respectively. But only a few officers of Bangla, and Soil Science discipline of upto 14<sup>th</sup> batch, Sociology of 8<sup>th</sup> batch and English and Accountancy of 7<sup>th</sup> batch have been promoted to professor (shown in the next table). Batch up-to 26<sup>th</sup> batch have fulfilled the promotional requirements for various ranks, but they have not got promotion.

Subject-wise promotion is given in this cadre. Insufficient post at the upper level of hierarchy and unequal number of post among the subjects creates a long queue of incumbent. It also creates intra cadre discrimination; consequently the senior officer has to serve under the supervision of junior which is an awkward situation for the cadre.

About 1583 officers of BCS general education cadre have been promoted in various ranks in May 2013. Ministry of Education issued an order in this regard on May 13, 2013. Of the officers, 154 associate professor have been promoted to professors while 373 assistant professor to associate professors and 1056 lecturer to assistant professor.<sup>69</sup> This is the largest- ever promotion in the education cadre. After this promotion, subject wise intra cadre scenario is presented the table below.

---

<sup>69</sup> Ministry of Education, *Gazette notification, No.37.00.0000.067.06.001.2013-391-Ed., dated on 13 May, 2013* (Dhaka: College Division, MoEd., 2013)



**Table 4.3: Subject-wise Promotional Picture**

| <b>Subject</b>                    | <b>Professor</b>  | <b>Associate Professor<br/>( till 00<sup>th</sup> Batch)</b> | <b>Assistant Professor<br/>( till 00<sup>th</sup> Batch)</b> |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| Economics                         | 10%/Absorbed/1984 | 18   | 24   |
| Arabic                            | 10%/Absorbed      | 16   | 24   |
| Islamic Studies                   | 10%/Absorbed/1984 | 16   | 24   |
| Islamic History & Culture         | 10%/Absorbed/1984 | 14   | 24   |
| History                           | Absorbed/1984     | 14   | 24   |
| English                           | 7 <sup>th</sup>   | 18   | 26   |
| Botany                            | 10%/Absorbed/1984 | 14   | 24   |
| Mathematics                       | 10%/Absorbed/1984 | 16   | 24   |
| Philosophy                        | 1983/ Absorbed    | 14   | 24   |
| Physics                           | 1984/ Absorbed    | 16   | 24   |
| Statistics                        |                   | 16   | 24   |
| Zoology                           | 1984/ Absorbed    | 14   | 24   |
| Finance & Banking                 |                   | Absorbed   | 26   |
| Bangle                            | 14 <sup>th</sup>  | 17   | 26   |
| Management                        | 10%/Absorbed/1984 | 14   | 24   |
| Geography                         | 1984/ Absorbed    | 16   | 24   |
| Marketing                         |                   | 10%  | 24 Full  |
| Soil Science                      | 14 <sup>th</sup>  | 16   | 24 Full  |
| Psychology                        | 1984/ Absorbed    | 16   | 24   |
| Chemistry                         | 1984/ Absorbed    | 16   | 24 Full  |
| Political Science                 | 10%/Absorbed/1984 | 17   | 26   |
| Social welfare                    | 10%/Absorbed/1984 | 14   | 24   |
| Sociology                         | 8 <sup>th</sup>   | 20   | 24   |
| Accountancy                       | 7 <sup>th</sup>   | 16   | 24   |
|                                   |                   |  |  |
| <b>Teachers Training College:</b> |                   |  |  |
| Bangla                            |                   | 14   | 26   |
| English                           |                   | 17   | 26   |
| Geography                         |                   |  | 26   |
| History                           |                   | 11   | 26   |
| Professional Ethics               |                   | 17   | 24   |

Source: Ministry of Education, GOB. Compiled by Researcher.

Note: Other than Full, all are Partial

The above table indicates a mixed promotional picture of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. The officers who were recruited by PSC in 1984, recruited through 10% provision, and absorbed from nationalized college are predominating at professor level. It also shows that officers of different subjects have been given promotion up-to different batches and partially. This system creates intra cadre problem at work station and also frustrates among the deprived officers.

#### **4.6.5. Posting and Transfer**

Posting and Transfer is a common and regular activity in service world for getting the service from the employee. Every organization and service has its own rules and regulations for management the personnel. There are several general rules and policy for administration and management of the civil officers in Bangladesh. On the basis of the policy, ministry of education introduced a circular containing some guideline for posting and transfers the officer of general education cadre.

**4.6.5.1 Posting:** Posting means the placement of the cadre officer to the respective vacant post in the line of cadre service. The following types of posting are practiced in BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre service.

- **First posting/ Entry posting:** In case of direct recruitment, selected candidates are posted to different entry post of the education cadre. Ministry of Education is responsible for posting the cadre officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) after appointment by the MoPA.
- **Transfer posting:** It means the change of work station of the officer within the same line of cadre with pay, status, responsibility remaining more or less same. Ministry of Education and DSHE are responsible for dealing this type of posting.

- **Promotional posting:** The cadre officers, who get promotion need to be posted in the new position with benefit, status responsibilities of new post. MoEd. Deals with the promotional posting of cadre officers.
- **Deputation posting:** Government can recruit education cadre official on deputation to the mid/top level position of attach bodies under the ministry of education. Ministry of Education and in some cases MoPA is the authorized body to approve the deputation posting.
- **OSD posting:** An Officer in Special Duty (OSD) is an officer of the government without any specific duty assigned to him. The rules promulgated in November, 1986 mentioned five grounds for making an officer OSD- 1) misconduct 2) unauthorized leave for more than two months 3) officers awaiting training, 4) OSD pending posting after return from abroad and 5) other exigency.<sup>70</sup> Ministry of Education controls OSD posting of BCS (Gen. Ed.) Cadre.

**4.6.5.2 Transfer:** Transfer involves a change of posting that means change of work centre/ station mainly within the same line of post with equal pay, status and responsibility. BCS (Gen. Ed.) officers are transferred for two purposes: a) transfer for public interest and b) transfer in response to the application of the officer. Under these two provisions, the general transfer systems in general education cadre are:

- **Normal transfer:** It means the transfer of the officer after completing a required time period in a station.
- **Negative/ Punishment transfer:** Transfer the officer from upgrade station to lower grade station in case of misconduct.

---

<sup>70</sup> The Daily Independent, dated on March 28, 2013.

- **Mutual transfer:** When two officers of same subject and status want to exchange their station and the authority approves the application, it is called mutual transfer.
- **Replacement transfer:** Transfer of an officer is replaced by transferring another officer from the surplus station is called replacement transfer.
- **Remedial Transfer:** It refers to rectification of wrong selection or placement of the cadre officer.

**4.6.5.3 General principle and guidelines:** Ministry of Education promulgated a circular on November 06, 2008 for management the posting/transfer of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre officers. The circular explains some general principle and guidelines that are as follows:

- Newly appointed officer will not be posted at colleges in Dhaka City Corporation. They will be posted either the colleges in their home district or the colleges near about the home district.
- The officer will have to serve for a specific time period in a station.
- The officer, who has higher educational qualification will be transferred to Hon'/ Masters' college.
- Seniority, higher educational degree, training, experience, honesty will be considered for posting the post of principal/ vice-principal.
- Priority will be given on Seniority, higher educational degree, training, experience, honesty, subject of the officer in case of Posting/transfer to the DSHE and other attach bodies under education ministry.
- Transfer and posting at the colleges in Dhaka City Corporation and of principal, vice-principal, professor, and associate professor will be done by the ministry.

- Transfer of assistant professor and lecturer (except colleges in DCC) will be conducted by DSHE.

**4.6.5.4 Observation:** Although a detail guideline has been formulated regarding the transfer and posting, the actual scenario does not match with that in many circumstances.

Posting to the DG of DSHE, highest post of the education cadre was not according to principle in several times. Different administrative posts of the education sector are occupied by many junior cadre officers with the help of illegal patronization. Another observation is that, several transfer order was passed in a day. About 258 and 263 numbers of transfer orders have been ordered from MoEd. And DSHE respectively during July 2012 to June 2013. Many officers were transferred before fulfilling the retention time period in a work station. Analyzing the first posting of 30<sup>th</sup> and 31<sup>st</sup> BCS, it is found that about 22.02% and 14.44% officer were posted outside home district even near after district. Positive sign is that, posting in home district/ near home district is increasing.

#### **4.6.6. Some Burning Problems in BCS General Education Cadre**

BCS General Education cadre is the largest cadre among the cadres of Bangladesh civil service. The officers of this cadre are contributing in the higher education about 70% and a major portion in the higher secondary level. Nevertheless, it is true that it is one of the neglected cadres among the twenty eight cadres. The cadre is suffering from some intra cadre and some inter cadre problems which makes the cadre unattractive. Some of the major problems that make the officers of education cadre frustrated are:

**a) Salary Scale Up-gradation:** Professors and Associate Professors of public university and technical colleges are getting their salary at grade-3 (29000-1100x6-

35600) and grade-4 (25750-1000x8-33750) respectively. On the other hand, Professors and Associate Professors of education cadre get the salary at grade-4 (25750-1000x8-33750) and grade- 5 (22250-900x10-31250) respectively. This cadre is claiming for up-gradation the salary scale from a long since. Even it was decided in a secretariat committee to up-grade the scale. But, the issue is not solved for some bureaucratic problems.

**b) Earned leave:** It is said that the BCS education Cadre enjoys much leave facility as a vacation department. But, reality is that the cadre enjoy one day public holiday in a week and they have to work on different holidays. In spite of this, the cadre does not get the facility of leave on average pay. Even, other civil servants in same the work station enjoy the facility. But the officers of BCS General Education cadre get leave on half-average pay.

**c) The scheduled posts are being occupied by other cadres:** The education cadre has been ascribed to some posts in the line of its hierarchy. Some of the top level posts have already been occupied by other influential cadre and there are constant threats regarding this; which creates inter cadre conflict.

**d) Timely Selection Grade:** Getting selection grade in due time is a common problem in general education cadre. Professor, Assistant professor and lecturer are not getting selection grade in due time. As a result they feel de-motivated in service.

**e) Discrimination in Promotion:** Timely promotion inspires the officer to serve cordially. Because of subject wise promotion system, education cadre officer do not get promotion timely comparing to that of others cadre. This discrimination creates ego problem among the cadres as well as among the intra cadre.

**f) Position in Warrant of Precedence:** In spite of the highest rank of education cadre, professor is not placed in the warrant of precedent. Only DG and

directors of DSHE have the position in the article. On the other hand professors of public university and public medical college have place in the warrant of precedent. As a result, professors of education cadre are not properly honoured at public meeting/ function in district and upazila level.

#### **4.7 Conclusion**

Officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre, the indispensable part of the education sector providing their service to make the future generation knowledge based human resources. They have the responsibility to develop a well educated nation. So the officers of education cadre must be well conversant and have deep knowledge in respective subjects. Conducive service environment and justice at every stage of service inspire them to deliver better and honest service. Regular promotion and timely selection grade can motivate them highly. The uniformity and fair practice in respect of promotion, posting and giving selection grade need to build the BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre as an efficient workforce. Though education is an important sector of the country, government of the country is not cordial enough for welfare of the education cadre. So, necessary initiative should be taken in the greater interest of education and nation.

## Chapter Five

### Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment differences in relation to Demographic Factors

#### 5.1 Introduction

Demographic factors are some of the common characteristic of the human resources, which are usually used variables in relation to job satisfaction and professional commitment. Studies have found a variety of personal characteristic such as age, gender, marital status, education, experience, tenure; impact on job satisfaction and professional commitment. Several researcher like Al Enezi (2004), Mottaz (1988) found that the impact of the personal character were not direct on the job satisfaction and commitment. On the other hand, some studies have identified a significant relationship between personal characteristic and job satisfaction, personal characteristic and professional commitment. The identified variables from the review of literature have mentioned in the conceptual framework of the study. In this chapter, those variables are discussed and analyze the personal data gathered from the research sample.

#### 5.2 Important Demographic Factors

**Designation:** Designation of the public employee has an important influence on the attitude and organizational behavior. Review of literature found mix assessment regarding the designation. Haque (1992) found that designation did not have significant impact on job satisfaction and professional commitment. On the other hand, Leelavathy conducted a study on self financing engineering college teacher and found a significant relationship between designation and job satisfaction and between designation and commitment.



**Appointment Type:** Appointment types are one of the important factors that impact the job satisfaction and professional commitment. In BCS education cadre, officers are recruited through direct, 10% quota and absorbed process.

**Institution Type:** Institute type where the employees are providing service has important influence on job satisfaction and commitment of the employee.

**Location of the work station:** Research found a positive relationship between satisfaction and commitment and location where the employee served. Employees in urban are seems to be more satisfied than employees in local area because of living facilities. Rawnak (2010) found that women civil servant working at rural level faced many problems than who are working at metropolitan area. In this research the location are categorized as metropolitan, municipal and rural.

**Occupational Group:** Occupational group has an important impact on the job satisfaction and professional commitment. Many research distinguished the staff of the education institute as academic and administrative group. The primary duties of academics are teaching, research, while the duties of administrative staffs are offering support service to research and teaching. Research studies have found that employees who perform high status job possess higher level of professional commitment compared to meaningless job holder. Many researchers advocated that occupational type was a significant predictor of job satisfaction and professional commitment.

**Age:** Most of the studies has advocated that age is an important determinate of job satisfaction and commitment. Mixed evidence exists regarding the relationship between age and job satisfaction and professional commitment.<sup>71</sup> Maximum research has found that age was positively correlated to job satisfaction and professional

---

<sup>71</sup> Robbins, S.P., Odendaal, A., & Roodt, G. (2003). Organisational behavior (9th ed.). Cape Town: Prentice-Hall International.

commitment. Workers in the advanced age group tend to be more satisfied and high commitment level probably because they have adjusted with their job conditions.

**Gender:** Gender is another personal characteristic which impact the satisfaction and commitment of the employee. Some studies found limited and inconsistent relation to job satisfaction and gender. Mathieu and Zajac (1990) found that women had higher commitment and satisfaction than men. On the other hand, Bruning and Snyder found no difference between men and women considering their level of satisfaction and commitment.

**Marital Status:** There is a significant difference in job satisfaction and professional commitment based on marital status. The general impression is that married employees are tent to be dissatisfied due to their family responsibility. But literature shows that Married people have more family obligation, financial concern; and therefore, they are likely to be more committed to their existing profession and more satisfied than their unmarried counterparts are. Therefore this study assumes that marital status is positively related to the job satisfaction and professional commitment.

**Tenure:** Tenure means the number of years an employee has spent working in an organization or in a profession. The relation between tenure and job satisfaction /commitment develops after the employee has passed some years in an organization. Some studies found that job tenure was a positive determinant of job satisfaction and commitment while positional tenure was a negative determinant. Research conducted by Mottaz (1988) amongst nurses in the United States of America found a significant positive relation in job satisfaction and professional commitment with length of time on the job. Clarke, Oswald and Warr (1996) argued that employees with longer service may experience higher satisfaction and commitment levels because the job

matches their personal needs. Contrary to the above decision, Sarker et al. (2003) states that longer tenure in a job may not increase job satisfaction and commitment, because of monotonous job in the profession.

**Educational Level:** Educational level of the employee's has a role on their satisfaction and commitment. Some studies argue that employees with lower educational level act as dissatisfied worker than the employees who have higher qualification due to less capability of stress management. Contrary to the above statement, some argue that higher educational qualified employees experience lower level of satisfaction and commitment because of their high level of expectation which employer are unable to fulfill.

One of the important specific objectives of this study was to measure the level of job satisfaction and professional commitment of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre officers and to examine whether there were any differentiation in levels of satisfaction and commitment in relation to demographic factors. To fulfill the objective a broad hypothesis was developed in methodology chapter.

### **5.3 Data Analysis and Interpretation**

To analyze data the study used Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) 17 version. Descriptive statistics like frequency, percentage were used to describe demographic characteristics of the respondents and mean, standard deviation, maximum, minimum were used to describe the level of satisfaction and commitment.

#### **5.3.1 Profile of the Respondents**

This section presents the demographic characteristics of the respondents in terms of designation, appointment type, institute category, institute location, occupational group, gender, age, marital status, job tenure, post tenure and highest educational level. The summarized characteristics are shown the table below.

**Table 5.1: Summary of Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents**

| <b>Demographic Factors</b> | <b>Frequency</b> | <b>Percent (%)</b> |
|----------------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| <b>Designation</b>         |                  |                    |
| Professor                  | 18               | 4.8                |
| Associate Professor        | 59               | 15.8               |
| Assistant Professor        | 137              | 36.6               |
| Lecturer                   | 160              | 42.8               |
| <b>Total</b>               | <b>374</b>       | <b>100%</b>        |
| <b>Appointment Type</b>    |                  |                    |
| PSC                        | 1                | .3                 |
| BCS (Direct)               | 342              | 91.4               |
| 10% Quota                  | 10               | 2.7                |
| Nationalized               | 21               | 5.6                |
| <b>Total</b>               | <b>374</b>       | <b>100%</b>        |
| <b>Inst. Category</b>      |                  |                    |
| Masters College            | 198              | 52.9               |
| Degree (Hon,s) college     | 112              | 29.9               |
| Degree Pass College        | 33               | 8.8                |
| Commercial Inst.           | 3                | .8                 |
| TTC                        | 14               | 3.7                |
| Madrassa                   | 2                | .5                 |
| Administrative             | 12               | 3.2                |
| <b>Total</b>               | <b>374</b>       | <b>100%</b>        |
| <b>Inst. Location</b>      |                  |                    |
| Metropolitan               | 178              | 47.6               |
| District Sadar             | 148              | 39.6               |
| Upozila Sadar              | 38               | 10.2               |
| Rural                      | 10               | 2.7                |
| <b>Total</b>               | <b>374</b>       | <b>100%</b>        |
| <b>Occupational Group</b>  |                  |                    |
| Academic                   | 358              | 95.7               |
| Administrative             | 16               | 4.3                |
| <b>Total</b>               | <b>374</b>       | <b>100%</b>        |

|                          |            |             |
|--------------------------|------------|-------------|
| <b>Gender</b>            |            |             |
| Male                     | 287        | 76.7        |
| Female                   | 87         | 23.3        |
| <b>Total</b>             | <b>374</b> | <b>100%</b> |
| <b>Age</b>               |            |             |
| Below 30                 | 17         | 4.5         |
| 30 – 39                  | 217        | 58          |
| 40 – 49                  | 93         | 24.9        |
| 50 and Above             | 47         | 12.6        |
| <b>Total</b>             | <b>374</b> | <b>100%</b> |
| <b>Marital Status</b>    |            |             |
| Single                   | 15         | 4           |
| Married                  | 359        | 96          |
| <b>Total</b>             | <b>374</b> | <b>100%</b> |
| <b>Job Tenure</b>        |            |             |
| 0 – 4                    | 50         | 13.4        |
| 5 – 10                   | 187        | 50          |
| 11 – 15                  | 48         | 12.8        |
| 16 and Above             | 89         | 23.8        |
| <b>Total</b>             | <b>374</b> | <b>100%</b> |
| <b>Post Tenure</b>       |            |             |
| Bellow 1 year            | 26         | 7           |
| 1 - 4                    | 160        | 42.8        |
| 5 - 10                   | 175        | 46.8        |
| 11- above                | 13         | 3.5         |
| <b>Total</b>             | <b>374</b> | <b>100%</b> |
| <b>Highest Education</b> |            |             |
| B. Degree                | 0          | 0           |
| Master                   | 334        | 89.3        |
| M.Phil                   | 10         | 2.7         |
| M.Phil Ongoing           | 1          | .3          |
| Ph.D                     | 24         | 6.4         |
| Ph.D Ongoing             | 5          | 1.3         |
| <b>Total</b>             | <b>374</b> | <b>100%</b> |

Source: Primary Data

The statistics show that only 4.8% were professor while 42.8% of the respondents were lecturer and 36.6% were assistant professor. The small number of professor may be the result of limited number of post in the different institute. Most of the respondents were appointed through BCS (Direct) recruitment process which is 91.4%. Considering the institute about half of the respondents were from Masters College (52.9%) and lowest number from madrasha (.5%). This is cause of large number of post for the BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre in the master's college. Respondents were included from different location of the institute. Respondent of metropolitan, district sadar, upozila and rural were 47.6%, 39.6%, 10.2%, and 2.7% respectably. Majority of the respondents were academic group (95.7%) while administrative were 4.3%. The study covered reasonable respondents in every age group but major portion of the respondents were in the age group of 30-39 which was 58%. Data also show that 96% of the respondents were married and 46.8% respondents are providing service at the same post about 5-10 years. Most of the respondents hold master degree as their highest education level (89.3%) and a good number holds Ph.D degree which is positive sign for the education cadre.

### **5.3.2 Level of Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction was measured with items developed by Warr, Cook and Wall (1979). Job satisfaction measured consisted of 17 items covering both extrinsic and intrinsic satisfaction and one item measured overall satisfaction considering every items of satisfaction. Descriptive statistics were calculated for each of the three scales: extrinsic job satisfaction, intrinsic job satisfaction and overall job satisfaction survey. Mean, standard deviation, minimum and maximum score were calculated for describing the level of satisfaction and commitment.

The levels of job satisfaction the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre are presented the table below.

**Table 5.2: Overall Job Satisfaction of the Respondents**

| Overall Satisfaction               | Frequency  | Percent      |
|------------------------------------|------------|--------------|
| Extremely Dissatisfied             | 11         | 2.9          |
| Dissatisfied                       | 83         | 22.2         |
| Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied | 47         | 12.6         |
| Satisfied                          | 205        | 54.8         |
| Extremely Satisfied                | 28         | 7.5          |
| <b>Total</b>                       | <b>374</b> | <b>100.0</b> |

**Source: Primary Data**

One of the important parts of the objective number one was to know the level of overall job satisfaction of the BCS general education cadre officer. The respondents were asked that how satisfied they are (taking everything into consideration) with their job. Table indicates that 54.8 percent respondents were satisfied. On the other hand 22.2 percent respondents were dissatisfied.

**Table 5.3: Summary Results of level of Job Satisfaction of the Officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.**

| Variables                  | N   | Min  | Max  | Mean | Std. Deviation | Comments  |
|----------------------------|-----|------|------|------|----------------|-----------|
| Overall Job Satisfaction   | 374 | 1    | 5    | 3.42 | 1.01           | satisfied |
| Extrinsic Job Satisfaction | 374 | 1.56 | 4.44 | 3.27 | .45            | neutral   |
| Intrinsic Job Satisfaction | 374 | 1.50 | 4.63 | 3.16 | .52            | neutral   |

**Source: Primary Data**

\*Mean categories: Extremely Dissatisfied= 1.00-1.80; Dissatisfied =1.81-2.60; Neutral= 2.61-3.40; Satisfied= 3.41- 4.20; Extremely Satisfied=4.21- 5.00. Extremely Not-committed/= 1.00-1.80; Not-committed =1.81-2.60; Neutral= 2.61-3.40; Committed = 3.41- 4.20; Extremely Committed =4.21-5.00.<sup>72</sup>

\*Note: Range of the scale is equally distributed to each scale.

<sup>72</sup> Butucha. K.G, Teachers' "Perceived Commitment as Measured by Age, Gender and School Type", Greener Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 3(8), October, 2013.

**Overall Job Satisfaction:** To determine the overall satisfaction, the respondents were asked that “Now considering everything, how satisfied are you with your job in general (Item No. 18). The responses was extremely satisfied 7.5%, satisfied 54.8%, neutral 12.6, dissatisfied 22.2% and extremely dissatisfied 2.9%. The mean score for this scale was 3.42 (SD=1.01) and fell within the satisfied range.

**Extrinsic job satisfaction:** Extrinsic job satisfaction was calculated by 9 items ( Item No.:1,3,5,7,9,11,12,14,17). Average was calculated of these 9 items as a new variable named ExtJobSat for each of the respondent. Then mean, standard deviation, minimum and maximum score were calculated for describing the level of extrinsic satisfaction. The average mean score for this scale was 3.27 (SD=.45) and fell within the neutral range.

**Intrinsic Job Satisfaction:** Intrinsic job satisfaction was calculated by 8 items (Item No.:2,4,6,8,10,13,,15,16). Average was calculated of these 8 items as a new variable named IntJobSat for each of the respondent. Then mean, standard deviation, minimum and maximum score were calculated and results are presented the table-5.3. The average mean score for this scale was 3.16 (SD=.52) and fell within the neutral range of the satisfaction level.

### **5.3.3 Levels of Professional Commitment**

Three dimensions of Professional commitment were affective professional commitment (APC), Continuance professional commitment (CPC) and Normative Professional commitment (NPC). These three professional commitments were measured with the questionnaire developed by Allen and Meyer. This study used 16 items to measure commitment of the BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre officer covering three dimensions of the commitment. However, the wordings of some of the items were changed to suit the context of the study. Descriptive statistics were computed for each



the three scales of commitment. The levels of professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre are presented the table below.

**Table 5.4: Summary Results of level of Professional Commitment of the Officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.**

| Professional Commitment | N   | Min  | Max  | Mean | Std. Deviation | Comments  |
|-------------------------|-----|------|------|------|----------------|-----------|
| Affective Commitment    | 374 | 1.50 | 5    | 3.70 | .66            | committed |
| Continuance Commitment  | 374 | 1.75 | 5    | 3.35 | .61            | neutral   |
| Normative Commitment    | 374 | 1.67 | 4.67 | 3.35 | .55            | neutral   |

Source: Primary Data

\*Mean categories: Extremely Dissatisfied= 1.00-1.80; Dissatisfied =1.81-2.60; Neutral= 2.61-3.40; Satisfied= 3.41- 4.20; Extremely Satisfied=4.21- 5.00. Extremely Not-committed/= 1.00-1.80; Not-committed =1.81-2.60; Neutral= 2.61-3.40; Committed = 3.41- 4.20; Extremely Committed =4.21- 5.00.<sup>73</sup>

**Affective Professional Commitment (APC):** Affective commitment was measured using six items. Average score of six items was computed for every respondent under different variable. Then mean, standard deviation, minimum and maximum score were calculated and results were shown in above table. The result of mean score for affective commitment was 3.71 (SD=.66 which fell into commitment range.

**Continuance Professional Commitment (CPC):** Continuance commitment was measured using four items. Item number 9 was reverse scored item and recorded as suggested by the developer. Average score of four items was computed for every respondent under different variable. Then mean, standard deviation, minimum and

---

\*Note: Range of the scale is equally distributed to each scale.

<sup>73</sup> Butucha. K.G, Teachers' "Perceived Commitment as Measured by Age, Gender and School Type", Greener Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 3(8), October, 2013.

maximum score were calculated for describing the level of continuance commitment. The mean score for this scale was 3.35 (SD=.61) and fell within the neutral range.

**Normative Professional Commitment (NPC):** Normative commitment was measured using six items. . Item number 13 was reverse scored item and recorded as suggested by the developer. Average score of six items was computed for every respondent under different variable. Then mean, standard deviation, minimum and maximum score were calculated for describing the level of normative commitment. The mean score for this scale was 3.35 (SD=.55) and fell within the neutral range.

## **5.4 Exploring the Relationship and Test of Hypothesis**

The second part of the objective number one was whether there were any differentiation in level of satisfaction and commitment in relation to demographic factors. The main demographic variables were selected as designation, type of appointment, category of institute, location of institute, occupational group, gender, age, marital status, job tenure and highest educational level to know the level of job satisfaction and commitment. To attain the objective a broad hypothesis (H1) was developed as, demographic factors had no relation with job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. To explain the broad hypothesis, some specific hypotheses have developed and have tested in this chapter. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to explore the association between demographic factors and job satisfaction and professional commitment and to test the hypothesis in this study.

## 5.4.1 Relation with Designation and Job Satisfaction; and Relation with Designation Professional Commitment

### 5.4.1.1 Designation and Level of Job Satisfaction; and Level of Professional Commitment

Designation is one of the important personal factors to determine the job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. In this study the designation of respondents has been categorized into four levels namely Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor and Lecturer. Result of descriptive statistics (frequency, mean and standard deviation) regarding designation and level of satisfaction and commitment perceived by the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre are presented following table.

**Table 5.5: Designation and Level of Job Satisfaction and Level of Professional Commitment**

| Designation         | f          | Job Satisfaction           |                              |                              | Commitment            |                       |                       |
|---------------------|------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
|                     |            | Overall Job Sat. Mean (SD) | Extrinsic Job Sat. Mean (SD) | Intrinsic Job Sat. Mean (SD) | APC Mean (SD)         | CPC Mean (SD)         | NPC Mean (SD)         |
| Professor           | 18         | 4.33<br>(.49)              | 3.72<br>(.29)                | 3.57<br>(.61)                | 4.33<br>(.37)         | 3.75<br>(.53)         | 3.79<br>(.39)         |
| Associate Professor | 59         | 3.68<br>(1.04)             | 3.32<br>(.48)                | 3.10<br>(.58)                | 3.95<br>(.64)         | 3.53<br>(.59)         | 3.42<br>(.52)         |
| Assistant Professor | 137        | 3.31<br>(1.00)             | 3.35<br>(.42)                | 3.21<br>(.47)                | 3.65<br>(.65)         | 3.39<br>(.53)         | 3.33<br>(.54)         |
| Lecturer            | 160        | 3.31<br>(.98)              | 3.13<br>(.42)                | 3.09<br>(.51)                | 3.59<br>(.64)         | 3.20<br>(.65)         | 3.30<br>(.56)         |
| <b>Total</b>        | <b>374</b> | <b>3.42<br/>(1.01)</b>     | <b>3.27<br/>(.45)</b>        | <b>3.16<br/>(.52)</b>        | <b>3.70<br/>(.66)</b> | <b>3.35<br/>(.61)</b> | <b>3.35<br/>(.55)</b> |

Source: Primary Data

\*Mean categories: Extremely Dissatisfied= 1.00-1.80; Dissatisfied =1.81-2.60; Neutral= 2.61-3.40; Satisfied= 3.41- 4.20; Extremely Satisfied=4.21- 5.00. Extremely Not-committed= 1.00-1.80; Not-committed =1.81-2.60; Neutral= 2.61-3.40; Committed = 3.41- 4.20; Extremely Committed =4.21- 5.00

It could be noted from the table that the level of overall job satisfaction of Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor and Lecturer were an average of 4.33, 3.68, 3.31, and 3.31 respectively. Table indicate that the highest level of extrinsic satisfaction was possessed by the professor (Mean= 3.72) and lowest level was possessed by the lecturer (Mean=3.13. The level of intrinsic job satisfaction of professor (mean=3.57) was highest and that of lecturer was lowest (mean=3.09). Table shows that the level of three scale of satisfaction (overall, extrinsic and intrinsic) varies from category to category of designation.

Regarding the commitment level, table indicate that, professor perceived highest level of commitment in each scale of commitment (APC, CPC, NPC) comparing to others categories. On the other hand, lecturer perceived lowest level of commitment among the BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. Table also shows that the highest mean score of the commitment scale was 3.79 for NPC which was perceived by professor. On the other hand, lowest score fell in APC as 3.09, perceived by lecturer. It is clear that the level of commitment is not same in every category.

#### **5.4.1.2 Designation and Job satisfaction**

In order to find out the significance of relationship between designation and job satisfaction, ANOVA test was used to test the hypothesis and result of the test is presented in the Table-5.5.

##### **Hypothesis**

**Null hypothesis (H<sub>0</sub>):** There is no significant relationship between designation and their job satisfaction.

**Alternative hypothesis (H<sub>1</sub>):** There is a significant relationship between designation and their job satisfaction.

**Table 5.6: Designation and Job Satisfaction (ANOVA)**

| Factor             | Variables              |                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F     | Sig. | Remarks     |
|--------------------|------------------------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|------|-------------|
| <b>Designation</b> | Overall Satisfaction   | Between Groups | 22.55          | 3   | 7.52        | 7.80  | .000 | Significant |
|                    |                        | Within Groups  | 356.38         | 370 | .96         |       |      |             |
|                    |                        | Total          | 378.93         | 373 |             |       |      |             |
|                    | Extrinsic Satisfaction | Between Groups | 7.79           | 3   | 2.60        | 14.29 | .000 | Significant |
|                    |                        | Within Groups  | 67.20          | 370 | .18         |       |      |             |
|                    |                        | Total          | 74.99          | 373 |             |       |      |             |
|                    | Intrinsic Satisfaction | Between Groups | 4.26           | 3   | 1.42        | 5.41  | .001 | Significant |
|                    |                        | Within Groups  | 97.14          | 370 | .26         |       |      |             |
|                    |                        | Total          | 101.40         | 373 |             |       |      |             |

It is noted from the above table that the F value for the one way ANOVA of overall job satisfaction of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre was  $F(3, 370) = 7.80$  and  $p = .000$  which was statistically significant at .05 (5%) level ( $P < .05$ ). It means designation of the respondents and their level of overall job satisfaction is closely related.

The F value for the one way ANOVA of extrinsic job satisfaction of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre was  $F(3, 370) = 14.29$  and  $p = .000$  which was statistically significant at .05 (5%) level ( $P < .05$ ). It means designation of the respondents and their level of extrinsic job satisfaction is closely related.

The F value for the one way ANOVA of intrinsic job satisfaction of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre was  $F(3, 370) = 5.41$  and  $p = .001$  which was statistically significant at .05 (5%) level ( $P < .05$ ). It means designation of the respondents and their level of intrinsic job satisfaction is closely related.

*P* values for three scale of satisfaction were less than .05. Hence, the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) is rejected. From the analysis, it is concluded that there is a significant relationship between designation and job satisfaction of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

#### 5.4.1.3 Designation and Professional Commitment

In order to find out the significance of relationship between designation and professional commitment, ANOVA test was used to test the hypothesis and result of the test is presented in the Table-5.6.

#### Hypothesis

**Null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ):** There is no significant relationship between designation and their Professional commitment.

**Alternative hypothesis ( $H_1$ ):** There is a significant relationship between designation and their Professional commitment.

**Table 5.7: Designation and Professional Commitment (ANOVA)**

| Factor      | Variables |                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F     | Sig. | Remarks     |
|-------------|-----------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|------|-------------|
| Designation | APC       | Between Groups | 13.32          | 3   | 4.44        | 11.03 | .000 | Significant |
|             |           | Within Groups  | 148.95         | 370 | .40         |       |      |             |
|             |           | Total          | 162.27         | 373 |             |       |      |             |
|             | CPC       | Between Groups | 8.48           | 3   | 2.83        | 8.06  | .000 | Significant |
|             |           | Within Groups  | 129.76         | 370 | .35         |       |      |             |
|             |           | Total          | 138.24         | 373 |             |       |      |             |
|             | NPC       | Between Groups | 4.22           | 3   | 1.41        | 4.85  | .003 | Significant |
|             |           | Within Groups  | 107.26         | 370 | .29         |       |      |             |
|             |           | Total          | 111.48         | 373 |             |       |      |             |

It is noted from the above table that P value of APC, CPC and NPC of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre were .000, .000 and .003 respectably. Each P value is less than 0.05 levels, which mean null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected. So, it is concluded that a significant association exist in relation to designation and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. Hence,

## 5.4.2 Type of Appointment and Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment

### 5.4.2.1 Type of Appointment and Level of Job Satisfaction and Level of Professional Commitment

Type of appointment is another important factor, that impact job satisfaction and commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. Four types of appointment system were considered in this study namely PSC, BCS, 10% quota and nationalized. Level of satisfaction and commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre regarding appointment types are presented the table-5.7.

**Table 5.8: Type of appointment and level of Job Satisfaction and Level of Professional Commitment**

| Appointment Type | f   | Job Satisfaction          |                             |                             | Commitment    |               |               |
|------------------|-----|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
|                  |     | Overall Job Sat Mean (SD) | Extrinsic Job Sat Mean (SD) | Intrinsic Job Sat Mean (SD) | APC Mean (SD) | CPC Mean (SD) | NPC Mean (SD) |
| PSC              | 1   | 5.00                      | 3.67                        | 3.50                        | 4.67          | 4.00          | 4.17          |
| BCS (Direct)     | 342 | 3.35<br>(.98)             | 3.23<br>(.43)               | 3.13<br>(.50)               | 3.65<br>(.64) | 3.31<br>(.61) | 3.33<br>(.54) |
| 10% Quota        | 10  | 4.20<br>(.42)             | 3.60<br>(.32)               | 3.31<br>(.55)               | 4.42<br>(.23) | 3.53<br>(.38) | 3.07<br>(.71) |
| Nationalized     | 21  | 4.10<br>(1.14)            | 3.72<br>(.46)               | 3.44<br>(.74)               | 4.25<br>(.62) | 3.85<br>(.48) | 3.83<br>(.35) |
| Total            | 374 | 3.42<br>(1.01)            | 3.27<br>(.45)               | 3.16<br>(.52)               | 3.70<br>(.66) | 3.35<br>(.61) | 3.35<br>(.55) |

Source: Primary Data

Table indicates that respondent of PSC category was one and the respondent's satisfaction and commitment level for every scale were satisfactory. Recruitment as the name of PSC was abolished after the introduction of BCS. Maximum officers, recruited through PSC system were completed their service tenure. As a result minimum respondent was included in this study. The level of satisfaction of BCS (Direct) category respondents fell into neutral range (Means=3.35, 3.23, 3.13) which means they were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. Another way, only APC level was satisfactory (M=3.65) but CPC and NPC were not satisfactory. Officers, recruited through 10% reserve quota were about strongly satisfied (M=4.20) in overall scale, and moderately satisfied (M=3.60) in extrinsic scale of satisfaction. In case of commitment level, they were highly committed to APC (M=4.42), medium committed to CPC (M=3.53) and neutral to NPC (M=3.07). Nationalized officers were satisfied with and committed to their job in each scale of satisfaction and commitment. The result shows a clear variation of satisfaction and commitment level regarding appointment type of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

#### **5.4.2.2 Type of Appointment and Job Satisfaction**

In order to find out the significance of relationship between type of appointment and job satisfaction, one way ANOVA test was used to test the hypothesis and result of the test is presented in the Table-5.8.

##### **Hypothesis**

**Null hypothesis (H<sub>0</sub>):** There is no significant relationship between Type of appointment and their job satisfaction.

**Alternative hypothesis (H<sub>1</sub>):** There is a significant relationship between Type of appointment and their job satisfaction.



**Table 5.9: Appointment type and Job Satisfaction (ANOVA)**

| Factor           | Variables              |                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F     | Sig. | Remarks                      |
|------------------|------------------------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|------|------------------------------|
| Appointment Type | Overall Satisfaction   | Between Groups | 19.93          | 3   | 6.64        | 6.85  | .000 | Significant<br><i>P</i> <.05 |
|                  |                        | Within Groups  | 359.00         | 370 | .97         |       |      |                              |
|                  |                        | Total          | 378.93         | 373 |             |       |      |                              |
|                  | Extrinsic Satisfaction | Between Groups | 5.97           | 3   | 1.99        | 10.67 | .000 | Significant<br><i>P</i> <.05 |
|                  |                        | Within Groups  | 69.02          | 370 | .19         |       |      |                              |
|                  |                        | Total          | 74.99          | 373 |             |       |      |                              |
|                  | Intrinsic Satisfaction | Between Groups | 2.22           | 3   | .74         | 2.76  | .042 | Significant<br><i>P</i> <.05 |
|                  |                        | Within Groups  | 99.18          | 370 | .27         |       |      |                              |
|                  |                        | Total          | 101.40         | 373 |             |       |      |                              |

From the above table, result regarding extrinsic, intrinsic, and overall satisfaction are *F* value=6.85, 10.67 and 2.76 respectively at 3, 370 degree of freedom and corresponding *P* value are .000, .000 and .042 respectively which are lower than significance level .05 (5%). Therefore the null hypothesis (*H*<sub>0</sub>) is rejected and alternative hypothesis (*H*<sub>1</sub>) is accepted. From the analysis it is concluded that appointment type of the BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre is significantly associated with extrinsic, intrinsic and overall job satisfaction of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.).

### 5.4.2.3 Type of Appointment and Professional Commitment

To find out the relationship between appointment type and commitment, test results of one way ANOVA are presented table below.

**Null hypothesis (H<sub>0</sub>):** There is no significant relationship between Type of appointment and their Professional commitment.

**Alternative hypothesis (H<sub>1</sub>):** There is a significant relationship between Type of appointment and their Professional commitment

To find out the relationship between appointment type and commitment, test results of one way ANOVA are presented table below.

**Table 5.10: Appointment type and Professional commitment (ANOVA)**

| Factor           | Variables |                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F     | Sig. | Remarks     |
|------------------|-----------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|------|-------------|
| Appointment Type | APC       | Between Groups | 13.26          | 3   | 4.42        | 10.98 | .000 | Significant |
|                  |           | Within Groups  | 149.00         | 370 | .40         |       |      |             |
|                  |           | Total          | 162.26         | 373 |             |       |      |             |
|                  | CPC       | Between Groups | 6.35           | 3   | 2.12        | 5.94  | .001 | Significant |
|                  |           | Within Groups  | 131.89         | 370 | .36         |       |      |             |
|                  |           | Total          | 138.24         | 373 |             |       |      |             |
|                  | NPC       | Between Groups | 6.53           | 3   | 2.18        | 7.68  | .000 | Significant |
|                  |           | Within Groups  | 104.95         | 370 | .28         |       |      |             |
|                  |           | Total          | 111.48         | 373 |             |       |      |             |

From the above table, result regarding APC, CPC, and NPC are *F* value=10.98, 5.94, and 7.68 respectively at 3, 370 degree of freedom and

corresponding  $P$  value are .000, .001 and .000 respectively which are lower than significance level .05 (5%). Therefore the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) is rejected and alternative hypothesis ( $H_1$ ) is accepted. From the analysis it is concluded that appointment type of the BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre is significantly associated with professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.).

### **5.4.3 Category of Institute and Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment**

#### **5.4.3.1 Category of Institute and Level of Job Satisfaction and Level of Professional Commitment**

BCS (Gen. Ed.) education officers are working at different kinds of institution. Seven types of institute were chosen in this study to determine the level of satisfaction and professional commitment. These institutes were master's college, honour's college, degree pass college, commercial institute, TTC, madrasha, board and DSHE. Respondents from board and DSHE were considered as Administrative officers. The distribution of sample respondents according to category of institute and level of satisfaction and commitment of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre are shown in the table-5.10.

**Table 5.11: Category of Institute and Level of Job Satisfaction and Level of Professional Commitment**

| Institution Category   | f   | Job Satisfaction          |                             |                             | Commitment    |               |               |
|------------------------|-----|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
|                        |     | Overall Job Sat Mean (SD) | Extrinsic Job Sat Mean (SD) | Intrinsic Job Sat Mean (SD) | APC Mean (SD) | CPC Mean (SD) | NPC Mean (SD) |
| Masters College        | 198 | 3.43<br>(1.04)            | 3.31<br>(.39)               | 3.15<br>(.48)               | 3.70<br>(.67) | 3.36<br>(.69) | 3.30<br>(.57) |
| Degree (Hon,s) college | 112 | 3.38<br>(.99)             | 3.21<br>(.50)               | 3.17<br>(.52)               | 3.67<br>(.68) | 3.30<br>(.47) | 3.38<br>(.50) |
| Degree Pass College    | 33  | 3.12<br>(.93)             | 3.19<br>(.50)               | 3.09<br>(.60)               | 3.79<br>(.53) | 3.45<br>(.53) | 3.41<br>(.54) |
| Commercial Inst.       | 3   | 3.33<br>(1.16)            | 3.33<br>(.19)               | 3.17<br>(.191)              | 3.17<br>(.44) | 3.75<br>(.25) | 3.06<br>(.69) |
| TTC                    | 14  | 3.64<br>(1.01)            | 3.37<br>(.38)               | 3.17<br>(.62)               | 3.77<br>(.74) | 3.46<br>(.56) | 3.52<br>(.50) |
| Madrasa                | 2   | 3.50<br>(.71)             | 2.94<br>(.24)               | 3.06<br>(.09)               | 3.67<br>(.00) | 2.88<br>(.18) | 3.42<br>(.35) |
| Administrative         | 12  | 4.08<br>(.52)             | 3.41<br>(.72)               | 3.36<br>(.85)               | 3.96<br>(.52) | 3.23<br>(.73) | 3.63<br>(.53) |
| Total                  | 374 | 3.42<br>(1.01)            | 3.27<br>(.45)               | 3.16<br>(.52)               | 3.70<br>(.66) | 3.35<br>(.61) | 3.35<br>(.55) |

Table indicates that, administrative officers are most satisfied than others regarding overall job satisfaction (M=4.08) and extrinsic job satisfaction (M=3.41). The levels of job satisfaction of the officers from master's college are average 3.43, 3.31, and 3.15 regarding overall, extrinsic and intrinsic job satisfaction respectively. The lowest overall job satisfaction perceived by the officers from degree pass college (M=3.12). Regarding extrinsic job satisfaction, administrative officers are perceived highest level of satisfaction (M=3.41) and officers from madrasha are perceived lowest level of satisfaction (M=2.94). Officers from administrative institute had highest level of intrinsic satisfaction (M=3.36) and officers from madrasha had lowest

level of same scale (M=3.06). Regarding commitment scale, officers from administrative institute perceived also highest level of APC (M=3.96) and NPC (M=3.63). On the other hand, officers from commercial institute had perceived highest level of CPC (M=3.75) and officers from madresha had perceived lowest level of CPC (M=2.88).

#### 5.4.3.2 Category of Institute and Job Satisfaction

In order to find out the significance of relationship between institute category and job satisfaction, one way ANOVA test was used to test the hypothesis and result of the test is presented in the Table-5.11

**Null hypothesis (H<sub>0</sub>):** There is no significant relationship between Category of Institute and their job satisfaction.

**Alternative hypothesis (H<sub>1</sub>):** There is a significant relationship between Category of Institute and their job satisfaction.

**Table 5.12: Institute category and Job Satisfaction (ANOVA)**

| Factor             | Variables              |                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F    | Sig. | Remarks         |
|--------------------|------------------------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|------|------|-----------------|
| Institute Category | Overall Satisfaction   | Between Groups | 9.12           | 6   | 1.52        | 1.51 | .17  | Not Significant |
|                    |                        | Within Groups  | 369.81         | 367 | 1.01        |      |      |                 |
|                    |                        | Total          | 378.93         | 373 |             |      |      |                 |
|                    | Extrinsic Satisfaction | Between Groups | 1.52           | 6   | .25         | 1.27 | .27  | Not Significant |
|                    |                        | Within Groups  | 73.46          | 367 | .20         |      |      |                 |
|                    |                        | Total          | 74.98          | 373 |             |      |      |                 |
|                    | Intrinsic Satisfaction | Between Groups | .72            | 6   | .12         | .44  | .86  | Not Significant |
|                    |                        | Within Groups  | 100.68         | 367 | .27         |      |      |                 |
|                    |                        | Total          | 101.40         | 373 |             |      |      |                 |

From the above table, result regarding extrinsic, intrinsic, and overall satisfaction are  $F$  value=1.51, 1.27 and .44 respectively at 6, 367 degree of freedom and corresponding  $P$  values are .17, .27, and .86 respectively which are greater than significance level .05 (5%). Therefore the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) is accepted. From the analysis it is concluded that category of institute is not significantly associated with extrinsic, intrinsic and overall job satisfaction of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.).

#### 5.4.3.3 Category of Institute and Professional Commitment

To find out the relationship between type of institute and commitment, test results of one way ANOVA are presented table below.

**Null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ):** There is no significant relationship between Category of Institute and Professional commitment.

**Alternative hypothesis ( $H_1$ ):** There is a significant relationship between Category of Institute and Professional commitment.

**Table 5.13: Institute category and Professional Commitment (ANOVA)**

| Factor             | Variables |                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F    | Sig. | Remarks         |
|--------------------|-----------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|------|------|-----------------|
| Institute Category | APC       | Between Groups | 2.07           | 6   | .35         | .79  | .57  | Not Significant |
|                    |           | Within Groups  | 160.19         | 367 | .44         |      |      |                 |
|                    |           | Total          | 162.26         | 373 |             |      |      |                 |
|                    | CPC       | Between Groups | 1.90           | 6   | .32         | .85  | .53  | Not Significant |
|                    |           | Within Groups  | 136.34         | 367 | .37         |      |      |                 |
|                    |           | Total          | 138.24         | 373 |             |      |      |                 |
|                    | NPC       | Between Groups | 2.34           | 6   | .39         | 1.31 | .25  | Not Significant |
|                    |           | Within Groups  | 109.14         | 367 | .29         |      |      |                 |
|                    |           | Total          | 111.48         | 373 |             |      |      |                 |

From the above table, result regarding APC, CPC, and NPC are  $F$  value=.79, .85, and 1.31 respectively at 6, 367 degree of freedom and corresponding  $P$  values are .57, .53 and .25 respectively which are greater than significance level .05 (5%). Therefore the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) is accepted. From the analysis it is concluded that category of institute of the BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre is not significantly associated with commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.).

#### **5.4.4 Location of Institute and Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment**

##### **5.4.4.1 Location of Institute and Level of Job Satisfaction and Level Professional Commitment**

Location of the institute is another important demographic characteristic of the respondent that impacts the job satisfaction and commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. In this study, location of the institute of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre has been classified into four types namely, metropolitan, district sadar, upazila sadar and rural. Distribution of sample according to location and level of satisfaction and commitment are shown in the table-5.13.

**Table 5.14: Location of Institute and Level of Job Satisfaction and Level of Professional Commitment**

| Location       | f   | Job Satisfaction          |                             |                             | Commitment    |               |               |
|----------------|-----|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
|                |     | Overall Job Sat Mean (SD) | Extrinsic Job Sat Mean (SD) | Intrinsic Job Sat Mean (SD) | APC Mean (SD) | CPC Mean (SD) | NPC Mean (SD) |
| Metropolitan   | 178 | 3.62<br>(.97)             | 3.36<br>(.43)               | 3.21<br>(.53)               | 3.71<br>(.73) | 3.45<br>(.61) | 3.37<br>(.59) |
| District Sadar | 148 | 3.36<br>(.98)             | 3.21<br>(.43)               | 3.13<br>(.50)               | 3.75<br>(.54) | 3.24<br>(.62) | 3.33<br>(.49) |
| Upozila Sadar  | 38  | 3.03<br>(.94)             | 3.14<br>(.48)               | 3.11<br>(.56)               | 3.55<br>(.79) | 3.41<br>(.52) | 3.35<br>(.54) |
| Rural          | 10  | 2.10<br>(.88)             | 3.03<br>(.60)               | 2.88<br>(.62)               | 3.62<br>(.41) | 3.00<br>(.33) | 3.30<br>(.50) |
| Total          | 374 | 3.42<br>(1.01)            | 3.27<br>(.45)               | 3.16<br>(.52)               | 3.70<br>(.66) | 3.35<br>(.61) | 3.35<br>(.55) |

**Source: Primary Data**

\*Mean categories: Extremely Dissatisfied= 1.00-1.80; Dissatisfied =1.81-2.60; Neutral= 2.61-3.40; Satisfied= 3.41- 4.20; Extremely Satisfied=4.21- 5.00. Extremely Not-committed/= 1.00-1.80; Not-committed =1.81-2.60; Neutral= 2.61-3.40; Committed = 3.41- 4.20; Extremely Committed =4.21- 5.00

Table shows that, respondents from metropolitan area have highest level of overall satisfaction (M=3.62), extrinsic satisfaction (M=3.36) and intrinsic job satisfaction (M=3.21). On the other hand, respondents from rural area have lowest level of job satisfaction (M=2.10 for overall, M=3.03 for extrinsic and M=2.88 for intrinsic satisfaction). The overall job satisfaction of the respondents from metropolitan (M=3.62) fell into satisfied range. Respondents from rural area are dissatisfied regarding overall job satisfaction. Every average regarding three scale of satisfaction of the respondents from district and upazila sadar fell into the neutral range of satisfaction level.



Regarding commitment level, also the officers from metropolitan area have the highest level of APC, CPC and NPC comparing to others. The lowest mean score for CPC (3.00) and NPC (3.30) are the level of the rural respondents.

From the analysis it is concluded that the highest level of satisfaction and commitment are perceived by respondents from metropolitan area followed in descending order by district sadar, upozila sadar and rural area.

#### 5.4.4.2 Location of Institute and Job Satisfaction

To find out the significance of relationship between location of institute and job satisfaction, test results of one way ANOVA are presented table below.

**Table 5.15: Location of Institute and Job Satisfaction (ANOVA)**

| Factor             | Variables              |                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F     | Sig. | Remarks         |
|--------------------|------------------------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|------|-----------------|
| Institute Location | Overall Satisfaction   | Between Groups | 31.26          | 3   | 10.42       | 11.08 | .000 | Significant     |
|                    |                        | Within Groups  | 347.67         | 370 | .94         |       |      |                 |
|                    |                        | Total          | 378.93         | 373 |             |       |      |                 |
|                    | Extrinsic Satisfaction | Between Groups | 3.12           | 3   | 1.04        | 5.33  | .001 | Significant     |
|                    |                        | Within Groups  | 71.88          | 370 | .19         |       |      |                 |
|                    |                        | Total          | 75.00          | 373 |             |       |      |                 |
|                    | Intrinsic Satisfaction | Between Groups | 1.49           | 3   | .49         | 1.83  | .140 | Not Significant |
|                    |                        | Within Groups  | 99.91          | 370 | .27         |       |      |                 |
|                    |                        | Total          | 101.40         | 373 |             |       |      |                 |

From the above table, result of overall job satisfaction is  $F=11.08$ , at 3, 370 degree of freedom and corresponding P value is .000. Since P value is lower than 5% significance level, it is clear that location of the institute is significantly related to the

overall job satisfaction of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. Result regarding extrinsic job satisfaction is  $F$  value=5.33 at 3, 370 degree of freedom and corresponding  $P$  value is .001, which is lower than significance level .05 (5%). From the analysis it is concluded that location of institute of the BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre is statistically significantly related to extrinsic job satisfaction of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.). But the intrinsic job satisfaction is not significantly closed to the location of the institute of the BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre ( $F=1.83$ ,  $df=3,370$  and  $P=.140>.05$ ).

#### 5.4.4.3 Location of Institute and Professional Commitment

In order to find out the significance of relationship between institute location and professional commitment, one way ANOVA test was used to test the hypothesis and result of the test is presented in the Table-5.15

**Table 5.16: Location of Institute and Professional Commitment (ANOVA)**

| Factor             | Variables |                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F    | Sig. | Remarks         |
|--------------------|-----------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|------|------|-----------------|
| Institute Location | APC       | Between Groups | 1.29           | 3   | .43         | .99  | .396 | Not Significant |
|                    |           | Within Groups  | 160.97         | 370 | .44         |      |      |                 |
|                    |           | Total          | 162.26         | 373 |             |      |      |                 |
|                    | CPC       | Between Groups | 5.01           | 3   | 1.67        | 4.64 | .003 | Significant     |
|                    |           | Within Groups  | 133.23         | 370 | .36         |      |      |                 |
|                    |           | Total          | 138.24         | 373 |             |      |      |                 |
|                    | NPC       | Between Groups | .15            | 3   | .05         | .17  | .916 | Not Significant |
|                    |           | Within Groups  | 109.13         | 367 | .30         |      |      |                 |
|                    |           | Total          | 111.48         | 373 |             |      |      |                 |

Result of APC in the table is  $F=.99$  at 3, 370 degree of freedom and corresponding  $P$  value is .396, which is greater than significance level .05 (5%). This means, there is no significant relationship between location of institute and APC of

the BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre officers. F value of CPC is 4.64 at 3, 370 degree of freedom and P value (.003) is less than significance level .05 (5%). This P value indicates that there is a significant association between location of institute and CPC of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. But in relation to NPC, result shows that there is no significant relationship between location of institute and NPC.

## 5.4.5 Occupational Group and Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment

### 5.4.5.1 Occupational Group and Level of Job Satisfaction and Level of Professional Commitment

There were two types of occupational group of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre namely academic and administrative. The academic officers are numerous comparing to administrative officers in this cadre. Distributed frequency, mean and standard deviation regarding occupational are stated below.

**Table 5.17: Occupational Group and Level of Job Satisfaction and Level of Professional Commitment**

| Occupational Group | f   | Job Satisfaction          |                             |                             | Commitment         |               |               |
|--------------------|-----|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|---------------|---------------|
|                    |     | Overall Job Sat Mean (SD) | Extrinsic Job Sat Mean (SD) | Intrinsic Job Sat Mean (SD) | APC Mean (SD)      | CPC Mean (SD) | NPC Mean (SD) |
| Academic           | 358 | 3.38<br>(1.01)            | 3.26<br>(.44)               | 3.14<br>(.50)               | 3.69<br>(.66)      | 3.35<br>(.60) | 3.34<br>(.54) |
| Administrative     | 16  | 4.19<br>(.54)             | 3.44<br>(.62)               | 3.52<br>(.79)               | 4.01<br>(.46)      | 3.36<br>(.72) | 3.70<br>(.52) |
| Total              | 374 | 3.42<br>(1.01)            | 3.27<br>(.45)               | 3.16<br>(.52)               | 3.7045<br>(.65957) | 3.35<br>(.61) | 3.35<br>(.55) |

**Source: Primary Data**

\*Mean categories: Extremely Dissatisfied= 1.00-1.80; Dissatisfied =1.81-2.60; Neutral= 2.61-3.40; Satisfied= 3.41- 4.20; Extremely Satisfied=4.21- 5.00. Extremely Not-committed/= 1.00-1.80; Not-committed =1.81-2.60; Neutral= 2.61-3.40; Committed = 3.41- 4.20; Extremely Committed =4.21- 5.00

Table shows that, administrative officers are more satisfied regarding every scale of satisfaction and commitment comparing to academic officers. Level of satisfaction of administrative group fell into satisfied range. On the other hand level of satisfaction of academic group fell into neutral range of satisfaction.

Regarding commitment scale, administrative group was perceived higher level of commitment than academic group.

#### **5.4.5.2 Occupational Group and Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment**

In order to test the significance of relationship between occupational group and job satisfaction, and between occupational group and professional commitment, ANOVA test was conducted and results are given the table below.

**Table 5.18: Occupational Group and Job Satisfaction and Professional  
commitment. (ANOVA)**

| Factor             | Variables              |                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F     | Sig. | Remarks         |
|--------------------|------------------------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|------|-----------------|
| Occupational Group | Overall Satisfaction   | Between Groups | 9.92           | 1   | 9.92        | 10.00 | .002 | Significant     |
|                    |                        | Within Groups  | 369.01         | 372 | .99         |       |      |                 |
|                    |                        | Total          | 378.93         | 373 |             |       |      |                 |
|                    | Extrinsic Satisfaction | Between Groups | .50            | 1   | .50         | 2.51  | .114 | Not Significant |
|                    |                        | Within Groups  | 74.48          | 372 | .20         |       |      |                 |
|                    |                        | Total          | 74.98          | 373 |             |       |      |                 |
|                    | Intrinsic Satisfaction | Between Groups | 2.24           | 1   | 2.24        | 8.40  | .004 | Significant     |
|                    |                        | Within Groups  | 99.16          | 372 | .27         |       |      |                 |
|                    |                        | Total          | 101.40         | 373 |             |       |      |                 |
|                    | APC                    | Between Groups | 1.56           | 1   | 1.56        | 3.62  | .058 | Not Significant |
|                    |                        | Within Groups  | 160.70         | 372 | .43         |       |      |                 |
|                    |                        | Total          | 162.26         | 373 |             |       |      |                 |
|                    | CPC                    | Between Groups | .01            | 1   | .01         | .004  | .951 | Not Significant |
|                    |                        | Within Groups  | 138.23         | 372 | .37         |       |      |                 |
|                    |                        | Total          | 138.24         | 373 |             |       |      |                 |
|                    | NPC                    | Between Groups | 2.00           | 1   | 2.00        | 6.79  | .010 | Significant     |
|                    |                        | Within Groups  | 109.48         | 372 | .29         |       |      |                 |
|                    |                        | Total          | 111.48         | 373 |             |       |      |                 |

In the table F value for overall satisfaction is 10.00 at 1, 372 degree of freedom and corresponding P value is .002, which is lower than significance level .05

(5%). This means, there is a significant relationship between occupational group and overall job satisfaction of the BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre officers. Result regarding extrinsic satisfaction in the table is  $F=2.51$  at 1, 372 degree of freedom and corresponding P value is .114, which is greater than significance level .05 (5%). This means, there is no significant relationship between occupational group and extrinsic job satisfaction of the BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre officers.

Result of intrinsic satisfaction in the table is  $F=8.40$  at 1, 372 degree of freedom and corresponding P value is .004, which is smaller than significance level .05 (5%). This means, there is a significant relationship between occupational group and intrinsic job satisfaction of the BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre officers.

Result of APC in the table is  $F=3.62$  at 1, 372 degree of freedom and corresponding P value is .058, which is greater than significance level .05 (5%). This means, there is no significant relationship between occupational group and APC of the BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre officers at 5% significance level.

Result of CPC in the table is  $F=.004$  at 1, 372 degree of freedom and corresponding P value is .951, which is greater than significance level .05 (5%). This means, there is no significant relationship between occupational group and CPC of the BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre officers at 5% significance level.

Result of NPC in the table is  $F=6.79$  at 1, 372 degree of freedom and corresponding P value is .010, which is lower than significance level .05 (5%). This means, there is a significant relationship between occupational group and NPC of the BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre officers at 5% significance level.

## 5.4.6 Gender and Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment

### 5.4.6.1 Gender and Level of Job Satisfaction and Level of Professional Commitment

Gender is an important predictor of job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. Descriptive statistics regarding gender of this study are summarized in the following table.

**Table 5.19: Gender and Level of Job Satisfaction and Level of Professional Commitment**

| Gender       | f   | Job Satisfaction          |                             |                             | Commitment    |               |               |
|--------------|-----|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
|              |     | Overall Job Sat Mean (SD) | Extrinsic Job Sat Mean (SD) | Intrinsic Job Sat Mean (SD) | APC Mean (SD) | CPC Mean (SD) | NPC Mean (SD) |
| Male         | 287 | 3.33<br>(1.04)            | 3.22<br>(.45)               | 3.12<br>(.52)               | 3.68<br>(.65) | 3.36<br>(.59) | 3.34<br>(.56) |
| Female       | 87  | 3.69<br>(.85)             | 3.43<br>(.39)               | 3.27<br>(.49)               | 3.80<br>(.68) | 3.31<br>(.66) | 3.40<br>(.51) |
| <b>Total</b> | 374 | 3.42                      | 3.27                        | 3.16                        | 3.70          | 3.35          | 3.35          |

Source: Primary Data

\*Mean categories: Extremely Dissatisfied= 1.00-1.80; Dissatisfied =1.81-2.60; Neutral= 2.61-3.40; Satisfied= 3.41- 4.20; Extremely Satisfied=4.21- 5.00. Extremely Not-committed/= 1.00-1.80; Not-committed =1.81-2.60; Neutral= 2.61-3.40; Committed = 3.41- 4.20; Extremely Committed =4.21- 5.00

Mean score for overall, extrinsic and intrinsic job satisfactions are as 3.33, 3.22 and 3.12 respectably of male respondents in this study. These score fell into the neutral range of satisfaction. On the other hand, mean score for overall satisfaction is 3.69, for extrinsic satisfaction is 3.43 and for intrinsic satisfaction is 3.27 of the female respondents. The results indicate that the female officers are more satisfied than the male officers.

Regarding professional commitment scale, female officers are perceived highest level of APC (M=3.80) and lowest level of CPC (M=3.31). Finally results also indicate that female officers of the cadre are perceived higher level of satisfaction and professional commitment (except CPC) than male officer.

#### 5.4.6.2 Gender and Job Satisfaction

In order to find out the significance of relationship between gender and job satisfaction and professional commitment, one way ANOVA test was used to test the hypothesis and results of the test are presented in the Table-xxx

#### Hypothesis

**Null hypothesis (H<sub>0</sub>):** There is no significant relationship between gender and their job satisfaction.

**Alternative hypothesis (H<sub>1</sub>):** There is a significant relationship between gender and their job satisfaction.

**Table 5.20: Gender and Job Satisfaction (ANOVA)**

| Factor | Variables              |                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F     | Sig. | Remarks     |
|--------|------------------------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|------|-------------|
| Gender | Overall Satisfaction   | Between Groups | 8.42           | 1   | 8.421       | 8.46  | .004 | Significant |
|        |                        | Within Groups  | 370.51         | 372 | .996        |       |      |             |
|        |                        | Total          | 378.93         | 373 |             |       |      |             |
|        | Extrinsic Satisfaction | Between Groups | 2.83           | 1   | 2.836       | 14.62 | .000 | Significant |
|        |                        | Within Groups  | 72.15          | 372 | .194        |       |      |             |
|        |                        | Total          | 74.98          | 373 |             |       |      |             |
|        | Intrinsic Satisfaction | Between Groups | 1.55           | 1   | 1.552       | 5.78  | .017 | Significant |
|        |                        | Within Groups  | 99.85          | 372 | .268        |       |      |             |
|        |                        | Total          | 101.40         | 373 |             |       |      |             |



Results of F values for overall, extrinsic and intrinsic job satisfaction are 8.46, 14.62 and 5.78 respectively at 1, 372 degree of freedom and corresponding P values are .004, .000 and .017 respectively. These P values are less than significance level .05 (5%). Therefore the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted. So, it is concluded that gender has significant association with the job satisfaction of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

#### 5.4.6.3 Gender and Professional Commitment

To find out the significance of relationship between gender and professional commitment, test results of one way ANOVA are presented table below.

##### Hypothesis

**Null hypothesis (Ho):** There is no significant relationship between gender and their professional commitment.

**Alternative hypothesis (H1):** There is a significant relationship between gender and their professional commitment.

**Table 5.21: Gender and Professional Commitment (ANOVA)**

| Factor | Variables |                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F    | Sig. | Remarks         |
|--------|-----------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|------|------|-----------------|
| Gender | APC       | Between Groups | 1.05           | 1   | 1.05        | 2.42 | .120 | Not Significant |
|        |           | Within Groups  | 161.21         | 372 | .43         |      |      |                 |
|        |           | Total          | 162.26         | 373 |             |      |      |                 |
|        | CPC       | Between Groups | .16            | 1   | .16         | .41  | .518 | Not Significant |
|        |           | Within Groups  | 138.08         | 372 | .37         |      |      |                 |
|        |           | Total          | 138.24         | 373 |             |      |      |                 |
|        | NPC       | Between Groups | .29            | 1   | .29         | .96  | .328 | Not Significant |
|        |           | Within Groups  | 111.19         | 372 | .29         |      |      |                 |
|        |           | Total          | 111.48         | 373 |             |      |      |                 |

Results of F values for APC, CPC and NPC are 2.42, .41 and .96 respectively at 1, 372 degree of freedom and corresponding P values are .120, .518 and .328 respectively. These P values are greater than significance level .05 (5%). Therefore the null hypothesis is accepted and alternative hypothesis is rejected. So, it is concluded that gender has no significant relationship with the professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

## 5.4.7 Age and Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment

### 5.4.7.1 Age and Level of Job Satisfaction and Level of Professional Commitment

Age is an important personal characteristic of the respondent. There were four category of age groups in this study. Descriptive statistics relation to age group and job satisfaction and commitment are presented the table below.

**Table 5.22: Age and Level of Job Satisfaction and Level of Professional Commitment**

| Age          | f   | Job Satisfaction                |                                   |                                   | Commitment          |                     |                     |
|--------------|-----|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
|              |     | Overall Job Sat<br>Mean<br>(SD) | Extrinsic Job Sat<br>Mean<br>(SD) | Intrinsic Job Sat<br>Mean<br>(SD) | APC<br>Mean<br>(SD) | CPC<br>Mean<br>(SD) | NPC<br>Mean<br>(SD) |
| Below 30     | 17  | 2.94<br>(1.20)                  | 2.93<br>(.52)                     | 2.93<br>(.51)                     | 3.44<br>(.71)       | 2.99<br>(.60)       | 3.11<br>(.57)       |
| 30 – 39      | 217 | 3.33<br>(.96)                   | 3.24<br>(.43)                     | 3.16<br>(.48)                     | 3.58<br>(.63)       | 3.26<br>(.57)       | 3.31<br>(.53)       |
| 40 – 49      | 93  | 3.44<br>(1.03)                  | 3.25<br>(.41)                     | 3.07<br>(.55)                     | 3.82<br>(.63)       | 3.49<br>(.60)       | 3.39<br>(.59)       |
| 50 and Above | 47  | 3.94<br>(.94)                   | 3.59<br>(.44)                     | 3.38<br>(.59)                     | 4.16<br>(.62)       | 3.62<br>(.64)       | 3.57<br>(.47)       |
| Total        | 374 | 3.42<br>(1.01)                  | 3.27<br>(.45)                     | 3.16<br>(.52)                     | 3.70<br>(.66)       | 3.35<br>(.61)       | 3.35<br>(.55)       |

Source: Primary Data

\*Mean categories: Extremely Dissatisfied= 1.00-1.80; Dissatisfied =1.81-2.60; Neutral= 2.61-3.40; Satisfied= 3.41- 4.20; Extremely Satisfied=4.21- 5.00. Extremely Not-committed/= 1.00-1.80; Not-committed =1.81-2.60; Neutral= 2.61-3.40; Committed = 3.41- 4.20; Extremely Committed =4.21- 5.00. ( ) SD

It could be noted from the table that the average levels of job satisfaction perceived by the respondents belonged to below 30 years age category are 2.94 for overall, 2.93 for extrinsic and 2.93 for intrinsic satisfaction. Professional commitment levels of this category for APC, CPC and NPC are average 3.44, 2.99 and 3.11 respectively. It is clear from the table that, the highest score for the scales of satisfaction and commitment were perceived by the respondents of '50 and above' age group. Observing the above table, it is concluded that, level of satisfaction and commitment of the respondent's increases in relation to increases the age of the respondents.

#### **5.4.7.2 Age and Job Satisfaction**

In order to test the hypothesis regarding age of the respondents and level of job satisfaction , one way ANOVA test had conducted and the results are presented below.

##### **Hypothesis**

**Null hypothesis (H<sub>0</sub>):** There is no significant relationship between age and their job satisfaction.

**Alternative hypothesis (H<sub>1</sub>):** There is a significant relationship between age and their job satisfaction.

**Table 5.23: Age and Job Satisfaction (ANOVA)**

| Factor | Variables              |                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F     | Sig. | Remarks     |
|--------|------------------------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|------|-------------|
| Age    | Overall Satisfaction   | Between Groups | 18.15          | 3   | 6.05        | 6.20  | .000 | Significant |
|        |                        | Within Groups  | 360.78         | 370 | .98         |       |      |             |
|        |                        | Total          | 378.93         | 373 |             |       |      |             |
|        | Extrinsic Satisfaction | Between Groups | 7.09           | 3   | 2.36        | 12.88 | .000 | Significant |
|        |                        | Within Groups  | 67.89          | 370 | .18         |       |      |             |
|        |                        | Total          | 74.98          | 373 |             |       |      |             |
|        | Intrinsic Satisfaction | Between Groups | 3.96           | 3   | 1.32        | 5.02  | .002 | Significant |
|        |                        | Within Groups  | 97.44          | 370 | .26         |       |      |             |
|        |                        | Total          | 101.40         | 373 |             |       |      |             |

Results of overall satisfaction are,  $F=6.20$  at 3, 370 degree of freedom and corresponding P value is .000 which is also lower than significance level .05 (5%). This indicates age is related to overall job satisfaction. F value for extrinsic satisfaction is 12.88 ( $df=3, 370$ ) and corresponding P value is .000 which is lower than significance level .05 (5%). Hence, age is closely associated with extrinsic satisfaction. F value for intrinsic satisfaction is 5.02 ( $df=3, 370$ ) and corresponding P value is .002 which is lower than significance level .05. This means age is related to intrinsic satisfaction. Since, P values for three scale of satisfaction are lower than significance level .05, the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) is rejected and alternative hypothesis ( $H_1$ ) is accepted. It is concluded that, age of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre is significantly related to job satisfaction of them at 5% significance level.

### 5.4.7.3 Age and Professional Commitment

Test results regarding age and professional commitment are showed the table below.

**Null hypothesis (H<sub>0</sub>):** There is no significant relationship between age and their Professional commitment.

**Alternative hypothesis (H<sub>1</sub>):** There is a significant relationship between age and their Professional commitment

**Table 5.24: Age and Professional commitment (ANOVA)**

| Factor | Variables |                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F     | Sig. | Remarks     |
|--------|-----------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|------|-------------|
| Age    | APC       | Between Groups | 15.46          | 3   | 5.16        | 12.99 | .000 | Significant |
|        |           | Within Groups  | 146.80         | 370 | .39         |       |      |             |
|        |           | Total          | 162.26         | 373 |             |       |      |             |
|        | CPC       | Between Groups | 9.53           | 3   | 3.17        | 9.13  | .000 | Significant |
|        |           | Within Groups  | 128.71         | 370 | .35         |       |      |             |
|        |           | Total          | 138.24         | 373 |             |       |      |             |
|        | NPC       | Between Groups | 3.81           | 3   | 1.27        | 4.36  | .005 | Significant |
|        |           | Within Groups  | 107.67         | 370 | .29         |       |      |             |
|        |           | Total          | 111.48         | 373 |             |       |      |             |

F values of APC, CPC and NPC are 12.99, 9.13 and 4.36 respectively at 3, 370 degree of freedom and corresponding P values are .000 for APC, .000 for CPC and .005 for NPC. All these values are less than significant level .05 (5%). This means, the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted. From the analysis, it is concluded that, there is significant relationship between age and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

## 5.4.8 Tenure of job and Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment

### 5.4.8.1 Tenure of job and Level of Job Satisfaction and Level of Professional Commitment

Job tenure is another influencing demographic factor of job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. In this study job tenure of the respondents has been classified into four groups namely 0-4 years, 5-10 years, 11-15 years and 16 and above years. Sample consists of 50 respondents having 0-4 years, 187 respondents having 5-10 years, 48 respondents having 11-16 years and 89 respondents having 16 and above years of job tenure. The level of job satisfaction and professional commitment according to job tenure of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre are stated the table-5.25

**Table 5.25: Tenure of job and Level of Job Satisfaction and Level of Professional Commitment**

| Tenure of Job | f   | Job Satisfaction          |                             |                             | Commitment    |               |               |
|---------------|-----|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
|               |     | Overall Job Sat Mean (SD) | Extrinsic Job Sat Mean (SD) | Intrinsic Job Sat Mean (SD) | APC Mean (SD) | CPC Mean (SD) | NPC Mean (SD) |
| 0 – 4         | 50  | 3.34<br>(1.04)            | 3.16<br>(.54)               | 3.14<br>(.47)               | 3.60<br>(.61) | 3.19<br>(.67) | 3.17<br>(.56) |
| 5 – 10        | 187 | 3.33<br>(.97)             | 3.22<br>(.40)               | 3.14<br>(.48)               | 3.56<br>(.65) | 3.26<br>(.56) | 3.32<br>(.54) |
| 11 – 15       | 48  | 3.17<br>(1.06)            | 3.25<br>(.43)               | 3.14<br>(.58)               | 3.75<br>(.61) | 3.45<br>(.61) | 3.34<br>(.56) |
| 16 and Above  | 89  | 3.78<br>(.97)             | 3.45<br>(.45)               | 3.21<br>(.60)               | 4.05<br>(.62) | 3.58<br>(.58) | 3.51<br>(.51) |
| Total         | 374 | 3.42<br>(1.01)            | 3.27<br>(.45)               | 3.16<br>(.52)               | 3.70<br>(.66) | 3.35<br>(.61) | 3.35<br>(.55) |

Source: Primary Data

It could be noted from the table that, the level of overall, extrinsic and intrinsic job satisfaction perceived by the officers of BCS education cadre having 0-4 years are

average 3.34, 3.16, and 3.14 respectively. Results indicate that, respondents of 16 and above group perceived highest level of job satisfaction than others group. The mean score for overall satisfaction of 11-15 years job tenure group is lowest (M=3.17).

Table also indicates that, the highest mean score for three scale of commitment were perceived by the job tenure group 16 and above (M=4.05 for APC, 3.58 for CPC and 3.51 for NPC). Respondent from 0-4 job tenure group were perceived the lowest level of CPC (M=3.19) and NPC (M=3.17).

#### **5.4.8.2 Tenure of job and Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment**

In order to test the significance of relationship between job tenure and job satisfaction, and between job tenure and professional commitment, ANOVA test was conducted and results are given the table 5.26.

**Table 5.26: Tenure of job and Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment  
(ANOVA)**

| Factor            | Variables              |                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F     | Sig. | Remarks         |
|-------------------|------------------------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|------|-----------------|
| <b>Job Tenure</b> | Overall Satisfaction   | Between Groups | 16.09          | 3   | 5.36        | 5.47  | .001 | Significant     |
|                   |                        | Within Groups  | 362.84         | 370 | .98         |       |      |                 |
|                   |                        | Total          | 378.93         | 373 |             |       |      |                 |
|                   | Extrinsic Satisfaction | Between Groups | 4.18           | 3   | 1.39        | 7.29  | .000 | Significant     |
|                   |                        | Within Groups  | 70.80          | 370 | .19         |       |      |                 |
|                   |                        | Total          | 74.98          | 373 |             |       |      |                 |
|                   | Intrinsic Satisfaction | Between Groups | .28            | 3   | .09         | .35   | .792 | Not Significant |
|                   |                        | Within Groups  | 101.12         | 370 | .27         |       |      |                 |
|                   |                        | Total          | 101.40         | 373 |             |       |      |                 |
|                   | APC                    | Between Groups | 15.35          | 3   | 5.118       | 12.89 | .000 | Significant     |
|                   |                        | Within Groups  | 146.91         | 370 | .39         |       |      |                 |
|                   |                        | Total          | 162.26         | 373 |             |       |      |                 |
|                   | CPC                    | Between Groups | 8.19           | 3   | 2.73        | 7.76  | .000 | Significant     |
|                   |                        | Within Groups  | 130.05         | 370 | .35         |       |      |                 |
|                   |                        | Total          | 138.24         | 373 |             |       |      |                 |
|                   | NPC                    | Between Groups | 3.79           | 3   | 1.26        | 4.34  | .005 | Not Significant |
|                   |                        | Within Groups  | 107.69         | 370 | .29         |       |      |                 |
|                   |                        | Total          | 111.48         | 373 |             |       |      |                 |

In the table F value for overall satisfaction is 5.47 at 3, 370 degree of freedom and corresponding P value is .001, which is lower than significance level .05 (5%).



This means, there is a significant relationship between job tenure and overall job satisfaction of the BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre officers.

Result regarding extrinsic satisfaction in the table is  $F=7.29$  at 3, 370 degree of freedom and corresponding P value is .000, which is lower than significance level .05 (5%). This means, there is a significant relationship between job tenure and extrinsic job satisfaction of the BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre officers.

Result of intrinsic satisfaction in the table is  $F=.35$  at 3, 370 degree of freedom and corresponding P value is .792, which is higher than significance level .05 (5%). This means, there is no significant relationship between job tenure and intrinsic job satisfaction of the BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre officers.

Result of APC in the table is  $F=12.89$  at 3, 370 degree of freedom and corresponding P value is .000, which is lower than significance level .05 (5%). This means, there is a significant relationship between job tenure and APC of the BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre officers at 5% significance level.

Result of CPC in the table is  $F=7.76$  at 3, 370 degree of freedom and corresponding P value is .000, which is lower than significance level .05 (5%). This means, there is a significant relationship between job tenure and CPC of the BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre officers at 5% significance level.

Result of NPC in the table is  $F=4.34$  at 3, 370 degree of freedom and corresponding P value is .005, which is lower than significance level .05 (5%). This means, there is a significant relationship between job tenure and NPC of the BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre officers at 5% significance level.

## 5.4.9 Education and Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment

### 5.4.9.1 Education and Level of Job Satisfaction and Level of Professional Commitment

Educational qualification is one of the important determinant of job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. It is believed that the highly qualified officers have possessed high level of knowledge and skill that leads to high expectation from the job. This study has considered five category of highest level of education of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. The distribution of sample respondents according to highest educational level and the level of job satisfaction and professional commitment are shown the table below.

**Table 5.27: Highest Education and Level of Job Satisfaction and Level of Professional Commitment.**

| Education      | f   | Job Satisfaction            |                                   |                               | Commitment          |                     |                     |
|----------------|-----|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
|                |     | Overall Sat<br>Mean<br>(SD) | Extrinsic Job Sat<br>Mean<br>(SD) | Intrinsic Sat<br>Mean<br>(SD) | APC<br>Mean<br>(SD) | CPC<br>Mean<br>(SD) | NPC<br>Mean<br>(SD) |
| Masters        | 334 | 3.38<br>(1.03)              | 3.25<br>(.45)                     | 3.15<br>(.52)                 | 3.68<br>(.65)       | 3.33<br>(.59)       | 3.35<br>(.54)       |
| M. Phil        | 10  | 3.40<br>(.97)               | 3.28<br>(.56)                     | 3.18<br>(.64)                 | 3.60<br>(.67)       | 3.15<br>(.80)       | 3.38<br>(.51)       |
| M.Phil ongoing | 1   | 4.00                        | 2.56                              | 2.63                          | 5.00                | 3.75                | 3.33                |
| Ph. D          | 24  | 3.88<br>(.68)               | 3.49<br>(.31)                     | 3.23<br>(.50)                 | 4.19<br>(.54)       | 3.66<br>(.75)       | 3.38<br>(.74)       |
| Ph. D Ongoing  | 5   | 3.60<br>(.89)               | 3.49<br>(.33)                     | 3.45<br>(.42)                 | 3.27<br>(.63)       | 3.35<br>(.28)       | 3.33<br>(.46)       |
| Total          | 374 | 3.42                        | 3.27                              | 3.16                          | 3.70                | 3.35                | 3.35                |

**Source: Primary Data**

\*Mean categories: Extremely Dissatisfied= 1.00-1.80; Dissatisfied =1.81-2.60; Neutral= 2.61-3.40; Satisfied= 3.41- 4.20; Extremely Satisfied=4.21- 5.00. Extremely Not-committed/= 1.00-1.80; Not-committed =1.81-2.60; Neutral= 2.61-3.40; Committed = 3.41- 4.20; Extremely Committed =4.21-5.00

The above table explains that, Most of the respondents were master's degree holder (f=334) and a significant number of respondents have Ph. D degree (f=24). The level of job satisfaction of respondents having Masters degree are overall 3.38, extrinsic 3.25 and intrinsic 3.15. The highest level of overall job satisfaction was perceived by the respondent having M. Phill ongoing (M=4.00) and lowest level of overall satisfaction perceived by the respondents having masters degree (M=3.38). On the other hand, respondents having M. Phil ongoing was perceived lowest level of extrinsic job satisfaction (M=2.56) and intrinsic job satisfaction (M=2.63).

Respondent from M.Phill ongoing category has perceived highest level of APC (M=5.00) and respondents having Ph.D degree has second highest level of APC (M=4.19). On the other hand, respondents from Ph. D ongoing category had perceived lowest level of APC (M=3.27).

#### **5.4.9.2 Education and Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment**

To find out the significance of relationship between highest educational level and job satisfaction, and between highest educational level and professional commitment, ANOVA test was conducted and results are given the table 5.28.

**Table 5.28: Educational level and Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment (ANOVA)**

| Factor                           | Variables              |                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F    | Sig. | Remarks         |
|----------------------------------|------------------------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|------|------|-----------------|
| <b>Highest Educational Level</b> | Overall Satisfaction   | Between Groups | 5.99           | 4   | 1.50        | 1.48 | .207 | Not Significant |
|                                  |                        | Within Groups  | 372.94         | 369 | 1.01        |      |      |                 |
|                                  |                        | Total          | 378.93         | 373 |             |      |      |                 |
|                                  | Extrinsic Satisfaction | Between Groups | 1.95           | 4   | .49         | 2.47 | .044 | Significant     |
|                                  |                        | Within Groups  | 73.03          | 369 | .19         |      |      |                 |
|                                  |                        | Total          | 74.98          | 373 |             |      |      |                 |
|                                  | Intrinsic Satisfaction | Between Groups | .88            | 4   | .22         | .81  | .519 | Not Significant |
|                                  |                        | Within Groups  | 100.52         | 369 | .27         |      |      |                 |
|                                  |                        | Total          | 101.40         | 373 |             |      |      |                 |
|                                  | APC                    | Between Groups | 8.79           | 4   | 2.20        | 5.28 | .000 | Significant     |
|                                  |                        | Within Groups  | 153.47         | 369 | .42         |      |      |                 |
|                                  |                        | Total          | 162.26         | 373 |             |      |      |                 |
|                                  | CPC                    | Between Groups | 2.90           | 4   | .73         | 1.98 | .097 | Not Significant |
|                                  |                        | Within Groups  | 135.33         | 369 | .37         |      |      |                 |
|                                  |                        | Total          | 138.24         | 373 |             |      |      |                 |
|                                  | NPC                    | Between Groups | .04            | 4   | .01         | .03  | .998 | Not Significant |
|                                  |                        | Within Groups  | 111.44         | 369 | .30         |      |      |                 |
|                                  |                        | Total          | 111.48         | 373 |             |      |      |                 |

In the table F value for overall satisfaction is 1.48 at 4, 369 degree of freedom and corresponding P value is .207, which is higher than significance level .05 (5%). This means, there is no significant relationship between highest educational level and overall job satisfaction of the BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre officers.

Result regarding extrinsic satisfaction in the table is  $F=2.47$  at 4, 369 degree of freedom and corresponding P value is .044, which is lower than significance level .05 (5%). This means, there is a significant relationship between highest educational level and extrinsic job satisfaction of the BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre officers.

Result of intrinsic satisfaction in the table is  $F=.81$  at 4, 369 degree of freedom and corresponding P value is .519, which is higher than significance level .05 (5%). This means, there is no significant relationship between highest educational level and intrinsic job satisfaction of the BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre officers.

Result of APC in the table is  $F=5.28$  at 4, 369 degree of freedom and corresponding P value is .000, which is lower than significance level .05 (5%). This means, there is a significant relationship between highest educational level and APC of the BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre officers at 5% significance level.

Result of CPC in the table is  $F=1.98$  at 4, 369 degree of freedom and corresponding P value is .097, which is greater than significance level .05 (5%). This means, there is no significant relationship between highest educational level and CPC of the BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre officers at 5% significance level.

Result of NPC in the table is  $F=0.03$  at 4, 369 degree of freedom and corresponding P value is .998, which is higher than significance level .05 (5%). This means, there is no significant relationship between job tenure and NPC of the BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre officers at 5% significance level.

## **5.5 Major Findings**

Demographic factors of the officers of BCS general education cadre have direct impact on job satisfaction and professional commitment. This chapter was aim to find out the level of job satisfaction and professional commitment and to explore the relationship between demographic variables and job satisfaction and professional commitment. Here efforts were given to score the level of job satisfaction and professional commitment and also tried to mark the significant items of personal characteristics. From the data analysis, major findings of this chapter are summarized below.

### **5.5.1 Level of Job Satisfaction**

The officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre are satisfied considering everything into account on an average. But specifically regarding extrinsic and intrinsic satisfaction, they are not satisfied. These findings also supported by FGD.

### **5.5.2 Level of Professional Commitment**

Regarding the three scale of commitment, only the level of APC is satisfactory. On the other hand, average level CPC and NPC are felt into neutral range of commitment. This means, the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre are involved in and are attached with the profession, but they do not feel sense of obligation to the profession.

### **5.5.3 Job Satisfaction Differences in relation to Demographic Factors**

Results of the current chapter reflect that a significant relationship and also a significant difference in job satisfaction exist based on the demographic factors of the BCS general education cadre offices. Summary of descriptive statistics are presented the table 5.29.

**Table 5.29: Summary of Level of Job Satisfaction in relation to Demographic Factors of BCS (Gen. Ed.) Cadre**

| Demographic Factors       | Levels of Job Satisfaction (mean) |           |           |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|
|                           | Overall                           | Extrinsic | Intrinsic |
| <b>Designation</b>        |                                   |           |           |
| Professor                 | 4.33                              | 3.72      | 3.57      |
| Associate Professor       | 3.68                              | 3.32      | 3.10      |
| Assistant Professor       | 3.31                              | 3.35      | 3.21      |
| Lecturer                  | 3.31                              | 3.13      | 3.09      |
| <b>Appointment Type</b>   |                                   |           |           |
| PSC                       | 5.00                              | 3.67      | 3.50      |
| BCS (Direct)              | 3.35                              | 3.23      | 3.13      |
| 10% Quota                 | 4.20                              | 3.60      | 3.31      |
| Nationalized              | 4.10                              | 3.72      | 3.44      |
| <b>Inst. Category</b>     |                                   |           |           |
| Masters College           | 3.43                              | 3.31      | 3.15      |
| Degree(Hon's) college     | 3.38                              | 3.21      | 3.17      |
| Degree Pass College       | 3.12                              | 3.19      | 3.09      |
| Commercial Inst.          | 3.33                              | 3.33      | 3.17      |
| TTC                       | 3.64                              | 3.37      | 3.17      |
| Madrasa                   | 3.50                              | 2.94      | 3.06      |
| Administrative            | 4.08                              | 3.41      | 3.36      |
| <b>Inst. Location</b>     |                                   |           |           |
| Metropolitan              | 3.62                              | 3.36      | 3.21      |
| District Sadar            | 3.36                              | 3.21      | 3.13      |
| Upozila Sadar             | 3.03                              | 3.14      | 3.11      |
| Rural                     | 2.10                              | 3.03      | 2.88      |
| <b>Occupational Group</b> |                                   |           |           |
| Academic                  | 3.38                              | 3.26      | 3.14      |
| Administrative            | 4.19                              | 3.44      | 3.52      |
| <b>Gender</b>             |                                   |           |           |
| Male                      | 3.33                              | 3.22      | 3.12      |
| Female                    | 3.69                              | 3.43      | 3.27      |
| <b>Age</b>                |                                   |           |           |
| Below 30                  | 2.94                              | 2.93      | 2.93      |
| 30 – 39                   | 3.33                              | 3.24      | 3.16      |
| 40 – 49                   | 3.44                              | 3.25      | 3.07      |
| 50 and Above              | 3.94                              | 3.59      | 3.38      |
| <b>Job Tenure</b>         |                                   |           |           |
| 0 – 4                     | 3.34                              | 3.16      | 3.14      |
| 5 – 10                    | 3.33                              | 3.22      | 3.14      |
| 11 – 15                   | 3.17                              | 3.25      | 3.14      |
| 16 and Above              | 3.78                              | 3.45      | 3.21      |
| <b>Highest Education</b>  |                                   |           |           |
| Master                    | 3.38                              | 3.25      | 3.15      |
| M.Phil                    | 3.40                              | 3.28      | 3.18      |
| M.Phil Ongoing            | 4.00                              | 2.56      | 2.63      |
| Ph.D                      | 3.88                              | 3.49      | 3.23      |
| Ph.D Ongoing              | 3.60                              | 3.49      | 3.45      |

Designation is significantly related to job satisfaction. Professors are most satisfied regarding every scale of satisfaction (overall, extrinsic and intrinsic) comparing to others. Associate professors are partially satisfied as overall but not satisfied in relation to extrinsic and intrinsic items of the job. On the other hand, Assistant professor and lecturer are not satisfied with their job.

Appointment type is significantly associated with job satisfaction from PSC, 10% and nationalized group are more satisfied than respondents from BCS group. Job satisfaction levels of BCS group are not satisfactory.

The levels of satisfaction differ based on the category of institution of respondents. But this variation is not statistically significant. BCS general education cadre officer, working at administrative institution have more satisfaction level than that of others institutions. In an average, respondents from Masters College and TTC have satisfactory level of job satisfaction. Another way, officers who are working at Degree College and commercial institute, have not satisfactory level of job satisfaction.

Location has significant relationship with job satisfaction of officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. The officers from metropolitan area have perceived more satisfaction level than others. The officers of district sadar and upozila sadar have not satisfactory level of job satisfaction. On the other hand, officers of rural area are dissatisfied with their job.

Occupational group has significant association with job satisfaction. Administrative officers are more satisfied with their profession than academic group. Academic group does not perceived moderate level of satisfaction.

There are significant relationships between gender and job satisfaction. Female officers are more satisfied than male officer.



Age of the respondent is other significant predictors of job satisfaction. There is a significant difference in job satisfaction based on the age. The results suggest that officers in the age group 50 and above years report significantly higher level of job satisfaction compare to other age categories. On the other hand, officers of the below 30 age group possess lowest level of satisfaction. Results also suggest that there is a positive correlation between age and job satisfaction.

Job tenure is also related to job satisfaction. Officers with 0-4 year service reflect higher level of job satisfaction than officer with 5-10 and 11-15 year service groups. On the other hand, officers with 16 and above year service have highest level of satisfaction. This situation may be attributed to the fact that officers with less than 4 years service believe that this profession will be able to meet their career expectation. Officer's expectations are high at the time of appointment, but when these expectations are not met, it leads to decrease in job satisfaction and remains relatively low for the next few years of service. Again, after 15 years of service, officer's satisfaction level increase.

There are differences in job satisfaction level of education cadre officer based on highest education level. But these differences are not statistically significant.

#### **5.5.4 Relationship between Demographic Factors and Job Satisfaction:**

Results of ANOVA reflect that a significant relationship between job satisfaction and demographic factors of the BCS general education cadre offices is present.

Designation is significantly related to job satisfaction (p value for overall, extrinsic and intrinsic are .000, .000, .001 respectably)

Appointment type is significantly associated with job satisfaction (p value for overall, extrinsic and intrinsic are .000, .000, .042 respectably)

The levels of satisfaction differ based on the category of institution of respondents. But this variation is not statistically significant.

**Table 5.30: Relationship between Demographic Factors and Job Satisfaction**

| Demographic Factors | Job Satisfaction |             |                |             |                |             |
|---------------------|------------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|
|                     | Overall          |             | Extrinsic      |             | Intrinsic      |             |
|                     | <i>p</i> value   | Comments    | <i>p</i> value | Comments    | <i>p</i> value | Comments    |
| Designation         | .000             | Significant | .000           | Significant | .001           | Significant |
| Appointment Type    | .000             | Significant | .000           | Significant | .042           | Significant |
| Inst. Category      | .17              |             | .27            |             | .86            |             |
| Inst. Location      | .000             | Significant | .001           | Significant | .140           |             |
| Occupational Group  | .002             | Significant | .114           |             | .004           | Significant |
| Gender              | .004             | Significant | .000           | Significant | .017           | Significant |
| Age                 | .000             | Significant | .000           | Significant | .002           | Significant |
| Job Tenure          | .001             | Significant | .000           | Significant | .792           |             |
| Highest Education   | .207             |             | .044           | Significant | .519           |             |

Location has significant relationship with overall job satisfaction ( $p=.000$ ) and with extrinsic job satisfaction ( $p=.001$ ).

Occupational group has significant association with overall job satisfaction ( $p=.002$ ) and with intrinsic job satisfaction ( $p=.004$ ).

There are significant relationships between gender and job satisfaction ( $p$  value for overall, extrinsic and intrinsic are .004, .000, .017 respectively).

Age of the respondent is other significant predictors of job satisfaction ( $p$  value for overall, extrinsic and intrinsic are .000, .000, .002 respectively).

Job tenure is significantly related to overall job satisfaction ( $p=.001$ ) and to extrinsic job satisfaction ( $p=.000$ ).

There are differences in job satisfaction level of education cadre officer based on highest education level. But these differences are statistically significant only for extrinsic job satisfaction ( $p=.044$ ).

### **5.5.5 Professional Commitment Differences in relation to Demographic Factors**

Results of the current chapter reflect that a significant relationship and also a significant difference in professional commitment exist based on the demographic factors of the BCS general education cadre offices which are presented in table 5.31.

Professors and Associate professors are committed to their profession. On the other hand, the level of commitment of assistant professor and lecturer are not satisfactory to the profession. There is a lack of sense of obligation to the profession among the assistant professors and lecturers.

Appointment type is significantly associated with professional commitment. Commitment levels are also highest for PSC group and lowest for BCS group. Officers from 10% quota and nationalized group have satisfactory level of commitment to the profession.

The levels of commitment differ based on the category of institution of respondents. But this variation is not statistically significant. BCS general education cadre officer, working at administrative institution have more commitment level than that of others institutions. In an average, respondents from Masters College and TTC have satisfactory affective professional commitment. Another way, officers who are working at Degree College and commercial institute, have not satisfactory level of job commitment.

Location has significant relationship with professional commitment of officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. The officers from metropolitan area have perceived more commitment level than others.

**Table 5.31: Summary of Level of Professional Commitment in relation to Demographic Factors of BCS (Gen. Ed.) Cadre**

| Demographic Factors       | Levels of Professional Commitment (mean) |      |      |
|---------------------------|--|------|------|
|                           | APC                                      | CPC  | NPC  |
| <b>Designation</b>        |  |      |      |
| Professor                 | 4.33                                     | 3.75 | 3.79 |
| Associate Professor       | 3.95                                     | 3.53 | 3.42 |
| Assistant Professor       | 3.65                                     | 3.39 | 3.33 |
| Lecturer                  | 3.59                                     | 3.20 | 3.30 |
| <b>Appointment Type</b>   |  |      |      |
| PSC                       | 4.67                                     | 4.00 | 4.17 |
| BCS (Direct)              | 3.65                                     | 3.31 | 3.33 |
| 10% Quota                 | 4.42                                     | 3.53 | 3.07 |
| Nationalized              | 4.25                                     | 3.85 | 3.83 |
| <b>Inst. Category</b>     |  |      |      |
| Masters College           | 3.70                                     | 3.36 | 3.30 |
| Degree(Hon,s) college     | 3.67                                     | 3.30 | 3.38 |
| Degree Pass College       | 3.79                                     | 3.45 | 3.41 |
| Commercial Inst.          | 3.17                                     | 3.75 | 3.06 |
| TTC                       | 3.77                                     | 3.46 | 3.52 |
| Madrasa                   | 3.67                                     | 2.88 | 3.42 |
| Administrative            | 3.96                                     | 3.23 | 3.63 |
| <b>Inst. Location</b>     |  |      |      |
| Metropolitan              | 3.71                                     | 3.45 | 3.37 |
| District Sadar            | 3.75                                     | 3.24 | 3.33 |
| Upozila Sadar             | 3.55                                     | 3.41 | 3.35 |
| Rural                     | 3.62                                     | 3.00 | 3.30 |
| <b>Occupational Group</b> |  |      |      |
| Academic                  | 3.69                                     | 3.35 | 3.34 |
| Administrative            | 4.01                                     | 3.36 | 3.70 |
| <b>Gender</b>             |  |      |      |
| Male                      | 3.68                                     | 3.36 | 3.34 |
| Female                    | 3.80                                     | 3.31 | 3.40 |
| <b>Age</b>                |  |      |      |
| Below 30                  | 3.44                                     | 2.99 | 3.11 |
| 30 – 39                   | 3.58                                     | 3.26 | 3.31 |
| 40 – 49                   | 3.82                                     | 3.49 | 3.39 |
| 50 and Above              | 4.16                                     | 3.62 | 3.57 |
| <b>Job Tenure</b>         |  |      |      |
| 0 – 4                     | 3.60                                     | 3.19 | 3.17 |
| 5 – 10                    | 3.56                                     | 3.26 | 3.32 |
| 11 – 15                   | 3.75                                     | 3.45 | 3.34 |
| 16 and Above              | 4.05                                     | 3.58 | 3.51 |
| <b>Highest Education</b>  |  |      |      |
| Master                    | 3.68                                     | 3.33 | 3.35 |
| M.Phil                    | 3.60                                     | 3.15 | 3.38 |
| M.Phil Ongoing            | 5.00                                     | 3.75 | 3.33 |
| Ph.D                      | 4.19                                     | 3.66 | 3.38 |
| Ph.D Ongoing              | 3.27                                     | 3.35 | 3.33 |

The officers of district sadar and upozila sadar have not satisfactory level of professional commitment. On the other hand, officers of rural area are not committed to their job.

Occupational group has significant association with commitment. Administrative officers are more committed to their profession than academic group. Academic group does not perceived moderate level of commitment.

There are significant relationships between gender and job satisfaction. On the other hand, the relationship between professional commitment and gender are not statistically significant.

Age of the respondent is other significant predictors of professional commitment. There is a significant difference in commitment based on the age. The results suggest that officers in the age group 50 and above years report significantly higher level of professional commitment compare to other age categories. On the other hand, officers of the below 30 age group possess lowest level commitment. Results also suggest that there is a positive correlation between age and commitment.

There are differences in commitment level of education cadre officer based on highest education level. But these differences are not statistically significant.

### **5.5.6 Relationship between Demographic Factors and Professional Commitment:**

Results of ANOVA reflect that a significant relationship between professional commitment and demographic factors of the BCS general education cadre offices is present. The relationship are presented in table 5.32

Designation is significantly related to professional commitment (p value for APC, CPC and NPC are .000, .000, .003 respectably).

Appointment type is significantly associated with professional commitment (p value for APC, CPC and NPC are .000, .001, .001 respectively).

**Table 5.32: Relationship between Demographic Factors and Professional Commitment**

| Demographic Factors | Professional Commitment |             |                |             |                |             |
|---------------------|-------------------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|
|                     | APC                     |             | CPC            |             | NPC            |             |
|                     | <i>p</i> value          | Comments    | <i>p</i> value | Comments    | <i>p</i> value | Comments    |
| Designation         | .000                    | Significant | .000           | Significant | .003           | Significant |
| Appointment Type    | .000                    | Significant | .001           | Significant | .000           | Significant |
| Inst. Category      | .57                     |             | .53            |             | .25            |             |
| Inst. Location      | .396                    |             | .003           | Significant | .916           |             |
| Occupational Group  | .058                    |             | .951           |             | .010           | Significant |
| Gender              | .120                    |             | .518           |             | .328           |             |
| Age                 | .000                    | Significant | .000           | Significant | .005           | Significant |
| Job Tenure          | .000                    | Significant | .000           | Significant | .005           | Significant |
| Highest Education   | .000                    | Significant | .097           |             | .998           |             |

The levels of professional commitment differ based on the category of institution of respondents. But this variation is not statistically significant.

Location has significant relationship with CPC of officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre (p=.003).

Occupational group has significant association with NPC (p=.010).

The levels of professional commitment differ based on the gender of respondents. But this variation is not statistically significant.

Age of the respondent is other significant predictors of professional commitment (p value for APC, CPC and NPC are .000, .000, .005 respectively).

Job tenure is also significantly related to professional commitment (p value for APC, CPC and NPC are .000, .000, .005 respectively).

There are differences in professional commitment level of education cadre officer based on highest education level. But these differences are only statistically significant for APC ( $p=.000$ ).

Some of the participant opined that designation, type of institution, location of institution and occupational group are most influencing factor of teachers' job satisfaction. (FGD: Dhaka, Rajshahi, Kushtia and Bogra).

## **5.6 Conclusion**

From the analysis of this chapter, researcher has concluded that, individual demographic factors have significant influence on job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre in Bangladesh. Findings also indicate that, designation, appointment type, location of institute, occupational group, gender, age, and job tenure are significantly related to job satisfaction and professional commitment. Level of highest education has not significant effect on job satisfaction and commitment. These results are consistent with previous studies that remark these variables as strong predictors of job satisfaction and commitment.

## **Chapter Six**

### **Impact of Human Resource Management on Job**

#### **Satisfaction and Professional Commitment**

##### **6.1 Introduction**

The impact of human resource management (HRM) practices on organizational performance and employee attitudes such as job satisfaction, commitment has become a leading area of research. Human resource management refers to policies, practices and systems that influence employees' behaviour, attitude, and performance. It includes human resource planning, job analysis, recruitment, selection, orientation, compensation, performance appraisal, training and development and labour relations. For better management of an organization, effective HRM practices are important because HRM practice play a vital role in creating and maintaining job satisfaction and professional commitment of the employees. But surprisingly, very limited numbers of studies have been conducted on HR practices in the context of developing countries in general and Bangladesh in particular.<sup>74</sup> So, this chapter discusses the different selected HRM practices and explores the relationship with job satisfaction and professional commitment among the BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre officers.

##### **6.2 HRM Practices and Job satisfaction**

HRM practices and job satisfaction are discussed widely by many researchers in different country. Every study has found a significant relationship between HRM practices and job satisfaction. Many scholars and practitioners believe that sound

---

<sup>74</sup> M. H. Mahmood, The institutional context of human resource management: Case studies of multinational subsidiaries in Bangladesh. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Manchester, UK, 2004.



HRM practices result in better level of job satisfaction which ultimately leads to organizational performance. Steijn (2004) found that HRM practices had positive impact on job satisfaction of the employees of Dutch public sector.

### **6.3 HRM Practices and Professional Commitment**

HRM practices have also an important impact on employees' professional commitment. Different studies show a significant positive association with commitment and HRM practices. Meyer and Smitt (2000) explain that unless employees believe they have been considered fairly in their profession, they will not be committed to their profession. Shukla (2009) demonstrated a high positive relation between professional commitment and job satisfaction. Another study shows that employee's perception to the HRM practices such as fairness in promotion, supervising influence to commitment.

### **6.4 Important HRM Practices**

Several studies have conducted on HRM practices in relation to job satisfaction and professional commitment. Various studies have identified some HRM practices as important predictors of job satisfaction and commitment. The most important practices, which are critical to the employees, have been identified as recruitment & selection, training and development, salary and benefits, performance appraisal, job security, participation in decision, justice and career development. The degree of impact of these practices may differ on the basis of the research type, area of research and so on. The selected HRM practices which are important for this study are briefly discussed below.

**Recruitment and Selection:** Recruitment and selection is a process to appoint qualified human resource from a lot of applied candidates for the organization. The target of this practice is to improve the fit between employees and the institute, teams,

and work requirements. Sophisticated recruitment and selection system can ensure a better fit between the individual's abilities and the organization's requirement. Katou and Budhwar (2007) in a study on the Greek manufacturing firms found that recruitment and selection was positively related to all organizational performance variables such as effectiveness, efficiency, innovation, and quality.

**Posting & Transfer:** Posting & Transfer is an important HRM practices that influence the satisfaction and commitment of the employees. It is a common practice for the government employees.

**Job Security:** Job security is an important predictor of job satisfaction and commitment in Bangladesh because of lack of available job opportunity. An employee pays a great attention on his/ her job security when s/he joined in a profession. Employees who are assured of job security may develop commitment and be satisfied with their jobs because of the longevity of the employment relationship.

**Promotional Opportunities:** Promotion is the assignment of an employee to a higher level of job and promotional opportunities refers to the degree of an employee's chance to grow and be promoted within the organization. Some studies have found that promotional opportunities have a positive relation with job satisfaction and professional commitment. Different theories of satisfaction suggest that promotion is a motivator that leads to satisfaction and commitment. T. Siddika conducted a study on civil servant working at field level and found that promotion is significantly positive relation with job satisfaction.

**Training and Development:** Training and development is considered most common practices that can have a significant impact on employee satisfaction and commitment. Training and development' refers to any effort to improve current of future employees' skills, abilities, and knowledge. Garcia (2005) found that training

and development has a significant positive impact on job satisfaction and professional commitment.

**Salary and Benefits:** Research found that salary and benefits has a significant impact on job satisfaction and commitment. It is very much important for employee because it is the main reason for which employee work. Studies show that salary alone improves employee satisfaction and or reduce dissatisfaction. But there is another point of view against the monetary influence on job satisfaction. Salary, of course, is not the only attraction to a profession. Christopher Hood has himself listed a considerable number of other benefits to public service, including pension, honors, social status, and regularity of reward, psychological satisfaction.

**Justice and Equity:** Adam's equity theory is based on the justice and equity in a HRM system of an organization. This theory explains that, employee brings inputs in the profession such as education, efforts, experience and in return, expect to fair outcomes from the profession such as pay, promotion, security, feedback among others. Employees always compare the input/ output ratio with the same ratio of the referent group. Therefore, perception of fairness will improve the satisfaction and commitment of the employee in an organization. Studies have found that justice and equity are significantly related to the satisfaction and commitment. Al-Omari *et al.* (2008) found that distributive justice had a positive indirect effect on academics intent to stay through organisational commitment. This means that higher levels of justice results higher levels of satisfaction and commitment.

**Performance Appraisal:** It is an important practice for the organization because it influences the other HRM practices such as selection, compensation, training etc. It refers to a systematic process to evaluate the employee after a certain period. Research shows that performance appraisal has a significant influence on job

satisfaction and professional commitment. Since performance appraisal play a role in decisions related to promotion, training, reward, career development, manager must be careful about this. According to Allan (1994) a systematic and appropriate performance appraisal system should be objective, free of bias and custom oriented to suitable for the profession.

**Participation in Decision:** Studies found that participation in decision making process is an important positive determinant of job satisfaction and commitment. When manager gives their employee more autonomy and responsibility, it creates a sense of obligation and attachment to the organization or profession. According to McElroy (2001) participation can increase affective and normative commitment when employees are involved in the decision making process.

**Career Development:** Employees have the dream to develop his career within an organization/ profession. So employee expects a clear career path through which he can reach the desired position. As a result it becomes a strong determinant for job satisfaction and commitment. Allen and Meyer's (1990) found that career development practices were best predictors of affective and normative commitment because they were critical in preparing employees for a future in the organisation. A clear and suitable career planning creates a feeling of obligation and develops emotional attachment to the profession.

## **6.5 Respondents' satisfaction regarding HRM factors**

HRM factors are the most important predictors of job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. Following the review of relevant literature, nine items were identified as important predictors of job satisfaction and professional commitment, namely; recruitment and selection, posting and transfer, job security, promotion, training, salary and benefits, justice and equity, performance

appraisal, and career development. Respondents perception regarding the selected HRM practices are shown in the table below.

**Table 6.1: Level of Satisfaction regarding HRM Factors**

| HRM Factors             | N   | Mean | Std. Deviation | Comment      |
|-------------------------|-----|------|----------------|--------------|
| Recruitment & Selection | 374 | 3.47 | 1.02           | Satisfied    |
| Posting & Transfer      | 374 | 2.36 | .63            | Dissatisfied |
| Job Security            | 374 | 3.61 | .80            | Satisfied    |
| Promotion               | 374 | 2.55 | .70            | Dissatisfied |
| Training                | 374 | 2.41 | .87            | Dissatisfied |
| Salary & Benefits       | 374 | 2.63 | .62            | Neutral      |
| Justice & Equity        | 374 | 2.62 | .72            | Neutral      |
| Performance Appraisal   | 374 | 2.59 | .65            | Dissatisfied |
| Career Development      | 374 | 2.71 | .79            | Neutral      |

**Source: Primary Data**

\*Mean categories: Extremely Dissatisfied= 1.00-1.80; Dissatisfied =1.81-2.60; Neutral= 2.61-3.40; Satisfied= 3.41- 4.20; Extremely Satisfied=4.21- 5.00.

**Recruitment and Selection:** This scale consisted of one item which measured the perception of officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre to the recruitment and selection system. Result in the table indicates that the average level of satisfaction is 3.47 which fell within the satisfied range of the satisfaction level. This means, the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre are satisfied regarding the recruitment and selection procedure of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

**Posting and Transfer:** This measures respondent's satisfaction in relation to posting and transfer practice of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. Five items were consisted (two were reverse wording) in this scale to determine the perception of the respondents. The mean score for the scale was 2.36 and fell within the dissatisfying range.

**Job Security:** Perception regarding job security of the respondents was measured by two items in this study. Result explains that the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre were satisfied (M=3.61) with their job security.

**Promotion:** This scale consisted of three items including one negative wording item. Result in the table indicates that the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre were not satisfied (M=2.55) within the promotion status.

**Training:** This scale consisted two items to measure the level of perception in relation to training. Mean score is 2.41 for this scale which refers that the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre were not satisfied regarding training system of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

**Salary and Benefits:** Perception regarding salary and benefits was measured by five items (two were negative wording) in this study. The average mean score is 2.63 and fell within the neutral range of satisfaction. That means they are low satisfied.

**Justice and Equity:** This measures respondent's satisfaction in relation to justice and equity practice of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. Six items were consisted (one was negative wording) in this scale to determine the perception of the respondents. The mean score for the scale was 2.62 which mean the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre were low satisfied regarding their justice and equity practices.

**Performance Appraisal:** This scale consisted five items to measure the level of perception in relation to performance appraisal of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. Mean score is 2.59 for this scale which refers that the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre were not satisfied regarding performance appraisal system of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

**Career Development:** Perception in relation to career development of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre was measured by three items. The average level of satisfaction is (M) 2.71 which fell into the neutral range of satisfaction scale.

Finally, it is concluded from the table that, the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre were satisfied regarding recruitment & selection, and job security factors of HRM practices. On the other hand, their perception levels were not satisfactory regarding the others factors of HRM.

## **6.6 Analysis the impact of HRM practices on job satisfaction and professional commitment and Test of Hypothesis**

The purpose of this section is to explore the relationships and carry out test of hypothesis among the various factors of HRM in relation to job satisfaction and professional commitment. The relationships are between on the independent variable namely- HRM factors (recruitment and selection, posting and transfer, job security, promotion, training, salary and benefits, justice and equity, performance appraisal, and career development) and the dependent variables namely- job satisfaction and professional commitment. The data analysis aims to examine the extent to which HRM factors influenced job satisfaction and professional commitment (objective no. 2).

Multiple regression analysis has been carried out to determine the degree to which the HRM factors predicted the job satisfaction and professional commitment. The estimation process was based on Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) [i.e.,  $Y = a + bx$ ]. For this purpose, the regression model for the study is as follows-

$$JS(PC) = \alpha + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \beta_5 X_5 + \beta_6 X_6 + \beta_7 X_7 + \beta_8 X_8 + \beta_9 X_9 + \epsilon$$

Where,

JS = Job Satisfaction (JS)

PC= Professional Commitment (PC)

X1= Recruitment and Selection (RS)

X2= Posting & Transfer (PT)

X3= Job Security (JS)

X4= Promotion (P)

X5= Training (T)

X6= Salary & Benefits (SB)

X7= Justice and Equity (JE)

X8= Performance Appraisal (PA)

X9= Career Development (CD)

$\epsilon$  = Error Term

And  $\alpha$  is a constant and  $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4, \beta_5, \beta_6, \beta_7, \beta_8, \beta_9$ , are coefficient to estimate.

To test the extent of influence of HRM factors, correlation ( $r$ ),  $R^2$ , adjusted  $R^2$ , ANOVA and coefficient of determination were used in this section of the study.

Prior to conduct multiple regression analysis, Pearson correlation analysis was performed to find out the pair wise relationship between the variables. It was also important to ensure that the factors were not too highly correlated. Hence, the correlation results are summarized in Appendix D.

Results show that, all HRM factors are independently positively correlated with overall job satisfaction, with extrinsic job satisfaction, and with intrinsic job satisfaction and also highly significant. The factors are also independently positively correlated with the three scale of professional commitment (APC, CPC, and NPC). The correlation results indicate that, HRM factors have a significant association with job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.



## 6.6.1 The extent to which HRM factors influenced job satisfaction and professional commitment

To examine the extent to which HRM factors influenced job satisfaction and professional commitment, multiple regression analysis was performed and the results ( $R^2$ , adjusted  $R^2$ , ANOVA and coefficient of determination) were presented in the tables.

### 6.6.1.1 Influence of HRM factors on Job Satisfaction

#### 1. Influence of HRM factors and Predictors of Overall Job Satisfaction of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

**Table 6.2: Multiple Regression Predicting Overall Job Satisfaction**

| HRM Factors                     | Overall Job Satisfaction |      |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|------|
| <b>Regression model summary</b> |                          |      |
| $R^2$                           | .273                     |      |
| Adjusted $R^2$                  | .255                     |      |
| F (ANOVA)                       | 15.211                   |      |
| Df                              | (9, 364)                 |      |
| Sig                             | .000                     |      |
| <b>Coefficients</b>             |                          |      |
|                                 | ( $\beta$ )              | Sig  |
| Recruitment & Selection         | -.004                    | .936 |
| Posting & Transfer              | .111                     | .025 |
| Job Security                    | .244                     | .000 |
| Promotion                       | .186                     | .000 |
| Training                        | -.016                    | .758 |
| Salary & Benefits               | .182                     | .000 |
| Justice & Equity                | .137                     | .022 |
| Performance Appraisal           | -.046                    | .411 |
| Career Development              | .259                     | .000 |

The regression results in the table indicate that the HRM factors of the study accounted for 27.3% ( $R^2=.273$ ) of the variance in Overall Job Satisfaction of the respondents. The remaining 72.7% is not explained which means that the rest 72.7% percent of the variation of OJS is related to other variables which are not depicted in the model. ANOVA results show that there is a significant influence of HRM factors on the OJS of the respondents ( $f=15.211$ ,  $df=9$ ,  $364$ ;  $P=.000<.05$ ).

In coefficient results indicate that Posting and Transfer ( $\beta=.111$ ,  $P=.023<.05$ ), Job Security ( $\beta=.244$ ,  $P=.000<.05$ ), Promotion ( $\beta=.186$ ,  $P=.000<.05$ ), Salary and Benefits ( $\beta=.182$ ,  $P=.000<.05$ ), Justice and Equity ( $\beta=.137$ ,  $P=.022<.05$ ), and Career Development ( $\beta=.259$ ,  $P=.000<.05$ ) have statistically significant influence on OJS of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

On the other hand, Recruitment and Selection ( $\beta= -.004$ ,  $P=.936>.05$ ), Training ( $\beta=-.016$ ,  $P=.758>.05$ ) and Performance Appraisal ( $\beta= -.046$ ,  $P=.411>.05$ ) have not statistically significant influence on OJS of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

According to significance level the factors are arranged in chronological order from most significant to less for better understanding and decision making for authority.

**Table 6.3: Rank order of HRM Factor according to significance level**

| Factors            | Beta Value | Rank on the basis of Significance |
|--------------------|------------|-----------------------------------|
| Career Development | .259       | 1                                 |
| Job Security       | .244       | 2                                 |
| Promotion          | .186       | 3                                 |
| Salary & Benefits  | .182       | 4                                 |
| Justice & Equity   | .137       | 5                                 |
| Posting & Transfer | .111       | 6                                 |

**2. Influence of HRM factors and Predictors of Extrinsic Job Satisfaction (EJS) of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.**

**Table 6.4: Multiple Regression Predicting Extrinsic Job Satisfaction**

| <b>HRM Factors</b>              | <b>Extrinsic Job Satisfaction</b> |      |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------|
| <b>Regression model summary</b> |                                   |      |
| R <sup>2</sup>                  | .415                              |      |
| Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>         | .401                              |      |
| F (ANOVA)                       | 28.746                            |      |
| Df                              | (9, 364)                          |      |
| Sig                             | .000                              |      |
| <b>Coefficients</b>             |                                   |      |
|                                 | (β)                               | Sig  |
| Recruitment & Selection         | .057                              | .172 |
| Posting & Transfer              | .252                              | .000 |
| Job Security                    | .254                              | .000 |
| Promotion                       | .057                              | .215 |
| Training                        | .068                              | .137 |
| Salary & Benefits               | .265                              | .000 |
| Justice & Equity                | .002                              | .973 |
| Performance Appraisal           | .219                              | .000 |
| Career Development              | .144                              | .011 |

The regression results in the table indicate that the HRM factors of the study accounted for 41.5% (R<sup>2</sup>=.415) of the variance in Extrinsic Job Satisfaction of the respondents. The remaining 58.5% is not explained which means that the rest 58.5% percent of the variation of EJS is related to other variables which are not depicted in the model. ANOVA results show that there is a significant influence of HRM factors on the EJS of the respondents (f=28.746, df=9, 364; P=.000<.05).

In coefficient results indicate that Posting and Transfer (β=.252, P=.000<.05), Job Security (β=.254, P=.000<.05), Salary and Benefits (β=.265, P=.000<.05), Performance Appraisal (β= .219, P=.000<.05), and Career Development (β=.144,

$P=.011<.05$ ) have statistically significant influence on EJS of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

On the other hand, Recruitment and Selection ( $\beta= .057$ ,  $P=.172>.05$ ), Promotion ( $\beta= .057$ ,  $P=.215>.05$ ), Training ( $\beta=- .068$ ,  $P=.137>.05$ ) and Justice and Equity ( $\beta= .002$ ,  $P=.973<.05$ ) have not statistically significant influence on EJS of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

According to significance level the factors are arranged in chronological order from most significant to less for better understanding and decision making for authority.

**Table 6.5: Rank order of HRM Factor according to significance level**

| <b>Factors</b>        | <b>Beta Value</b> | <b>Rank on the basis of Significance</b> |
|-----------------------|-------------------|--|
| Salary & Benefits     | .265              | 1  |
| Job Security          | .254              | 2  |
| Posting & Transfer    | .252              | 3  |
| Performance Appraisal | .219              | 4  |
| Career Development    | .144              | 5  |

The table indicates that the salary and benefits are the most significant impacting HRM factor of extrinsic job satisfaction followed by job security, posting, performance appraisal and career development of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre in Bangladesh.

### 3. Influence of HRM factors and Predictors of Intrinsic Job Satisfaction (IJS) of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

**Table 6.6: Multiple Regression Predicting Intrinsic Job Satisfaction**

| HRM Factors                     | Intrinsic Job Satisfaction |      |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------|------|
| <b>Regression model summary</b> |                            |      |
| R <sup>2</sup>                  | .316                       |      |
| Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>         | .300                       |      |
| F (ANOVA)                       | 18.721                     |      |
| Df                              | (9, 364)                   |      |
| Sig                             | .000                       |      |
| <b>Coefficients</b>             |                            |      |
|                                 | (β)                        | Sig  |
| Recruitment & Selection         | .052                       | .249 |
| Posting & Transfer              | .067                       | .164 |
| Job Security                    | .213                       | .000 |
| Promotion                       | .101                       | .043 |
| Training                        | .097                       | .048 |
| Salary & Benefits               | -.018                      | .729 |
| Justice & Equity                | .066                       | .258 |
| Performance Appraisal           | .279                       | .000 |
| Career Development              | .094                       | .125 |

The regression results in the table indicate that the HRM factors of the study accounted for 31.6% ( $R^2=.316$ ) of the variance in Intrinsic Job Satisfaction of the respondents. The remaining 68.4% is not explained which means that the rest 68.4% percent of the variation of IJS is related to other variables which are not depicted in the model. ANOVA results show that there is a significant influence of HRM factors on the IJS of the respondents ( $f=18.721$ ,  $df=9, 364$ ;  $P=.000<.05$ ).

In coefficient results indicate that Job Security ( $\beta=.213$ ,  $P=.000<.05$ ), Promotion ( $\beta= .101$ ,  $P=.043<.05$ ), Training ( $\beta= .097$ ,  $P=.048<.05$ ), and Performance

Appraisal ( $\beta = .279$ ,  $P = .000 < .05$ ) have statistically significant influence on IJS of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

On the other hand, Recruitment and Selection ( $\beta = .052$ ,  $P = .249 > .05$ ), Posting and Transfer ( $\beta = .067$ ,  $P = .164 > .05$ ), Salary and Benefits ( $\beta = -.018$ ,  $P = .729 > .05$ ), Justice and Equity ( $\beta = .066$ ,  $P = .258 > .05$ ) and Career Development ( $\beta = .094$ ,  $P = .125 > .05$ ) have not statistically significant influence on IJS of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

According to significance level the factors are arranged in chronological order from most significant to less for better understanding and decision making for authority.

**Table 6.7: Rank order of HRM Factor according to significance level**

| Factors               | Beta Value | Rank on the basis of Significance |
|-----------------------|------------|-----------------------------------|
| Performance Appraisal | .279       | 1                                 |
| Job Security          | .213       | 2                                 |
| Promotion             | .101       | 3                                 |
| Training              | .097       | 4                                 |

### 6.6.1.2 Influence of HRM factors on Professional Commitment

#### 1. Influence of HRM factors and Predictors of Affective Professional Commitment (APC) of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

**Table 6.8: Multiple Regression Predicting Affective Professional Commitment**

| HRM Factors                     | APC      |      |
|---------------------------------|----------|------|
| <b>Regression model summary</b> |          |      |
| R <sup>2</sup>                  | .393     |      |
| Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>         | .378     |      |
| F (ANOVA)                       | 26.216   |      |
| Df                              | (9, 364) |      |
| Sig                             | .000     |      |
| <b>Coefficients</b>             | (β)      | Sig  |
|                                 |          |      |
| Recruitment & Selection         | -.024    | .571 |
| Posting & Transfer              | -.082    | .069 |
| Job Security                    | .365     | .000 |
| Promotion                       | .174     | .001 |
| Training                        | .035     | .446 |
| Salary & Benefits               | .335     | .000 |
| Justice & Equity                | .181     | .001 |
| Performance Appraisal           | -.039    | .450 |
| Career Development              | .301     | .000 |

The regression results in the table indicate that the HRM factors of the study accounted for 39.3% (R<sup>2</sup>=.393) of the variance in APC of the respondents. The remaining 60.7% is not explained which means that the rest 60.7% percent of the variation of APC is related to other variables which are not depicted in the model. ANOVA results show that there is a significant influence of HRM factors on the APC of the respondents (F=26.216, df=9, 364; P=.000<.05).

In coefficient results indicate that Posting and Transfer ( $\beta=-.082$ ,  $P=.069<.10$ ), Job Security ( $\beta=.365$ ,  $P=.000<.05$ ), Promotion ( $\beta= .174$ ,  $P=.001<.05$ ), Salary and Benefits ( $\beta=.335$ ,  $P=.000<.05$ ), Justice and Equity ( $\beta= .181$ ,  $P=.001<.05$ ) and Career Development ( $\beta=.301$ ,  $P=.000<.05$ ) have statistically significant influence on APC of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

On the other hand, Recruitment and Selection ( $\beta= -.024$ ,  $P=.571>.05$ ), Training ( $\beta= .035$ ,  $P=.046>.05$ ) and Performance Appraisal ( $\beta=- .039$ ,  $P=.450>.05$ ) have not statistically significant influence on APC of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

According to significance level the factors are arranged in chronological order from most significant to less for better understanding and decision making for authority.

**Table 6.9: Rank order of HRM Factor according to significance level**

| <b>Factors</b>     | <b>Beta Value</b> | <b>Rank on the basis of Significance</b> |
|--------------------|-------------------|--|
| Job Security       | .365              | 1  |
| Salary & Benefits  | .335              | 2  |
| Career Development | .301              | 3  |
| Justice & Equity   | .181              | 4  |
| Promotion          | .174              | 5  |
| Posting & Transfer | -.082             | 6  |



**2. Influence of HRM factors and Predictors of Continuance Professional Commitment (CPC) of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.**

**Table 6.10: Multiple Regression Predicting Continuance Professional Commitment**

| HRM Factors                     | CPC                     |       |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------|-------|
| <b>Regression model summary</b> |                         |       |
| R <sup>2</sup>                  | .148                    |       |
| Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>         | .127                    |       |
| F (ANOVA)                       | 7.029                   |       |
| Df                              | (9, 364)                |       |
| Sig                             | .000                    |       |
| <b>Coefficients</b>             | (β)                     | Sig   |
|                                 | Recruitment & Selection | -.008 |
| Posting & Transfer              | .035                    | .511  |
| Job Security                    | .291                    | .000  |
| Promotion                       | -.102                   | .066  |
| Training                        | -.059                   | .278  |
| Salary & Benefits               | .189                    | .000  |
| Justice & Equity                | .010                    | .881  |
| Performance Appraisal           | .083                    | .174  |
| Career Development              | .137                    | .045  |

The regression results in the table indicate that the HRM factors of the study accounted for 14.8% (R<sup>2</sup>=.148) of the variance in CPC of the respondents. The remaining 85.2% is not explained which means that the rest 85.2% percent of the variation of CPC is related to other variables which are not depicted in the model. ANOVA results show that there is a significant influence of HRM factors on the CPC of the respondents (F=7.029, df=9, 364; P=.000<.05).

In coefficient results indicate that Job Security (β=.291, P=.000<.05), Promotion (β= -.102, P=.066<.10), Salary and Benefits (β=.189, P=.000<.05), and

Career Development ( $\beta=.137$ ,  $P=.045<.05$ ) have statistically significant influence on CPC of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

On the other hand, Recruitment and Selection ( $\beta= -.008$ ,  $P=.875>.05$ ), Posting and Transfer ( $\beta=.035$ ,  $P=.511>.05$ ), Training ( $\beta= -.059$ ,  $P=.278>.05$ ) Justice and Equity ( $\beta= .010$ ,  $P=.881>.05$ ) and Performance Appraisal ( $\beta= .083$ ,  $P=.174>.05$ ) have not statistically significant influence on CPC of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

According to significance level the factors are arranged in chronological order from most significant to less for better understanding and decision making for authority.

**Table 6.11: Rank order of HRM Factor according to significance level**

| Factors            | Beta Value | Rank on the basis of Significance |
|--------------------|------------|-----------------------------------|
| Job Security       | .291       | 1                                 |
| Salary & Benefits  | .189       | 2                                 |
| Career Development | .137       | 3                                 |
| Promotion          | -.102      | 4                                 |

### 3. Influence of HRM factors and Predictors of Normative Professional Commitment (NPC) of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

**Table 6.12: Multiple Regression Predicting Normative Professional Commitment**

| HRM Factors                     | NPC         |      |
|---------------------------------|-------------|------|
| <b>Regression model summary</b> |             |      |
| R <sup>2</sup>                  | .191        |      |
| Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>         | .171        |      |
| F (ANOVA)                       | 9.533       |      |
| Df                              | (9, 364)    |      |
| Sig                             | .000        |      |
| <b>Coefficients</b>             | ( $\beta$ ) | Sig  |
|                                 |             |      |
| Recruitment & Selection         | .070        | .154 |
| Posting & Transfer              | -.007       | .887 |
| Job Security                    | .157        | .002 |
| Promotion                       | .011        | .838 |
| Training                        | .112        | .036 |
| Salary & Benefits               | -.008       | .894 |
| Justice & Equity                | .110        | .081 |
| Performance Appraisal           | .093        | .120 |
| Career Development              | .158        | .018 |

The regression results in the table indicate that the HRM factors of the study accounted for 19.1% ( $R^2=.191$ ) of the variance in NPC of the respondents. The remaining 80.9% is not explained which means that the rest 80.9% percent of the variation of NPC is related to other variables which are not depicted in the model. ANOVA results show that there is a significant influence of HRM factors on the NPC of the respondents ( $F=9.533$ ,  $df=9, 364$ ;  $P=.000<.05$ ).

In coefficient results indicate that Job Security ( $\beta=.157$ ,  $P=.002<.05$ ), Training ( $\beta= .112$ ,  $P=.036<.05$ ), Justice and Equity ( $\beta= .110$ ,  $P=.081<.10$ ) and Career

Development ( $\beta=.158, P=.018<.05$ ) have statistically significant influence on NPC of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

On the other hand, Recruitment and Selection ( $\beta= .070, P=.154>.05$ ), Posting and Transfer ( $\beta=-.007, P=.887>.05$ ), Promotion ( $\beta= .011, P=.838>.05$ ), Salary and Benefits ( $\beta=-.008, P=.894>.05$ ), and Performance Appraisal ( $\beta= .093, P=.120>.05$ ) have not statistically significant influence on CPC of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

According to significance level the factors are arranged in chronological order from most significant to less for better understanding and decision making for authority.

**Table 6.13: Rank order of HRM Factor according to significance level**

| Factors            | Beta Value | Rank on the basis of Significance |
|--------------------|------------|-----------------------------------|
| Career Development | .158       | 1                                 |
| Job Security       | .157       | 2                                 |
| Training           | .112       | 3                                 |
| Justice & Equity   | .110       | 4                                 |

## 6.6.2 Test of Hypothesis

In order to find out the significance of relationship between HRM factors and job satisfaction and between HRM factors and professional commitment, a broad hypothesis (H2) was developed as; Individual HR factors have significantly positive impact on job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. To explain the broad hypothesis, additional hypothesis have developed as follows.

**H2a:** HRM factors have significant impact on overall job satisfaction of officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

Results from the multiple regression table-6.2 indicate that, F value for the ANOVA of overall job satisfaction of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre was  $F = 15.211$  ( $df=9, 364$ ) and  $p=.000$  which was statistically significant at .05 (5%) level ( $P<.05$ ). It means hypothesis H2a is accepted and HRM factors have significant impact on overall job satisfaction of officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

**H2b:** HRM factors have significant impact on extrinsic job satisfaction of officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

Results from the multiple regression table-6.4 indicate that, F value for the ANOVA of extrinsic job satisfaction of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre was  $F = 28.746$  ( $df=9, 364$ ) and  $p=.000$  which was statistically significant at .05 (5%) level ( $P<.05$ ). It means hypothesis H2b is accepted and HRM factors have significant impact on extrinsic job satisfaction of officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

**H2c:** HRM factors have significant impact on intrinsic job satisfaction of officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

Results from the multiple regression table-6.6 indicate that, F value for the ANOVA of intrinsic job satisfaction of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre was  $F = 18.721$  ( $df=9, 364$ ) and  $p=.000$  which was statistically significant at .05 (5%) level ( $P<.05$ ). It means hypothesis H2c is accepted and HRM factors have significant impact on intrinsic job satisfaction of officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

**H2d:** HRM factors have significant impact on affective professional commitment of officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

Results from the multiple regression table-6.8 indicate that, F value for the ANOVA of affective professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre was  $F = 26.216$  ( $df=9, 364$ ) and  $p=.000$  which was statistically significant at .05 (5%) level ( $P<.05$ ). It means hypothesis H2d is accepted and HRM factors have

significant impact on affective professional commitment of officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

**H2e:** HRM factors have significant impact on continuance professional commitment of officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

Results from the multiple regression table-6.10 indicate that, F value for the ANOVA of continuance professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre was  $F = 7.029$  ( $df=9, 364$ ) and  $p=.000$  which was statistically significant at .05 (5%) level ( $P<.05$ ). It means hypothesis H2e is accepted and HRM factors have significant impact on continuance professional commitment of officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

**H2f:** HRM factors have significant impact on normative professional commitment of officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

Results from the multiple regression table-6.12 indicate that, F value for the ANOVA of continuance professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre was  $F = 9.533$  ( $df=9, 364$ ) and  $p=.000$  which was statistically significant at .05 (5%) level ( $P<.05$ ). It means hypothesis H2f is accepted and HRM factors have significant impact on normative professional commitment of officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

The above analysis showed that HRM factors have significant impact on every scale of job satisfaction and professional commitment, thus supporting broad hypothesis H2.

## **6.7 Major Findings**

This chapter was aim to know the perception of education cadre officers about the HRM practice and to find out the relationship between HRM factors and job satisfaction and commitment. From the above analysis and discussion, the findings are revealed as follows:

### 6.7.1 Perception of Officers to the HRM Factors

The officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre are relatively satisfied with recruitment & selection procedure and their job security. They are less satisfied with salary & benefits, justice & equity and career development. On the other hand, they are dissatisfied with promotion, posting & transfer, training and performance appraisal system of the education cadre (FGD: 1, 2, 3,4).

### 6.7.2 Impact of HRM Factors on Job Satisfaction

The HRM factors have significant impact on job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

**Table 6.14: Impacting HRM Factors of Job Satisfaction**

| HRM Factors             | Job Satisfaction |                             |      |           |                             |      |           |                             |      |
|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|------|-----------|-----------------------------|------|-----------|-----------------------------|------|
|                         | Overall          |                             |      | Extrinsic |                             |      | Intrinsic |                             |      |
|                         | Sig              | Comment                     | Rank | Sig       | Comment                     | Rank | Sig       | Comment                     | Rank |
| Recruitment & Selection | .936             |                             |      | .172      |                             |      | .249      |                             |      |
| Posting & Transfer      | .025             | <i>P</i> <.05 (significant) | 6    | .000      | <i>P</i> <.05 (significant) | 3    | .164      |                             |      |
| Job Security            | .000             | <i>P</i> <.05 (significant) | 2    | .000      | <i>P</i> <.05 (significant) | 2    | .000      | <i>P</i> <.05 (significant) | 2    |
| Promotion               | .000             | <i>P</i> <.05 (significant) | 3    | .215      |                             |      | .043      | <i>P</i> <.05 (significant) | 3    |
| Training                | .758             |                             |      | .137      |                             |      | .048      | <i>P</i> <.05 (significant) | 4    |
| Salary & Benefits       | .000             | <i>P</i> <.05 (significant) | 4    | .000      | <i>P</i> <.05 (significant) | 1    | .729      |                             |      |
| Justice & Equity        | .022             | <i>P</i> <.05 (significant) | 5    | .973      |                             |      | .258      |                             |      |
| Performance Appraisal   | .411             |                             |      | .000      | <i>P</i> <.05 (significant) | 4    | .000      | <i>P</i> <.05 (significant) | 1    |
| Career Development      | .000             | <i>P</i> <.05 (significant) | 1    | .011      | <i>P</i> <.05 (significant) | 5    | .125      |                             |      |

The pattern of result revealed that salary & benefits, career development, job security, promotion, justice & equity and posting & transfer factors have significant impact on overall job satisfaction. Among the factors, salary & benefits, job security, posting & transfer, performance appraisal and career development are the most important extrinsic variables, which need to maintain minimum level of job satisfaction of cadre officers, and performance appraisal, job security, promotion and

training are significant predictors of intrinsic job satisfaction of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre of Bangladesh.

### 6.7.3 Impact of HRM Factors on Professional Commitment

Results also indicate that, HRM factors have significant impact on professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre of Bangladesh.

**Table 6.15: Impacting HRM Factors of Professional Commitment**

| HRM Factors             | Professional Commitment |                             |      |      |                             |      |      |                             |      |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|------|------|-----------------------------|------|------|-----------------------------|------|
|                         | APC                     |                             |      | CPC  |                             |      | NPC  |                             |      |
|                         | Sig                     | Comment                     | Rank | Sig  | Comment                     | Rank | Sig  | Comment                     | Rank |
| Recruitment & Selection | .571                    |                             |      | .875 |                             |      | .154 |                             |      |
| Posting & Transfer      | .069                    |                             |      | .511 |                             |      | .887 |                             |      |
| Job Security            | .000                    | <i>P</i> <.05 (significant) | 1    | .000 | <i>P</i> <.05 (significant) | 1    | .002 | <i>P</i> <.05 (significant) | 2    |
| Promotion               | .001                    | <i>P</i> <.05 (significant) | 5    | .066 |                             |      | .838 |                             |      |
| Training                | .446                    |                             |      | .278 |                             |      | .036 | <i>P</i> <.05 (significant) | 3    |
| Salary & Benefits       | .000                    | <i>P</i> <.05 (significant) | 2    | .000 | <i>P</i> <.05 (significant) | 3    | .894 |                             |      |
| Justice & Equity        | .001                    | <i>P</i> <.05 (significant) | 4    | .881 |                             |      | .081 |                             |      |
| Performance Appraisal   | .450                    |                             |      | .174 |                             |      | .120 |                             |      |
| Career Development      | .000                    | <i>P</i> <.05 (significant) | 3    | .045 | <i>P</i> <.05 (significant) | 2    | .018 | <i>P</i> <.05 (significant) | 1    |

Among the HRM factors, job security and career development are the common factors which impact the three scale of commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. Job security, salary & benefits, career development, justice & equity, promotion and posting & transfer are the significant influencing factors of APC; Job security, salary & benefits, career development and promotion are important predictors of CPC and job security, career development, training, justice & equity are influencing factors of NPC of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre of Bangladesh. These were justified by the every FGD Session.



## Chapter Seven

# Influence of Institutional Factors, Job Stressors and Job Characteristics on Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment

## 7.1 Influence of Institutional Factors

### 7.1.1 Introduction

There are some forces inside and outside of the institute that influence the job satisfaction and commitment of the employees. Apparently, these forces seem less important to the HR manager but it has a great impact on the psychology of the employees. Some of these factors are manageable by the authority and some are not. These factors are grouped under internal and external factors of the institute.

### 7.1.2 Internal Factors

There are factors that affect officer's satisfaction and commitment that are under officer's control. In fact, these factors are also manageable by the organization. These inside factors are called internal factors of the institute. The important internal institutional factors are:

**Collegial relation:** Collegial relation is an important internal factors that influence the total organizational environment. It is the interpersonal relationship among the colleague. A good collegial relationship develops the level of satisfaction and commitment which ultimately leads to better performance of the employee.

**Staff morale:** Staff morale is other important predictors of job satisfaction and professional commitment. Low staff morale has been a problem of the staff of Bangladeshi education institution. Low staff morale is important cause of low satisfaction and low level of commitment.

**Service seeker behavior:** Service seeker behavior has much influence on the employee satisfaction and commitment for a service provider organization. If the service seekers' behavior is good, the level of satisfaction will be increased and commitment level also be good.

**Logistics support:** Infrastructure, teaching instrument, furniture are some example which enhance the educational policy implementation.

### **7.1.3 External Factors**

There are some factors that impact the employee's satisfaction and commitment but beyond employee's control. These factors influence the satisfaction and commitment from outside the institute. These outside factors are called external factors of the satisfaction and commitment.

**Family support:** Family members have great impact on satisfaction and commitment of an employee. Several studies suggest that parental support has an impact on job satisfaction. Harris & Associates (1992) studied on teachers and found that only one-fourth of teachers are satisfied with the level of parental support.

**Community support:** Community of an employee is an important determinant of job satisfaction and professional commitment. If the community honored one's profession, the person feels proud of his profession.

**Social status:** The status of one's profession in a society impact the job satisfaction and professional commitment. Type of job, nature of job, salary & benefits from the job, power etc determine the social status of job in a society. Positive attitude of the society to the profession develop the satisfaction and commitment of the employee.

**Work station expenditure:** The expenditure of one's living station is an important factor of job satisfaction and commitment. If the employee saves after

meeting the expense, s/he will be satisfied. But when the employee faces challenges to match his income with expenditure at his work station, s/he will be frustrated

#### **7.1.4 Respondents' satisfaction regarding Institutional (Internal and External) Factors.**

Job satisfaction and Professional Commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre are also influenced by different internal and external factors of the working institution. . Following the review of relevant literature, four internal items and four external items were identified as important predictors of job satisfaction and professional commitment, namely; staff relation, staff moral, service seekers behavior, logistic support, family support, community support, social status and station expending. Respondents' perceptions regarding the selected internal and external factors are shown in the table below.

**Table 7.1: Level of Satisfaction Regarding Institutional (Internal and External) Factors**

| <b>Institutional Factors</b> | <b>N</b> | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Std. Deviation</b> | <b>Comment</b> |
|------------------------------|----------|-------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| <b>Internal Factors</b>      |          |             |                       |                |
| Staff Relation               | 374      | 3.75        | .73                   | Satisfied      |
| Staff Morale                 | 374      | 2.85        | 1.03                  | Neutral        |
| Service Seeker Behavior      | 374      | 3.67        | .53                   | Satisfied      |
| Logistic Support             | 374      | 3.25        | .63                   | Neutral        |
| <b>External Factors</b>      |          |             |                       |                |
| Family Support               | 374      | 3.70        | .86                   | Satisfied      |
| Community Support            | 374      | 2.80        | .66                   | Neutral        |
| Social Status                | 374      | 2.84        | .53                   | Neutral        |
| Station Expenditure.         | 374      | 2.29        | .75                   | Dissatisfied   |

**Source: Primary Data**

\*Mean categories: Extremely Dissatisfied= 1.00-1.80; Dissatisfied =1.81-2.60; Neutral= 2.61-3.40; Satisfied= 3.41- 4.20; Extremely Satisfied=4.21- 5.00

**Internal Factors:** Result from the table indicates that, respondents are satisfied with the staff relation (M=3.75) and service seeker behavior (M=3.67). On the other hand, they are neutral regarding staff morale (M=2.85).

**External Factors:** Table also shows that the respondents are satisfied with the family support (M=3.70), but the levels of satisfaction regarding community support, social status and station expending are not up to the mark.

### **7.1.5 Identify the influencing Institutional Factors of job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.**

The purpose of this section is to explore the relationships and carry out test of hypothesis among the various internal and external factors in relation to job satisfaction and professional commitment. The data analysis aims to examine the extent to which factors influenced job satisfaction and professional commitment (objective no. 2).

Multiple regression analysis has been carried out to determine the degree to which the internal and external factors predicted the job satisfaction and professional commitment. The estimation process was based on Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) [i.e.,  $Y = a + bx$ ]. For this purpose, the regression model for the study is as follows-

$$JS(PC) = \alpha + \beta_1X_1 + \beta_2X_2 + \beta_3X_3 + \beta_4X_4 + \beta_5X_5 + \beta_6X_6 + \beta_7X_7 + \beta_8X_8 + \epsilon$$

Where,

JS = Job Satisfaction

PC= Professional Commitment

X1= Staff Relation (SR)

X2= Staff Moral (SM)

X3= Service Seeker Behavior (SSB)

X4= Logistic Support (LS)

X5= Family Support (FS)

X6= Community Support (CS)

X7= Social Status (SS)

X8= Station Expenditure (SE)

$\epsilon$ = Error Term

And  $\alpha$  is a constant and  $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4, \beta_5, \beta_6, \beta_7, \beta_8$ , are coefficient to estimate.

To test the extent of influence of institutional factors, correlation ( $r$ ),  $R^2$ , adjusted  $R^2$ , ANOVA and coefficient of determination were used in this section of the study.

Prior to conduct multiple regression analysis, Pearson correlation analysis was performed to find out the pair wise relationship between the variables. It was also important to ensure that the factors were not too highly correlated. Hence, the results are summarized in Appendix E.

Results show that, all HRM factors are independently positively correlated with overall job satisfaction, with extrinsic job satisfaction, and with intrinsic job satisfaction and also highly significant. The factors are also independently positively correlated with the three scale of professional commitment (APC, CPC, and NPC). The correlation results indicate that, HRM factors have a significant association with job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

#### **7.1.5.1 The extent to which Institutional factors influenced job satisfaction and professional commitment**

To examine the extent to which institutional factors influenced job satisfaction and professional commitment, multiple regression analysis was performed and the results ( $R^2$ , adjusted  $R^2$ , ANOVA and coefficient of determination) were presented in the tables.

### 7.1.5.1.1 Influence of Institutional factors on Job Satisfaction

#### 1. Influence of Institutional factors and Predictors of Overall Job Satisfaction of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

**Table 7.2: Multiple Regression Predicting Overall Job Satisfaction**

| Institutional Factors           | Overall Job Satisfaction |      |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|------|
| <b>Regression model summery</b> |                          |      |
| R <sup>2</sup>                  | .198                     |      |
| Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>         | .180                     |      |
| F (ANOVA)                       | 11.218                   |      |
| Df                              | (8, 365)                 |      |
| Sig                             | .000                     |      |
| <b>Coefficients</b>             |                          |      |
|                                 | (β)                      | Sig  |
| Staff Relation                  | .101                     | .054 |
| Staff Moral                     | .121                     | .023 |
| Service Seeker Behavior         | .007                     | .902 |
| Logistic Support                | .076                     | .146 |
| Family Support                  | .198                     | .000 |
| Community Support               | .235                     | .000 |
| Social Status                   | -.024                    | .628 |
| Station Expenditure.            | .003                     | .950 |

The regression results in the table indicate that the institutional factors of the study accounted for 19.8% (R<sup>2</sup>=.198) of the variance in Overall Job Satisfaction of the respondents. The remaining 80.2% is not explained which means that the rest 80.2% percent of the variation of OJS is related to other variables which are not depicted in the model. ANOVA results show that there is a significant influence of institutional factors on the OJS of the respondents (F=11.218, df= 8, 365; P=.000<.05).

In coefficient results indicate that Staff Relation (β=.101, P=.054<.10), Staff Moral (β=.121, P=.023<.05), Family Support (β=.198, P=.000<.05), and Community

Support ( $\beta=.235$ ,  $P=.000<.05$ ) have statistically significant influence on OJS of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. On the other hand, Service Seekers Behavior ( $\beta=.007$ ,  $P=.902>.05$ ), Logistic Support ( $\beta=.076$ ,  $P=.146>.05$ ), Social Status ( $\beta=-.024$ ,  $P=.628>.05$ ) and Station expenditure ( $\beta=.003$ ,  $P=.950>.05$ ) have not statistically significant influence on OJS of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

## 2. Influence of Institutional factors and Predictors of Extrinsic Job Satisfaction (EJS) of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

**Table 7.3: Multiple Regression Predicting Extrinsic Job Satisfaction**

| Institutional Factors           | Extrinsic Job Satisfaction |      |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------|------|
| <b>Regression model summery</b> |                            |      |
| R <sup>2</sup>                  | .333                       |      |
| Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>         | .319                       |      |
| F (ANOVA)                       | 22.257                     |      |
| Df                              | (8, 365)                   |      |
| Sig                             | .000                       |      |
| <b>Coefficients</b>             |                            |      |
|                                 | ( $\beta$ )                | Sig  |
| Staff Relation                  | .173                       | .000 |
| Staff Moral                     | .242                       | .000 |
| Service Seeker Behavior         | -.050                      | .321 |
| Logistic Support                | .256                       | .000 |
| Family Support                  | .128                       | .006 |
| Community Support               | .189                       | .000 |
| Social Status                   | -.004                      | .933 |
| Station Expenditure.            | .018                       | .679 |

The regression results in the table indicate that the institutional factors of the study accounted for 33.3% ( $R^2=.333$ ) of the variance in EJS of the respondents. The remaining 66.7% is not explained which means that the rest 66.7% percent of the variation of EJS is related to other variables which are not depicted in the model.

ANOVA results show that there is a significant influence of institutional factors on the EJS of the respondents ( $F=22.257$ ,  $df= 8, 365$ ;  $P=.000<.05$ ).

In coefficient results indicate that Staff Relation ( $\beta=.173$ ,  $P=.000<.05$ ), Staff Moral ( $\beta=.242$ ,  $P=.000<.05$ ), Logistic Support ( $\beta=.256$ ,  $P=.000<.05$ ), Family Support ( $\beta=.128$ ,  $P=.006<.05$ ), and Community Support ( $\beta=.189$ ,  $P=.000<.05$ ) have statistically significant influence on EJS of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

On the other hand, Service Seekers Behavior ( $\beta= -.050$ ,  $P=.321>.05$ ), Social Status ( $\beta= -.004$ ,  $P=.933>.05$ ) and Station expenditure ( $\beta= .018$ ,  $P=.679>.05$ ) have not statistically significant influence on OJS of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

### 3. Influence of Institutional factors and Predictors of Intrinsic Job Satisfaction (IJS) of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

**Table 7.4: Multiple Regression Predicting Intrinsic Job Satisfaction**

| Institutional Factors           | Intrinsic Job Satisfaction |      |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------|------|
| <b>Regression model summery</b> |                            |      |
| R <sup>2</sup>                  | .235                       |      |
| Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>         | .218                       |      |
| F (ANOVA)                       | 13.996                     |      |
| Df                              | (8, 365)                   |      |
| Sig                             | .000                       |      |
| <b>Coefficients</b>             |                            |      |
|                                 | ( $\beta$ )                | Sig  |
| Staff Relation                  | .221                       | .000 |
| Staff Moral                     | .162                       | .002 |
| Service Seeker Behavior         | -.067                      | .213 |
| Logistic Support                | .205                       | .000 |
| Family Support                  | .131                       | .009 |
| Community Support               | .133                       | .006 |
| Social Status                   | -.058                      | .230 |
| Station Expenditure.            | .006                       | .899 |



The regression results in the table indicate that the institutional factors of the study accounted for 23.5% ( $R^2=.235$ ) of the variance in IJS of the respondents. The remaining 76.5% is not explained which means that the rest 76.5% percent of the variation of IJS is related to other variables which are not depicted in the model. ANOVA results show that there is a significant influence of institutional factors on the IJS of the respondents ( $F=13.996$ ,  $df= 8, 365$ ;  $P=.000<.05$ ).

In coefficient results indicate that Staff Relation ( $\beta=.221$ ,  $P=.000<.05$ ), Staff Moral ( $\beta=.162$ ,  $P=.002<.05$ ), Logistic Support ( $\beta=.205$ ,  $P=.000<.05$ ), Family Support ( $\beta=.131$ ,  $P=.009<.05$ ), and Community Support ( $\beta=.133$ ,  $P=.006<.05$ ) have statistically significant influence on IJS of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

On the other hand, Service Seekers Behavior ( $\beta= -.067$ ,  $P=.213>.05$ ), Social Status ( $\beta= -.058$ ,  $P=.230>.05$ ) and Station expenditure ( $\beta= .006$ ,  $P=.899>.05$ ) have not statistically significant influence on OJS of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

### 7.1.5.1.2 Influence of Institutional factors on Professional Commitment

#### 1. Influence of Institutional factors and Predictors of Affective Professional Commitment (APC) of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

**Table 7.5: Multiple Regression Predicting Affective Professional Commitment**

| Institutional Factors           | APC      |      |
|---------------------------------|----------|------|
| <b>Regression model summary</b> |          |      |
| R <sup>2</sup>                  | .405     |      |
| Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>         | .392     |      |
| F (ANOVA)                       | 30.929   |      |
| Df                              | (8, 365) |      |
| Sig                             | .000     |      |
| <b>Coefficients</b>             |          |      |
|                                 | (β)      | Sig  |
| Staff Relation                  | .119     | .009 |
| Staff Moral                     | -.036    | .428 |
| Service Seeker Behavior         | .189     | .000 |
| Logistic Support                | .050     | .273 |
| Family Support                  | .369     | .000 |
| Community Support               | .257     | .000 |
| Social Status                   | -.012    | .770 |
| Station Expenditure.            | .063     | .133 |

The regression results in the table indicate that the institutional factors of the study accounted for 40.5% ( $R^2=.405$ ) of the variance in APC of the respondents. The remaining 59.5% is not explained which means that the rest 59.5% percent of the variation of APC is related to other variables which are not depicted in the model. ANOVA results show that there is a significant influence of institutional factors on the APC of the respondents ( $F=30.929$ ,  $df= 8, 365$ ;  $P=.000<.05$ ).

In coefficient results indicate that Staff Relation ( $\beta=.119$ ,  $P=.009<.05$ ), Service Seekers Behavior ( $\beta= .189$ ,  $P=.000<.05$ ), Family Support ( $\beta=.369$ ,

$P=.000<.05$ ), and Community Support ( $\beta=.257$ ,  $P=.000<.05$ ) have statistically significant influence on APC of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

On the other hand, Staff Moral ( $\beta=-.036$ ,  $P=.428>.05$ ), Logistic Support ( $\beta=.050$ ,  $P=.273>.05$ ), Social Status ( $\beta=-.012$ ,  $P=.770>.05$ ) and Station expenditure ( $\beta=.063$ ,  $P=.133>.05$ ) have not statistically significant influence on APC of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

## 2. Influence of Institutional factors and Predictors of Continuance Professional Commitment (CPC) of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

**Table 7.6: Multiple Regression Predicting Continuance Professional Commitment**

| Institutional Factors           | CPC         |      |
|---------------------------------|-------------|------|
| <b>Regression model summery</b> |             |      |
| R <sup>2</sup>                  | .121        |      |
| Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>         | .101        |      |
| F (ANOVA)                       | 6.236       |      |
| Df                              | (8, 365)    |      |
| Sig                             | .000        |      |
| <b>Coefficients</b>             |             |      |
|                                 | ( $\beta$ ) | Sig  |
| Staff Relation                  | -.079       | .153 |
| Staff Moral                     | -.031       | .570 |
| Service Seeker Behavior         | -.008       | .888 |
| Logistic Support                | .168        | .002 |
| Family Support                  | .275        | .000 |
| Community Support               | .016        | .761 |
| Social Status                   | -.052       | .310 |
| Station Expenditure.            | .092        | .071 |

The regression results in the table indicate that the institutional factors of the study accounted for 12.1% ( $R^2=.121$ ) of the variance in CPC of the respondents. The remaining 87.9% is not explained which means that the rest 87.9% percent of the variation of CPC is related to other variables which are not depicted in the model.

ANOVA results show that there is a significant influence of institutional factors on the CPC of the respondents ( $F=6.236$ ,  $df= 8, 365$ ;  $P=.000<.05$ ).

In coefficient results indicate that Logistic Support ( $\beta=.168$ ,  $P=.002<.05$ ), Family Support ( $\beta=.275$ ,  $P=.000<.05$ ), and Station expenditure ( $\beta= .092$ ,  $P=.071<.10$ ) have statistically significant influence on CPC of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

On the other hand, Staff Relation ( $\beta=-.079$ ,  $P=.153>.05$ ), Staff Moral ( $\beta=-.031$ ,  $P=.570>.05$ ), Service Seekers Behavior ( $\beta= -.008$ ,  $P=.888>.05$ ), Community Support ( $\beta=.016$ ,  $P=.761>.05$ ) Social Status ( $\beta= -.052$ ,  $P=.310>.05$ ) and have not statistically significant influence on OJS of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

### 3. Influence of Institutional factors and Predictors of Normative Professional Commitment (NPC) of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

**Table 7.7: Multiple Regression Predicting Normative Professional Commitment**

| Institutional Factors           | NPC         |      |
|---------------------------------|-------------|------|
| <b>Regression model summery</b> |             |      |
| R <sup>2</sup>                  | .232        |      |
| Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>         | .215        |      |
| F (ANOVA)                       | 13.737      |      |
| Df                              | (8, 365)    |      |
| Sig                             | .000        |      |
| <b>Coefficients</b>             |             |      |
|                                 | ( $\beta$ ) | Sig  |
| Staff Relation                  | -.073       | .158 |
| Staff Moral                     | .117        | .024 |
| Service Seeker Behavior         | .109        | .043 |
| Logistic Support                | -.021       | .685 |
| Family Support                  | .363        | .000 |
| Community Support               | .083        | .089 |
| Social Status                   | -.140       | .004 |
| Station Expenditure.            | .089        | .061 |

The regression results in the table indicate that the institutional factors of the study accounted for 23.2% ( $R^2=.232$ ) of the variance in NPC of the respondents. The remaining 76.8% is not explained which means that the rest 76.8% percent of the variation of NPC is related to other variables which are not depicted in the model. ANOVA results show that there is a significant influence of institutional factors on the NPC of the respondents ( $F=13.737$ ,  $df= 8, 365$ ;  $P=.000<.05$ ).

In coefficient results indicate that Staff Moral ( $\beta=.117$ ,  $P=.024<.05$ ), Service Seekers Behavior ( $\beta= .109$ ,  $P=.043<.05$ ), Family Support ( $\beta=.363$ ,  $P=.000<.05$ ), Community Support ( $\beta=.083$ ,  $P=.089<.10$ ), Social Status ( $\beta= -.140$ ,  $P=.004<.05$ ) and Station expenditure ( $\beta= .089$ ,  $P=.061<.10$ ) have statistically significant influence on NPC of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

On the other hand, Staff Relation ( $\beta=-.073$ ,  $P=.158>.05$ ), and Logistic Support ( $\beta=-.21$ ,  $P=.685>.05$ ) have not statistically significant influence on NPC of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

### **7.1.6 Test of Hypothesis**

To find out the relationship between institutional factors and job satisfaction and professional commitment a hypothesis (H3) was developed as Institutional factors (Internal & External) will have significant impact on job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

The results of the multiple regression analysis showed that, F value for the ANOVA of overall job satisfaction was  $F=11.218$ ;  $df=8,365$ ;  $p=.000<.5$  (Table-7.2), of extrinsic job satisfaction was  $F=22.257$ ;  $df=8,365$ ;  $p=.000<.5$  (Table-7.3), of intrinsic job satisfaction was  $F=13.996$ ;  $df=8,365$ ;  $p=.000<.5$  (Table-7.4), of APC was  $F=30.929$ ;  $df=8,365$ ;  $p=.000<.5$  (Table-7.5), of CPC was  $F=6.236$ ;  $df=8,365$ ;  $p=.000<.5$  (Table-7.6), and of NPC was  $F=13.737$ ;  $df=8,365$ ;  $p=.000<.5$  (Table-7.7).

These results indicate that the hypothesis H3 is accepted and the institutional factors have significant influence on job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

## **7.2 Influence of Job Stressors and Job Characteristic on Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment**

### **7.2.1 Introduction**

Work environments are composed of physical structure, social and psychological factors. These work environments impact the employee's satisfaction and commitment. Social and psychological environment consists of job stressors and job characteristics factors which influence the job satisfaction and commitment. Different studies have been carried out relating job satisfaction and commitment to job stressors and job characteristics.

### **7.2.2 Job Stressors**

Job stressors include job overload, job conflict and job ambiguity. Studies have found that these job stressors are negatively affect job satisfaction and professional commitment. (Lambert, 2003).

**Job overload:** Job overload refers to the demands exceeds the ability of the employee to perform the task relating to the job. In this case, the employee finds it difficult to complete an assigned task within an allotted period of time.

**Job conflict:** It is the incompatibility among job expectation and demand. Al-Omari *et al.* (2008) found that role conflict had a negative indirect effect on academics intent to stay through job satisfaction and organisational commitment.

**Job ambiguity:** It refers the absence of clear information about the expectation of the job.

Various studies have found that job stressors to be negative predictors of job satisfaction and professional commitment; and positive predictors of turnover intention.

### **7.2.3 Perception of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre regarding Job Stressor**

From the review of literature it is clear that, job stressors have important impact on job satisfaction and professional commitment. There are three important job stressor (Job Overload, Job Conflict and Job Ambiguity) has identified that are influence job satisfaction and professional commitment. Different studies show that job stressor has inverse relationship with job satisfaction and professional commitment. Perceptions to the job stressor among the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre are given the table below.

**Table 7.8: Level of Perception to the Job Stressor**

| <b>Job Stressor</b> | <b>N</b> | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Std. Deviation</b> |
|---------------------|----------|-------------|-----------------------|
| Job Overload        | 374      | 2.05        | .63                   |
| Job Conflict        | 374      | 2.97        | .56                   |
| Job Ambiguity       | 374      | 3.39        | .51                   |

Source: Primary Data

As the job stressors are negatively related to job satisfaction, the mean score of the table implies, there were moderate levels of job stressor exist in the job of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. The job load of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre is not high (M=2.05) and the job conflict also moderate level. On the other hand, the level of job ambiguity is higher than others (M=3.39) which means there is a lack of clear and adequate policies and guidelines about the duties of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

#### 7.2.4 Job Characteristics

The jobs are characteristics by different factors such as task variety, autonomy, feedback, coworker support among the employee. Studies have found that employees possess high level of job satisfaction and professional commitment when they perform challenging and complex job. Jobs are characterized by job autonomy, task variety, feedback, co-worker support and administer support which are explained below:

**Job autonomy:** Job autonomy is an important character in academic profession. Al-Omari *et al.*, (2008) found that autonomy had a positive direct effect on academics intent to stay through job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

**Feedback:** Feedback is another job related factor that influence employee job satisfaction and professional commitment.

**Task variety:** Task variety removes the monotony of the employee. If the employee has the opportunity to conduct multifarious activities, they perfume better. Studies have found that task variety is positively related to job satisfaction and professional commitment.

**Coworker and Boss support:** Supervisory and coworker support have been found to be a important predictor of job satisfaction and professional commitment. Joiner and Bakalis (2006), in a survey study of 72 Australian casual academics, found that job-related characteristics played an important role in their affective commitment. The study found that strong co-worker and supervisor supports both positively contributed to affective commitment.

. All these factors have significant impact on job satisfaction and commitment. Mottaz (1987, 1988) found that unlike demographic characteristics, job characteristics such as job autonomy, task variety and job significance had strong, positive influence



on organisational commitment and work satisfaction. Supervisory and co-worker support have been found to be significant predictors of job satisfaction and organisational commitment Lambert,2003;

### **7.2.5 Perception of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre regarding Job Characteristic**

From the review of literature, there were five important job characteristics (Job Autonomy, Feedback, Task Variety, Co-worker support and Boss Support) has identified that are influence job satisfaction and professional commitment. Different studies show that job characteristics have positive relationship with job satisfaction and professional commitment. Perceptions to the job characteristics among the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre are given the table below.

**Table 7.9: Level of Perception to the Job Characteristics**

| <b>Job Characteristic</b> | <b>N</b> | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Std. Deviation</b> | <b>Comment</b> |
|---------------------------|----------|-------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Job Autonomy              | 374      | 3.35        | .77                   | Neutral        |
| Feedback                  | 374      | 3.14        | .80                   | Neutral        |
| Task Variety              | 374      | 2.89        | .85                   | Neutral        |
| Co-worker Support         | 374      | 3.56        | .75                   | Satisfied      |
| Boss Support              | 374      | 3.43        | .71                   | Satisfied      |

Source: Primary Data

\*Mean categories: Extremely Dissatisfied= 1.00-1.80; Dissatisfied =1.81-2.60; Neutral= 2.61-3.40; Satisfied= 3.41- 4.20; Extremely Satisfied=4.21- 5.00.

Result from the table indicates that, the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre are satisfied with co-worker support (M=3.56) and Boss support (M=3.43). But they are indifference regarding job autonomy and feedback. It also implies that there is a lack of task variety in the job of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

### **7.2.6 Identify the influencing Job Stressors and Job Characteristics of job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.**

The purpose of this section is to explore the relationships and carry out test of hypothesis among the various job stressors and job characteristics in relation to job satisfaction and professional commitment. The data analysis aims to examine the extent to which factors influenced job satisfaction and professional commitment (objective no. 4).

Multiple regression analysis has been carried out to determine the degree to which job stressors and job characteristics predicted the job satisfaction and professional commitment. The estimation process was based on Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) [i.e.,  $Y = a + bx$ ]. For this purpose, the regression model for the study is as follows-

$$JS(PC) = \alpha + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \beta_5 X_5 + \beta_6 X_6 + \beta_7 X_7 + \beta_8 X_8 + \epsilon$$

Where,

JS = Job Satisfaction

PC = Professional Commitment

X1 = Job Overload (JO)

X2 = Job Conflict (JC)

X3 = Job Ambiguity (JAm)

X4 = Job Autonomy (JAu)

X5 = Feedback (FB)

X6 = Task Variety (TV)

X7 = Co-worker Support (CS)

X8 = Boss Support (BS)

$\epsilon$  = Error Term

And  $\alpha$  is a constant and  $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4, \beta_5, \beta_6, \beta_7, \beta_8$ , are coefficient to estimate.

To test the extent of influence of job stressor and job characteristics, correlation (r), R<sup>2</sup>, adjusted R<sup>2</sup>, ANOVA and coefficient of determination were used in this section of the study.

Prior to conduct multiple regression analysis, Pearson correlation analysis was performed to find out the pair wise relationship between the variables. It was also important to ensure that the factors were not too highly correlated. Hence, the correlation results are summarized in Appendix E.

### **7.2.6.1 The extent to which Job Stressors and Job Characteristics influenced job satisfaction and professional commitment**

To examine the extent to which job stressor and job characteristics influenced job satisfaction and professional commitment, multiple regression analysis was performed and the results (R<sup>2</sup>, adjusted R<sup>2</sup>, ANOVA and coefficient of determination) were presented in the tables.

#### **7.2.6.1.1 Influence of Job stressor and Job characteristics on Job Satisfaction**

##### **1. Influence of job stressor and job characteristics and Predictors of Overall Job Satisfaction of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.**

**Table 7.10: Multiple Regression Predicting Overall Job Satisfaction**

| <b>Job stressor and Job characteristics</b> | <b>Overall Job Satisfaction</b> |      |
|---|---------------------------------|------|
| <b>Regression model summery</b>             |                                 |      |
| R <sup>2</sup>                              | .093                            |      |
| Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>                     | .073                            |      |
| F (ANOVA)                                   | 4.696                           |      |
| Df  | (8, 365)                        |      |
| Sig   | .000                            |      |
| <b>Coefficients</b>                         |                                 |      |
|   | (β)                             | Sig  |
| Job Overload                                | -.015                           | .774 |
| Job Conflict                                | -.080                           | .133 |
| Job Ambiguity                               | .040                            | .479 |
| Job Autonomy                                | .002                            | .979 |
| Feedback                                    | -.040                           | .609 |
| Task Variety                                | .084                            | .145 |
| Co-worker Support                           | .013                            | .836 |
| Boss Support                                | .233                            | .002 |

The regression results in the table indicate that the job stressor and job characteristics of the study accounted for 09.3% ( $R^2=.093$ ) of the variance in Overall Job Satisfaction of the respondents. The remaining 90.7% is not explained which means that the rest 90.7% percent of the variation of OJS is related to other variables which are not depicted in the model. ANOVA results show that there is a significant influence of job stressor and job characteristics on the OJS of the respondents ( $F=4.696$ ,  $df= 8, 365$ ;  $P=.000<.05$ ).

In coefficient results indicate that boss support ( $\beta=.233$ ,  $P=.002<.05$ ) has statistically significant influence on OJS of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

On the other hand, job overload ( $\beta= -.015$ ,  $P=.774>.05$ ), job conflict ( $\beta= -.080$ ,  $P=.133>.05$ ), job ambiguity ( $\beta=.040$ ,  $P=.479>.05$ ), job autonomy ( $\beta=.002$ ,  $P=.979>.05$ ), Feedback ( $\beta=-.040$ ,  $P=.609>.05$ ), Task Variety ( $\beta=.084$ ,  $P=.145>.05$ ), and Co-worker Support ( $\beta= .013$ ,  $P=.836>.05$ ) have not statistically significant influence on OJS of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

**2. Influence of job stressor and job characteristics and Predictors of Extrinsic Job Satisfaction of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.**

**Table 7.11: Multiple Regression Predicting Extrinsic Job Satisfaction**

| Job stressor and Job characteristics | Extrinsic Job Satisfaction |      |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|------|
| <b>Regression model summary</b>      |                            |      |
| R <sup>2</sup>                       | .335                       |      |
| Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>              | .320                       |      |
| F (ANOVA)                            | 22.959                     |      |
| Df                                   | (8, 365)                   |      |
| Sig                                  | .000                       |      |
| <b>Coefficients</b>                  |                            |      |
|                                      | (β)                        | Sig  |
| Job Overload                         | .000                       | .996 |
| Job Conflict                         | -.084                      | .067 |
| Job Ambiguity                        | .107                       | .029 |
| Job Autonomy                         | .153                       | .008 |
| Feedback                             | .077                       | .245 |
| Task Variety                         | -.025                      | .612 |
| Co-worker Support                    | .053                       | .311 |
| Boss Support                         | .321                       | .000 |

The regression results in the table indicate that the job stressor and job characteristics of the study accounted for 33.5% ( $R^2=.335$ ) of the variance in Overall Job Satisfaction of the respondents. The remaining 66.5% is not explained which means that the rest 66.5% percent of the variation of EJS is related to other variables which are not depicted in the model. ANOVA results show that there is a significant influence of job stressor and job characteristics on the EJS of the respondents ( $F=22.959$ ,  $df= 8, 365$ ;  $P=.000<.05$ ).

In coefficient results indicate that job conflict ( $\beta= -.084$ ,  $P=.067<.10$ ), job ambiguity ( $\beta=.107$ ,  $P=.029<.05$ ), job autonomy ( $\beta=.153$ ,  $P=.008<.05$ ), and boss

support ( $\beta=.321$ ,  $P=.000<.05$ ) have statistically significant influence on EJS of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

On the other hand, job overload ( $\beta= .000$ ,  $P=.996>.05$ ), Feedback ( $\beta=.077$ ,  $P=.245>.05$ ), Task Variety ( $\beta=-.025$ ,  $P=.612>.05$ ), and Co-worker Support ( $\beta= .053$ ,  $P=.311>.05$ ) have not statistically significant influence on EJS of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

### 3. Influence of job stressor and job characteristics and Predictors of Intrinsic Job Satisfaction of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

**Table 7.12: Multiple Regression Predicting Intrinsic Job Satisfaction**

| Job stressor and Job characteristics | Intrinsic Job Satisfaction |      |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|------|
| <b>Regression model summary</b>      |                            |      |
| R <sup>2</sup>                       | .385                       |      |
| Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>              | .371                       |      |
| F (ANOVA)                            | 28.545                     |      |
| Df                                   | (8, 365)                   |      |
| Sig                                  | .000                       |      |
| <b>Coefficients</b>                  |                            |      |
|                                      | ( $\beta$ )                | Sig  |
| Job Overload                         | .063                       | .143 |
| Job Conflict                         | .030                       | .497 |
| Job Ambiguity                        | .127                       | .007 |
| Job Autonomy                         | .268                       | .000 |
| Feedback                             | .150                       | .019 |
| Task Variety                         | -.008                      | .872 |
| Co-worker Support                    | -.013                      | .790 |
| Boss Support                         | .270                       | .000 |

The regression results in the table indicate that the job stressor and job characteristics of the study accounted for 38.5% ( $R^2=.385$ ) of the variance in Intrinsic Job Satisfaction of the respondents. The remaining 61.5% is not explained which

means that the rest 61.5% percent of the variation of IJS is related to other variables which are not depicted in the model. ANOVA results show that there is a significant influence of job stressor and job characteristics on the IJS of the respondents ( $F=28.545$ ,  $df= 8, 365$ ;  $P=.000<.05$ ).

In coefficient results indicate that job ambiguity ( $\beta=.127$ ,  $P=.007<.05$ ), job autonomy ( $\beta=.268$ ,  $P=.000<.05$ ), Feedback ( $\beta=.150$ ,  $P=.019<.05$ ), and boss support ( $\beta=.270$ ,  $P=.000<.05$ ) have statistically significant influence on IJS of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

On the other hand, job overload ( $\beta= .063$ ,  $P=.143>.05$ ), job conflict ( $\beta= .030$ ,  $P=.497>.05$ ), Task Variety ( $\beta=-.008$ ,  $P=.872>.05$ ), and Co-worker Support ( $\beta= -.013$ ,  $P=.790>.05$ ) have not statistically significant influence on EJS of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

### 7.2.6.1.2 Influence of Job stressor and Job characteristics on Professional Commitment

#### 1. Influence of job stressor and job characteristics and Predictors of Affective Professional Commitment (APC) of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

**Table 7.13: Multiple Regression Predicting Affective Professional Commitment**

| Job stressor and Job characteristics | APC      |      |
|--------------------------------------|----------|------|
| <b>Regression model summary</b>      |          |      |
| R <sup>2</sup>                       | .227     |      |
| Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>              | .211     |      |
| F (ANOVA)                            | 13.436   |      |
| Df                                   | (8, 365) |      |
| Sig                                  | .000     |      |
| <b>Coefficients</b>                  |          |      |
|                                      | (β)      | Sig  |
| Job Overload                         | .115     | .018 |
| Job Conflict                         | .045     | .358 |
| Job Ambiguity                        | .182     | .001 |
| Job Autonomy                         | .134     | .031 |
| Feedback                             | -.017    | .809 |
| Task Variety                         | .123     | .022 |
| Co-worker Support                    | .049     | .377 |
| Boss Support                         | .212     | .003 |

The regression results in the table indicate that the job stressor and job characteristics of the study accounted for 22.7% ( $R^2=.227$ ) of the variance in APC of the respondents. The remaining 77.3% is not explained which means that the rest 77.3% percent of the variation of APC is related to other variables which are not depicted in the model. ANOVA results show that there is a significant influence of job stressor and job characteristics on the APC of the respondents ( $F=13.436$ ,  $df= 8$ ,  $365$ ;  $P=.000<.05$ ).



In coefficient results indicate that job overload ( $\beta = .115$ ,  $P = .018 < .05$ ), job ambiguity ( $\beta = .182$ ,  $P = .001 < .05$ ), job autonomy ( $\beta = .134$ ,  $P = .031 < .05$ ), Task Variety ( $\beta = .123$ ,  $P = .022 < .05$ ), and boss support ( $\beta = .212$ ,  $P = .003 < .05$ ) have statistically significant influence on APC of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

On the other hand, job conflict ( $\beta = .045$ ,  $P = .358 > .05$ ), Feedback ( $\beta = -.017$ ,  $P = .809 > .05$ ), and Co-worker Support ( $\beta = .049$ ,  $P = .377 > .05$ ) have not statistically significant influence on APC of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

## 2. Influence of job stressor and job characteristics and Predictors of Continuance Professional Commitment (CPC) of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

**Table 7.14: Multiple Regression Predicting Continuance Professional Commitment**

| Job stressor and Job characteristics | CPC         |      |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|------|
| <b>Regression model summary</b>      |             |      |
| R <sup>2</sup>                       | .100        |      |
| Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>              | .081        |      |
| F (ANOVA)                            | 5.089       |      |
| Df                                   | (8, 365)    |      |
| Sig                                  | .000        |      |
| <b>Coefficients</b>                  |             |      |
|                                      | ( $\beta$ ) | Sig  |
| Job Overload                         | .129        | .014 |
| Job Conflict                         | -.162       | .002 |
| Job Ambiguity                        | -.004       | .948 |
| Job Autonomy                         | .250        | .000 |
| Feedback                             | -.086       | .263 |
| Task Variety                         | -.060       | .300 |
| Co-worker Support                    | -.048       | .432 |
| Boss Support                         | .148        | .052 |

The regression results in the table indicate that the job stressor and job characteristics of the study accounted for 10.0% ( $R^2=.100$ ) of the variance in CPC of the respondents. The remaining 90.0% is not explained which means that the rest 90.0% percent of the variation of CPC is related to other variables which are not depicted in the model. ANOVA results show that there is a significant influence of job stressor and job characteristics on the CPC of the respondents ( $F=5.089$ ,  $df= 8$ ,  $365$ ;  $P=.000<.05$ ).

In coefficient results indicate that job overload ( $\beta= .129$ ,  $P=.014<.05$ ), job conflict ( $\beta= -.162$ ,  $P=.002<.05$ ), job autonomy ( $\beta=.250$ ,  $P=.000<.05$ ), and boss support ( $\beta=.148$ ,  $P=.052<.10$ ) have statistically significant influence on CPC of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

On the other hand, job ambiguity ( $\beta=-.004$ ,  $P=.948>.05$ ), Feedback ( $\beta=-.086$ ,  $P=.263>.05$ ), Task Variety ( $\beta=-.060$ ,  $P=.300>.05$ ) and Co-worker Support ( $\beta= -.048$ ,  $P=.432>.05$ ) have not statistically significant influence on CPC of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

**3. Influence of job stressor and job characteristics and Predictors of Normative Professional Commitment (NPC) of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.**

**Table 7.15: Multiple Regression Predicting Continuance Professional Commitment**

| <b>Job stressor and Job characteristics</b> | <b>NPC</b> |      |
|---|------------|------|
| <b>Regression model summery</b>             |            |      |
| R <sup>2</sup>                              | .206       |      |
| Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>                     | .188       |      |
| F (ANOVA)                                   | 11.825     |      |
| Df  | (8, 365)   |      |
| Sig   | .000       |      |
| <b>Coefficients</b>                         |            |      |
|   | (β)        | Sig  |
| Job Overload                                | .173       | .000 |
| Job Conflict                                | -.115      | .022 |
| Job Ambiguity                               | -.115      | .031 |
| Job Autonomy                                | .005       | .940 |
| Feedback                                    | .073       | .317 |
| Task Variety                                | .038       | .485 |
| Co-worker Support                           | -.036      | .525 |
| Boss Support                                | .402       | .000 |

The regression results in the table indicate that the job stressor and job characteristics of the study accounted for 20.6% ( $R^2=.206$ ) of the variance in NPC of the respondents. The remaining 79.4% is not explained which means that the rest 79.4% percent of the variation of NPC is related to other variables which are not depicted in the model. ANOVA results show that there is a significant influence of job stressor and job characteristics on the NPC of the respondents ( $F=11.825$ ,  $df= 8$ ,  $365$ ;  $P=.000<.05$ ).

In coefficient results indicate that job overload ( $\beta = .173, P = .000 < .05$ ), job conflict ( $\beta = -.115, P = .022 < .05$ ), job ambiguity ( $\beta = -.115, P = .031 < .05$ ), and boss support ( $\beta = .402, P = .000 < .05$ ) have statistically significant influence on NPC of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

On the other hand, job autonomy ( $\beta = .005, P = .940 > .05$ ), Feedback ( $\beta = .073, P = .317 > .05$ ), Task Variety ( $\beta = .038, P = .485 > .05$ ) and Co-worker Support ( $\beta = -.036, P = .525 > .05$ ) have not statistically significant influence on NPC of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

### **7.2.7 Test of Hypothesis**

To find out the relationship between job stressors and characteristics and job satisfaction and professional commitment a hypothesis (H4) was developed as Job stressors and characteristics have significant impact on job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

The results of the multiple regression analysis showed that, F value for the ANOVA of overall job satisfaction was  $F = 4.696; df = 8, 365; p = .000 < .5$  (Table-7.10), of extrinsic job satisfaction was  $F = 22.959; df = 8, 365; p = .000 < .5$  (Table-7.11), of intrinsic job satisfaction was  $F = 28.545; df = 8, 365; p = .000 < .5$  (Table-7.12), of APC was  $F = 13.436; df = 8, 365; p = .000 < .5$  (Table-7.13), of CPC was  $F = 5.089; df = 8, 365; p = .000 < .5$  (Table-7.14), and of NPC was  $F = 11.825; df = 8, 365; p = .000 < .5$  (Table-7.15). These results indicate that the hypothesis H4 is accepted and the job stressors and job characteristics are significant predictors of job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

## 7.3 Major Findings

This chapter aims to analyze the impact of institutional items in one part and the impact of job stressors & characteristics in another part. The summary of findings are as follows:

### 7.3.1 Perception to Institutional Factors

The officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre of Bangladesh are moderately satisfied with their internal institutional factor except staff morale. Regarding external factors, they are only satisfied with family support. On the other hand, their perception to community support, social status and job station expenditure is not satisfactory.

### 7.3.2 Identified Significant Institutional Factors of Job Satisfaction

Results of regression analysis indicate that, individually institutional factors have significant impact on job satisfaction.

**Table 7.16: Significant Institutional Factors of Job Satisfaction**

| Institutional Factors   | Job Satisfaction |                            |      |           |                            |      |           |                            |      |
|-------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|------|-----------|----------------------------|------|-----------|----------------------------|------|
|                         | Overall          |                            |      | Extrinsic |                            |      | Intrinsic |                            |      |
|                         | Sig              | Comment                    | Rank | Sig       | Comment                    | Rank | Sig       | Comment                    | Rank |
| Staff Relation          | .054             | $P < .10$<br>(significant) | 4    | .000      | $P < .05$<br>(significant) | 4    | .000      | $P < .05$<br>(significant) | 1    |
| Staff Moral             | .023             | $P < .05$<br>(significant) | 3    | .000      | $P < .05$<br>(significant) | 2    | .002      | $P < .05$<br>(significant) | 3    |
| Service Seeker Behavior | .902             |                            |      | .321      |                            |      | .213      |                            |      |
| Logistic Support        | .146             |                            |      | .000      | $P < .05$<br>(significant) | 1    | .000      | $P < .05$<br>(significant) | 2    |
| Family Support          | .000             | $P < .05$<br>(significant) | 2    | .006      | $P < .05$<br>(significant) | 5    | .009      | $P < .05$<br>(significant) | 5    |
| Community Support       | .000             | $P < .05$<br>(significant) | 1    | .000      | $P < .05$<br>(significant) | 3    | .006      | $P < .05$<br>(significant) | 4    |
| Social Status           | .628             |                            |      | .933      |                            |      | .230      |                            |      |
| Station Expenditure.    | .950             |                            |      | .679      |                            |      | .899      |                            |      |

Among the factors, only staff relation, staff moral, family support and community support are the common significant factors that influence the three scale of satisfaction (overall, extrinsic, intrinsic) of the BCS general education cadre officer. Logistic support is another important factor for improving extrinsic and intrinsic job satisfaction.

### 7.3.3 Identified Significant Institutional Factors of Professional Commitment

Results of regression analysis indicate that, individually institutional factors have significant impact on professional commitment.

**Table 7.17: Significant Institutional Factors of Professional Commitment**

| Institutional Factors   | Professional Commitment |                             |      |      |                             |      |      |                             |      |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|------|------|-----------------------------|------|------|-----------------------------|------|
|                         | APC                     |                             |      | CPC  |                             |      | NPC  |                             |      |
|                         | Sig                     | Comment                     | Rank | Sig  | Comment                     | Rank | Sig  | Comment                     | Rank |
| Staff Relation          | .009                    | <i>P</i> <.10 (significant) | 4    | .153 |                             |      | .158 |                             |      |
| Staff Moral             | .428                    |                             |      | .570 |                             |      | .024 | <i>P</i> <.05 (significant) | 3    |
| Service Seeker Behavior | .000                    | <i>P</i> <.05 (significant) | 3    | .888 |                             |      | .043 | <i>P</i> <.05 (significant) | 4    |
| Logistic Support        | .273                    |                             |      | .002 | <i>P</i> <.05 (significant) | 2    | .685 |                             |      |
| Family Support          | .000                    | <i>P</i> <.05 (significant) | 1    | .000 | <i>P</i> <.05 (significant) | 1    | .000 | <i>P</i> <.05 (significant) | 1    |
| Community Support       | .000                    | <i>P</i> <.05 (significant) | 2    | .761 |                             |      | .089 | <i>P</i> <.10 (significant) | 6    |
| Social Status           | .770                    |                             |      | .310 |                             |      | .004 | <i>P</i> <.05 (significant) | 2    |
| Station Expenditure.    | .133                    |                             |      | .071 | <i>P</i> <.10 (significant) | 3    | .061 | <i>P</i> <.10 (significant) | 5    |

Individual institutional factors have significant impact on professional commitment. Among the factors, only staff relation, family support and community support are the most important predictors of the respondent's commitment. Staff relation and social status are also influencing factors of professional commitment. Some FGD participant opined that staff relation and staff morality in local and degree pass college is better than metropolitan college (FGD: Bogra and Kushtia.).

### 7.3.4 Impact of Job Stressors and Job Characteristics on Job Satisfaction

Previous studies advocated that, job stressors and job characteristics have significant impact on job satisfaction. The average mean scores of the job stressors items from the present study shows that, moderate level of stressor exists in the job of BCS education cadre.

**Table 7.18: Impact of Job Stressors and Job Characteristics on Job Satisfaction**

| Job Stressors and Job Characteristics | Job Satisfaction |                                |      |           |                                |      |           |                                |      |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|------|-----------|--------------------------------|------|-----------|--------------------------------|------|
|                                       | Overall          |                                |      | Extrinsic |                                |      | Intrinsic |                                |      |
|                                       | Sig              | Comment                        | Rank | Sig       | Comment                        | Rank | Sig       | Comment                        | Rank |
| Job Overload                          | .774             |                                |      | .996      |                                |      | .143      |                                |      |
| Job Conflict                          | .133             |                                |      | .067      | <i>P</i> <.10<br>(significant) | 4    | .497      |                                |      |
| Job Ambiguity                         | .479             |                                |      | .029      | <i>P</i> <.05<br>(significant) | 3    | .007      | <i>P</i> <.05<br>(significant) | 3    |
| Job Autonomy                          | .979             |                                |      | .008      | <i>P</i> <.05<br>(significant) | 2    | .000      | <i>P</i> <.05<br>(significant) | 2    |
| Feedback                              | .609             |                                |      | .245      |                                |      | .019      | <i>P</i> <.05<br>(significant) | 4    |
| Task Variety                          | .145             |                                |      | .612      |                                |      | .872      |                                |      |
| Co-worker Support                     | .836             |                                |      | .311      |                                |      | .790      |                                |      |
| Boss Support                          | .002             | <i>P</i> <.05<br>(significant) |      | .000      | <i>P</i> <.05<br>(significant) | 1    | .000      | <i>P</i> <.05<br>(significant) | 1    |

Among the stressors factors, job conflict has significant impact on extrinsic satisfaction at 10% level ( $p=.067$ ). Job ambiguity is also the important influencing factor of extrinsic ( $p=.029$ ), intrinsic ( $p=.007$ ) job satisfaction. Job autonomy has significant impact on extrinsic job satisfaction ( $p=.008$ ) and on intrinsic job satisfaction ( $p=.000$ ). Feedback is significant for intrinsic job satisfaction ( $p=.019$ ). Finally, support from the boss is most significant factors for job satisfaction of officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre ( $p$  value for overall, extrinsic and intrinsic are .002, .000, .000 respectably).

### 7.3.5 Impact of Job Stressors and Job Characteristics on Professional Commitment

Studies suggested that job stressors and job characteristics are the important predictors of professional commitment.

**Table 7.19: Impact of Job Stressors and Job Characteristics on Professional Commitment**

| Job Stressors and Job Characteristics | Professional Commitment |                             |      |      |                             |      |      |                             |      |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|------|------|-----------------------------|------|------|-----------------------------|------|
|                                       | APC                     |                             |      | CPC  |                             |      | NPC  |                             |      |
|                                       | Sig                     | Comment                     | Rank | Sig  | Comment                     | Rank | Sig  | Comment                     | Rank |
| Job Overload                          | .018                    | <i>P</i> <.05 (significant) | 3    | .014 | <i>P</i> <.05 (significant) | 3    | .000 | <i>P</i> <.05 (significant) | 2    |
| Job Conflict                          | .358                    |                             |      | .002 | <i>P</i> <.10 (significant) | 2    | .022 | <i>P</i> <.05 (significant) | 3    |
| Job Ambiguity                         | .001                    | <i>P</i> <.05 (significant) | 1    | .948 |                             |      | .031 | <i>P</i> <.05 (significant) | 4    |
| Job Autonomy                          | .031                    | <i>P</i> <.05 (significant) | 5    | .000 | <i>P</i> <.05 (significant) | 1    | .940 |                             |      |
| Feedback                              | .809                    |                             |      | .263 |                             |      | .317 |                             |      |
| Task Variety                          | .022                    | <i>P</i> <.05 (significant) | 4    | .300 |                             |      | .485 |                             |      |
| Co-worker Support                     | .377                    |                             |      | .432 |                             |      | .525 |                             |      |
| Boss Support                          | .003                    | <i>P</i> <.05 (significant) | 2    | .052 | <i>P</i> <.10 (significant) | 4    | .000 | <i>P</i> <.05 (significant) | 1    |

Results indicates that, job overload has significant impact on APC ( $p=.018$ ), on CPC ( $p=.014$ ) and NPC ( $p=.000$ ). Job conflict is significant for CPC ( $p=.002$ ) and for NPC ( $p=.022$ ). Job ambiguity has important impact on APC ( $p=.001$ ) and on NPC ( $p=.031$ ). Job autonomy has impact on APC ( $p=.031$ ) and on CPC ( $p=.000$ ). Finally, support from the boss has significant impact on professional commitment ( $p$  value for APC, CPC and NPC are .003, .052 at 10%level, .000 respectably).

### 7.4 Conclusion

This chapter was targeted to analyze the impact of institutional (internal and external) factors, job stressors and job characteristics on the job satisfaction and commitment of the BCS general education cadre officers. Researcher has found that, every independent variable has significant association with job satisfaction and professional commitment.



## **Chapter Eight**

### **Combined Influence of Demographic Factors, HRM Practices, Institutional Factors, Job Stressors and Job Characteristics on Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment**

#### **8.1 Introduction**

Literature suggests that job satisfaction and professional commitment are influenced by different social and psychological variables. These variables are grouped into several names such as demographic factors, HRM practices, organizational factors, job stressor, job characteristic etc. These variables have both individual and combined influence on job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. The previous three chapters had described the level of job satisfaction and professional commitment and also had explored the relationship among variables individually. Those chapters also had found out the individual influence of job satisfaction and professional commitment. This chapter aims to analyze the combined impact of independent variables (Demographic, HRM, Institutional, job stressors and job characteristics) on the dependents variables (job satisfaction and professional commitment). The data analysis aim to address the following objective of the study:

- To examine the combined influence of factors (Demographic, HRM, Institutional, Job stressors and Job characteristics) on the job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.
- To identify the major contributing factors of job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

To examine the combined impact and find out the major influencing factors, hierarchical multiple regression analysis has been conducted in this section of the study.

## **8.2 Impact of Independent Variables on Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment of the Officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) Cadre.**

A review of existing related literature suggested that, different independent variables influence job satisfaction and professional commitment of the employees in the organization. But the degree of impact is not same regarding the each variable. To examine the extent to which independent variables influenced job satisfaction and commitment, multiple regression analysis was performed. In this analysis, one group of independent variables was entered in a block and then others group into regression equation with overall, extrinsic and intrinsic job satisfaction and three scale of commitment (APC, CPC and NPC) as the dependent variables. This analysis also aims to examine whether the individual effect of the variables varies at the time of combined effect. The analysis also helps to select a set of independent variables (Demographic, HRM, Institutional, job stressors and job characteristics) that best predict the dependent variables (Job satisfaction and Professional Commitment).

The results of hierarchical multiple regression analysis ( $R^2$ , adjusted  $R^2$ ,  $R^2$  change, ANOVA and coefficient of determination) were presented in the tables.

## 8.2.1 Predictors of Job Satisfaction

### a) Combined impact of IVs and Predictors of Overall Job Satisfaction of the Officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

**Table-8.1: Hierarchical Multiple Regression Predicting Overall Job Satisfaction (OJS)**

| Independent Variables                      | Model 1 |       | Model 2 |        | Model 3 |       | Model 4 |        |
|--|---------|-------|---------|--------|---------|-------|---------|--------|
|  | (β)     | Sig   | (β)     | Sig    | (β)     | Sig   | (β)     | Sig    |
| <b>Demographic Factors</b>                 |         |       |         |        |         |       |         |        |
| Designation                                | -.092   | .259  | -.113   | .125   | -.069   | .337  | -.089   | .242   |
| Appointment Type                           | .109    | .048* | .078    | .119   | .067    | .174  | .067    | .185   |
| Inst. Type                                 | .105    | .110  | .015    | .805   | .000    | .999  | .008    | .906   |
| Inst. Location                             | -.249   | .000* | -.212   | .000*  | -.259   | .000* | -.248   | .000*  |
| Occupational Group                         | .048    | .452  | .104    | .079** | .115    | .048* | .100    | .098** |
| Gender                                     | .140    | .004* | .092    | .039*  | .050    | .272  | .058    | .215   |
| Age  | .150    | .132  | .070    | .438   | .091    | .312  | .064    | .497   |
| Job Tenure                                 | -.120   | .185  | -.162   | .053** | -.195   | .019* | -.185   | .032*  |
| Highest Ed.                                | .030    | .560  | .011    | .811   | .018    | .697  | .021    | .644   |
| <b>HRM Factors</b>                         |         |       |         |        |         |       |         |        |
| Recruitment & Selection                    |         |       | .002    | .970   | -.027   | .545  | -.018   | .689   |
| Posting and Transfer                       |         |       | -.027   | .615   | -.017   | .755  | -.024   | .653   |
| Job Security                               |         |       | .230    | .000*  | .216    | .000* | .223    | .000*  |
| Promotion opportunity                      |         |       | .225    | .000*  | .228    | .000* | .221    | .000*  |
| Training                                   |         |       | -.055   | .287   | -.080   | .125  | -.082   | .124   |
| Salary and Benefits                        |         |       | .167    | .004*  | .160    | .006* | .165    | .005*  |
| Justice and Equity                         |         |       | .163    | .005*  | .181    | .003* | .168    | .009*  |
| Performance Appraisal                      |         |       | -.034   | .533   | -.073   | .198  | -.061   | .318   |
| Career Development                         |         |       | .231    | .000*  | .213    | .001* | .230    | .000*  |
| <b>Institutional Factors</b>               |         |       |         |        |         |       |         |        |
| Staff Relation                             |         |       |         |        | .041    | .408  | .054    | .366   |
| Staff Moral                                |         |       |         |        | .163    | .001* | .154    | .005*  |
| Service Seeker Behavior                    |         |       |         |        | -.043   | .403  | -.044   | .410   |
| Logistic Support                           |         |       |         |        | -.055   | .306  | -.048   | .395   |
| Family Support                             |         |       |         |        | .156    | .001* | .144    | .004*  |
| Community Support                          |         |       |         |        | .032    | .513  | .047    | .350   |
| Social Status                              |         |       |         |        | -.091   | .050* | -.083   | .078** |
| Station Expenditure.                       |         |       |         |        | -.025   | .618  | -.035   | .517   |
| <b>Job Stressors &amp; Characteristics</b> |         |       |         |        |         |       |         |        |
| Job Overload                               |         |       |         |        |         |       | -.026   | .581   |
| Job Conflict                               |         |       |         |        |         |       | -.025   | .624   |
| Job Ambiguity                              |         |       |         |        |         |       | .008    | .884   |
| Job Autonomy                               |         |       |         |        |         |       | -.099   | .115   |
| Feedback                                   |         |       |         |        |         |       | -.036   | .600   |
| Task Variety                               |         |       |         |        |         |       | .001    | .992   |
| Co-worker Support                          |         |       |         |        |         |       | -.024   | .709   |
| Boss Support                               |         |       |         |        |         |       | .099    | .167   |
| <b>Regression model summary</b>            |         |       |         |        |         |       |         |        |
| R <sup>2</sup>                             | .160    |       | .349    |        | .404    |       | .414    |        |
| Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>                    | .139    |       | .316    |        | .359    |       | .355    |        |
| R <sup>2</sup> Change                      | .160    |       | .189    |        | .055    |       | .01     |        |
| F (ANOVA)                                  | 7.669   |       | 10.551  |        | 9.017   |       | 7.010   |        |

\*p<.05; \*\*p<.10

The results in the table indicate that all the independent variables (Demographic, HRM, Institutional, job stressors and job characteristics) of this study accounted for 41.4% ( $R^2 = .414$ , Model 4) of the variance in overall job satisfaction of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. The  $R^2$  change values indicate that, HRM factors were the most important variables in influencing overall job satisfaction of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre ( $R^2$  change = .189).

The results show that appointment type, institution location and gender (Model 1) were the only demographic factors which significantly predicted overall job satisfaction of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. The results also indicate that the inclusion of HRM factors into the regression equation changed the relationship between demographic factors, such that appointment type became non significant, while occupational group and job tenure became significant predictors (Model 2). Again, the inclusion of institutional, job stressor and job characteristics into the equation changed the relationship as; gender became non significant predictors of overall job satisfaction (Model 4). Table also shows that, job security, promotion opportunity, salary, justice, and career development were the HRM factors and staff moral, family support and social status were the institutional factors which significantly influence the overall job satisfaction of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre (Model 4). Finally results indicate that job stressors and characteristics became non significant predictors of overall job satisfaction

According to significance level the statistically significant factors are listed below for better understanding and decision making for authority.

**Table 8.2: List of Significant Variables of Overall Job Satisfaction**

| <b>Independent Variables</b> | <b>(<math>\beta</math>)</b> | <b>Sig</b> |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|
| Inst. Location               | -.248                       | .000*      |
| Occupational Group           | .100                        | .098**     |
| Job Tenure                   | -.185                       | .032*      |
| Job Security                 | .223                        | .000*      |
| Promotion opportunity        | .221                        | .000*      |
| Salary and Benefits          | .165                        | .005*      |
| Justice and Equity           | .168                        | .009*      |
| Career Development           | .230                        | .000*      |
| Staff Moral                  | .154                        | .005*      |
| Family Support               | .144                        | .004*      |
| Social Status                | -.083                       | .078**     |

**b) Combined impact of IVs and Predictors of Extrinsic Job Satisfaction of the Officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.**

**Table-8.3: Hierarchical Multiple Regression Predicting Extrinsic Job Satisfaction (EJS) of the Officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.**

| Independent Variables                    | Model 1 |       | Model 2 |        | Model 3 |        | Model 4 |        |
|--|---------|-------|---------|--------|---------|--------|---------|--------|
|  | (β)     | Sig   | (β)     | Sig    | (β)     | Sig    | (β)     | Sig    |
| <b>Demographic Factors</b>               |         |       |         |        |         |        |         |        |
| Designation                              | -.192   | .018* | -.172   | .009*  | -.149   | .021*  | -.153   | .018*  |
| Appointment Type                         | .175    | .001* | .121    | .008*  | .114    | .010*  | .100    | .018*  |
| Inst. Type                               | .074    | .252  | -.042   | .455   | -.022   | .691   | -.031   | .567   |
| Inst. Location                           | -.153   | .003* | .007    | .877   | .018    | .696   | .030    | .505   |
| Occupational Group                       | -.016   | .797  | .013    | .802   | .015    | .773   | .019    | .704   |
| Gender                                   | .196    | .000* | .147    | .000*  | .109    | .007*  | .117    | .003*  |
| Age                                      | .044    | .656  | -.044   | .587   | -.065   | .414   | -.093   | .243   |
| Job Tenure                               | -.034   | .702  | -.028   | .706   | -.014   | .850   | .026    | .717   |
| Highest Ed.                              | .026    | .606  | .006    | .877   | .025    | .538   | .020    | .597   |
| <b>HRM Factors</b>                       |         |       |         |        |         |        |         |        |
| Recruitment & Selection                  |         |       | .081    | .047*  | .066    | .098** | .090    | .019*  |
| Posting and Transfer                     |         |       | .192    | .000*  | .199    | .000*  | .184    | .000*  |
| Job Security                             |         |       | .216    | .000*  | .143    | .001*  | .116    | .008*  |
| Promotion opportunity                    |         |       | .105    | .025*  | .085    | .061** | .073    | .115   |
| Training                                 |         |       | .062    | .179   | .020    | .661   | .000    | .992   |
| Salary and Benefits                      |         |       | .033    | .486   | .060    | .227   | .013    | .782   |
| Justice and Equity                       |         |       | .014    | .788   | .043    | .424   | .094    | .085** |
| Performance Appraisal                    |         |       | .245    | .000*  | .178    | .000*  | .084    | .101   |
| Career Development                       |         |       | .096    | .082** | .051    | .347   | .055    | .314   |
| <b>Inst. Factors</b>                     |         |       |         |        |         |        |         |        |
| Staff Relation                           |         |       |         |        | .106    | .017*  | -.006   | .899   |
| Staff Moral                              |         |       |         |        | .146    | .001*  | .148    | .001*  |
| Service Seeker Behavior                  |         |       |         |        | -.048   | .300   | -.056   | .217   |
| Logistic Support                         |         |       |         |        | .117    | .014*  | .091    | .056** |
| Family Support                           |         |       |         |        | .056    | .186   | .021    | .625   |
| Community Support                        |         |       |         |        | .072    | .101   | .087    | .043*  |
| Social Status                            |         |       |         |        | -.060   | .141   | -.065   | .100   |
| Station Expenditure.                     |         |       |         |        | -.078   | .084** | -.130   | .004*  |
| <b>Job Stressors and Characteristics</b> |         |       |         |        |         |        |         |        |
| Job Overload                             |         |       |         |        |         |        | -.052   | .200   |
| Job Conflict                             |         |       |         |        |         |        | -.036   | .401   |
| Job Ambiguity                            |         |       |         |        |         |        | .102    | .026*  |
| Job Autonomy                             |         |       |         |        |         |        | .019    | .719   |
| Feedback                                 |         |       |         |        |         |        | .014    | .811   |
| Task Variety                             |         |       |         |        |         |        | -.043   | .356   |
| Co-worker Support                        |         |       |         |        |         |        | .050    | .357   |
| Boss Support                             |         |       |         |        |         |        | .195    | .001*  |
| <b>Regression model summery</b>          |         |       |         |        |         |        |         |        |
| R <sup>2</sup>                           | .176    |       | .471    |        | .532    |        | .583    |        |
| Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>                  | .156    |       | .444    |        | .497    |        | .541    |        |
| R <sup>2</sup> Change                    | .176    |       | .295    |        | .061    |        | .051    |        |
| F (ANOVA)                                | 8.622   |       | 17.530  |        | 15.152  |        | 13.889  |        |

\*p<.05; \*\*p<.10

The results in the table indicate that all the independent variables (Demographic, HRM, Institutional, job stressors and job characteristics) of this study accounted for 58.3% ( $R^2 = .583$ , Model 4) of the variance in Extrinsic job satisfaction of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. The  $R^2$  change values indicate that, Demographic and HRM factors were the most important variables in influencing Extrinsic job satisfaction of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre ( $R^2$  change, Model 1 and 2).

The results show that, designation, appointment type, institution location and gender (Model 1) were the only demographic factors which significantly predicted extrinsic job satisfaction of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. The results also indicate that the inclusion of HRM, institutional factors, job stressors and job characteristics into the regression equation changed the relationship between demographic factors, such that institute location became non significant predictors of extrinsic job satisfaction (Model 4). Table also shows that, Recruitment & Selection, Posting and Transfer, job security, promotion opportunity, performance appraisal and career development were the only HRM factors which significantly influence the extrinsic job satisfaction. After inclusion of institutional factors, job stressors and characteristics into the equation changed the level of significant such as, justice and equity became significant and performance appraisal, career development became non significant predictors of extrinsic job satisfaction (Model 4).

Table also shows that; staff moral, logistic support, community support and station expenditure were the institutional factors which impact the extrinsic job satisfaction of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed. Cadre. Finally, job ambiguity was the only job stressor to negative impact and boss support was the only job characteristic

which significantly influence the extrinsic job satisfaction of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre (Model 4).

According to significance level the statistically significant factors are listed below for better understanding and decision making for authority.

**Table 8.4: List of Significant Variables of Extrinsic Job Satisfaction**

| <b>Independent Variables</b> | <b>(β)</b> | <b>Sig</b> |
|------------------------------|------------|------------|
| Designation                  | -.153      | .018*      |
| Appointment Type             | .100       | .018*      |
| Gender                       | .117       | .003*      |
| Recruitment & Selection      | .090       | .019*      |
| Posting and Transfer         | .184       | .000*      |
| Job Security                 | .116       | .008*      |
| Justice and Equity           | .094       | .085**     |
| Staff Moral                  | .148       | .001*      |
| Logistic Support             | .091       | .056**     |
| Community Support            | .087       | .043*      |
| Station Expenditure.         | -.130      | .004*      |
| Job Ambiguity                | .102       | .026*      |
| Boss Support                 | .195       | .001*      |

**c) Combined impact of IVs and Predictors of Intrinsic Job Satisfaction of the Officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.**



**Table-8.5: Hierarchical Multiple Regression Predicting Intrinsic Job Satisfaction (IJS) of the Officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.**

| Independent Variables                    | Model 1 |        | Model 2 |        | Model 3 |        | Model 4 |       |
|--|---------|--------|---------|--------|---------|--------|---------|-------|
|  | (β)     | Sig    | (β)     | Sig    | (β)     | Sig    | (β)     | Sig   |
| <b>Demographic Factors</b>               |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |       |
| Designation                              | -.122   | .153   | -.120   | .099** | -.083   | .245   | -.095   | .162  |
| Appointment Type                         | .095    | .100   | .054    | .279   | .037    | .446   | .020    | .659  |
| Inst. Type                               | -.012   | .865   | -.167   | .007*  | -.145   | .017*  | -.175   | .002* |
| Inst. Location                           | -.084   | .123   | .031    | .541   | .032    | .537   | -.004   | .940  |
| Occupational Group                       | .130    | .055** | .195    | .001*  | .186    | .001*  | .193    | .000* |
| Gender                                   | .115    | .025*  | .063    | .152   | .015    | .737   | .025    | .551  |
| Age                                      | .104    | .318   | .024    | .790   | .035    | .688   | .020    | .811  |
| Job Tenure                               | -.189   | .047*  | -.204   | .014*  | -.207   | .011*  | -.198   | .010* |
| Highest Ed.                              | .017    | .752   | -.002   | .960   | .007    | .868   | -.012   | .776  |
| <b>HRM Factors</b>                       |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |       |
| Recruitment & Selection                  |         |        | .044    | .331   | .025    | .565   | .043    | .288  |
| Posting and Transfer                     |         |        | .027    | .612   | .051    | .325   | .035    | .470  |
| Job Security                             |         |        | .223    | .000*  | .174    | .000*  | .101    | .029* |
| Promotion opportunity                    |         |        | .117    | .023*  | .110    | .029*  | .076    | .116  |
| Training                                 |         |        | .131    | .010*  | .100    | .052** | .074    | .118  |
| Salary and Benefits                      |         |        | -.017   | .750   | .032    | .565   | -.037   | .466  |
| Justice and Equity                       |         |        | .080    | .165   | .127    | .035*  | .240    | .000* |
| Performance Appraisal                    |         |        | .272    | .000*  | .220    | .000*  | .061    | .259  |
| Career Development                       |         |        | .082    | .180   | .056    | .356   | -.005   | .927  |
| <b>Inst. Factors</b>                     |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |       |
| Staff Relation                           |         |        |         |        | .163    | .001*  | .033    | .534  |
| Staff Moral                              |         |        |         |        | .084    | .093** | .109    | .025* |
| Service Seeker Behavior                  |         |        |         |        | -.103   | .043*  | -.116   | .016* |
| Logistic Support                         |         |        |         |        | .060    | .249   | -.014   | .774  |
| Family Support                           |         |        |         |        | .095    | .043*  | .061    | .172  |
| Community Support                        |         |        |         |        | .001    | .979   | .001    | .979  |
| Social Status                            |         |        |         |        | -.092   | .043*  | -.109   | .010* |
| Station Expenditure.                     |         |        |         |        | -.092   | .066** | -.121   | .012* |
| <b>Job Stressors and Characteristics</b> |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |       |
| Job Overload                             |         |        |         |        |         |        | .066    | .123  |
| Job Conflict                             |         |        |         |        |         |        | .033    | .469  |
| Job Ambiguity                            |         |        |         |        |         |        | .156    | .001* |
| Job Autonomy                             |         |        |         |        |         |        | .216    | .000* |
| Feedback                                 |         |        |         |        |         |        | .125    | .042* |
| Task Variety                             |         |        |         |        |         |        | -.007   | .884  |
| Co-worker Support                        |         |        |         |        |         |        | -.030   | .601  |
| Boss Support                             |         |        |         |        |         |        | .167    | .009* |
| <b>Regression model summary</b>          |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |       |
| R <sup>2</sup>                           | .075    |        | .361    |        | .424    |        | .535    |       |
| Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>                  | .052    |        | .329    |        | .381    |        | .488    |       |
| R <sup>2</sup> Change                    | .075    |        | .286    |        | .063    |        | .111    |       |
| F (ANOVA)                                | 3.267   |        | 11.125  |        | 9.807   |        | 11.433  |       |

\*p<.05; \*\*p<.10

The results in the table indicate that all the independent variables (Demographic, HRM, Institutional, job stressors and job characteristics) of this study accounted for 53.5% ( $R^2 = .535$ , Model 4) of the variance in intrinsic job satisfaction of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. The  $R^2$  change values indicate that, HRM factors, job stressors and job characteristics were the most important variables in influencing intrinsic job satisfaction of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre ( $R^2$  change, Model 2 and 4).

The results show that occupational group, gender and job tenure (Model 1) were the only demographic factors which significantly predicted intrinsic job satisfaction of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. The results also indicate that the inclusion of HRM, institutional factors, job stressors and job characteristics into the regression equation changed the relationship between demographic factors, such that gender became non significant predictors of extrinsic job satisfaction and institute type became significant variable (Model 4).

Table also shows that, job security, promotion opportunity, training and performance appraisal the only HRM factors which significantly influence the intrinsic job satisfaction. After inclusion of institutional factors, job stressors and characteristics into the equation changed the level of significant such as, justice and equity became significant and promotion, training, performance appraisal became non significant predictors of intrinsic job satisfaction (Model 4). Results also show that, among the institutional factors, staff moral, service seeker behavior, social status and station expenditure were significant factors intrinsic job satisfaction of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed. Cadre. Finally, job ambiguity, job autonomy, feedback and boss support were the only job stressor and job characteristic which significantly influence the intrinsic job satisfaction of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre (Model 4).

According to significance level the statistically significant factors are listed below for better understanding and decision making for authority.

**Table 8.6: List of Significant Variables of Intrinsic Job Satisfaction**

| <b>Independent Variables</b> | <b>(β)</b> | <b>Sig</b> |
|------------------------------|------------|------------|
| Inst. Type                   | -.175      | .002*      |
| Occupational Group           | .193       | .000*      |
| Job Tenure                   | -.198      | .010*      |
| Job Security                 | .101       | .029*      |
| Justice and Equity           | .240       | .000*      |
| Staff Moral                  | .109       | .025*      |
| Service Seeker Behavior      | -.116      | .016*      |
| Social Status                | -.109      | .010*      |
| Station Expenditure.         | -.121      | .012*      |
| Job Ambiguity                | .156       | .001*      |
| Job Autonomy                 | .216       | .000*      |
| Feedback                     | .125       | .042*      |
| Boss Support                 | .167       | .009*      |

## **8.2.2 Predictors of Professional Commitment**

**a) Combined impact of IVs and Predictors of Affective Professional Commitment (APC) of the Officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.**

**Table-8.7: Hierarchical Multiple Regression Predicting Affective Professional Commitment (APC) of the Officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.**

| Independent Variables                    | Model 1 |        | Model 2 |        | Model 3 |        | Model 4 |        |
|--|---------|--------|---------|--------|---------|--------|---------|--------|
| Demographic Factors                      | (β)     | Sig    | (β)     | Sig    | (β)     | Sig    | (β)     | Sig    |
| <b>Designation</b>                       | -.032   | .702   | -.063   | .358   | -.044   | .479   | -.081   | .201   |
| Appointment Type                         | .123    | .027*  | .082    | .078** | .047    | .271   | .037    | .376   |
| Inst. Type                               | .112    | .093** | -.033   | .572   | -.040   | .452   | -.037   | .481   |
| Inst. Location                           | .027    | .611   | .058    | .215   | .039    | .384   | .037    | .416   |
| Occupational Group                       | .010    | .876   | .108    | .050** | .106    | .033*  | .111    | .027*  |
| Gender                                   | .088    | .076** | .014    | .737   | -.048   | .215   | -.043   | .267   |
| Age                                      | .133    | .185   | .067    | .421   | .027    | .728   | .005    | .952   |
| Job Tenure                               | .113    | .219   | .024    | .755   | .024    | .736   | -.006   | .938   |
| Highest Ed.                              | .072    | .163   | .043    | .311   | .026    | .493   | .016    | .677   |
| <b>HRM Factors</b>                       |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |        |
| Recruitment & Selection                  |         |        | -.011   | .791   | -.004   | .910   | .006    | .869   |
| Posting and Transfer                     |         |        | -.123   | .014*  | -.090   | .047*  | -.089   | .050** |
| Job Security                             |         |        | .338    | .000*  | .295    | .000*  | .273    | .000*  |
| Promotion opportunity                    |         |        | -.048   | .315   | -.100   | .023*  | -.122   | .008*  |
| Training                                 |         |        | .034    | .470   | .019    | .673   | .011    | .807   |
| Salary and Benefits                      |         |        | .072    | .148   | .060    | .211   | .035    | .466   |
| Justice and Equity                       |         |        | .172    | .002*  | .098    | .060** | .156    | .004*  |
| Performance Appraisal                    |         |        | -.024   | .643   | -.014   | .775   | -.069   | .178   |
| Career Development                       |         |        | .284    | .000*  | .206    | .000*  | .163    | .003*  |
| <b>Inst. Factors</b>                     |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |        |
| Staff Relation                           |         |        |         |        | .080    | .061** | -.008   | .869   |
| Staff Moral                              |         |        |         |        | -.046   | .294   | -.024   | .598   |
| Service Seeker Behavior                  |         |        |         |        | .113    | .011*  | .076    | .092** |
| Logistic Support                         |         |        |         |        | -.051   | .263   | -.056   | .232   |
| Family Support                           |         |        |         |        | .304    | .000*  | .299    | .000*  |
| Community Support                        |         |        |         |        | .139    | .001*  | .151    | .000*  |
| Social Status                            |         |        |         |        | -.009   | .828   | -.022   | .568   |
| Station Expenditure.                     |         |        |         |        | .019    | .666   | .013    | .778   |
| <b>Job Stressors and Characteristics</b> |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |        |
| Job Overload                             |         |        |         |        |         |        | .086    | .030*  |
| Job Conflict                             |         |        |         |        |         |        | .006    | .896   |
| Job Ambiguity                            |         |        |         |        |         |        | .120    | .008*  |
| Job Autonomy                             |         |        |         |        |         |        | .057    | .276   |
| Feedback                                 |         |        |         |        |         |        | -.013   | .814   |
| Task Variety                             |         |        |         |        |         |        | .022    | .628   |
| Co-worker Support                        |         |        |         |        |         |        | .065    | .222   |
| Boss Support                             |         |        |         |        |         |        | .061    | .306   |
| <b>Regression model summery</b>          |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |        |
| R <sup>2</sup>                           | .133    |        | .441    |        | .565    |        | .593    |        |
| Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>                  | .112    |        | .413    |        | .532    |        | .552    |        |
| R <sup>2</sup> Change                    | .133    |        | .308    |        | .124    |        | .028    |        |
| F (ANOVA)                                | 6.210   |        | 15.528  |        | 17.286  |        | 14.502  |        |

\*p<.05; \*\*p<.10

The results in the table indicate that all the independent variables (Demographic, HRM, Institutional, job stressors and job characteristics) of this study accounted for 59.3% ( $R^2 = .593$ , Model 4) of the variance in APC of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. The  $R^2$  change values indicate that, Demographic, HRM factors, and Institutional factors were the most important variables in influencing APC of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre ( $R^2$  change, Model 1,2 and 3). The  $R^2$  changes also show that HRM factors had highest influence on the APC (Model 2).

It is noted from the table that, appointment type, institute type and gender (Model 1) were the only demographic factors which significantly predicted APC of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. But inclusion of HRM, institutional factors, job stressors and job characteristics into the regression equation changed the relationship between demographic factors and APC, such that all the factors became non significant predictors of APC except occupational group (Model 4).

Table also shows that, posting and transfer, promotion opportunity were the negative impact and job security, justice and equity, career development were the another HRM factors which significantly positive influence the APC. Results also show that, among the institutional factors, staff relation, service seeker behavior, family support and community support were significant antecedents of APC of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed. Cadre. After inclusion of job stressors and job characteristics into the equation, the relation between institutional factor and APC were changed as staff relation became non-significant. Finally, job overload and job ambiguity were the only job stressor which significantly influence the APC of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre (Model 4).

According to significance level the statistically significant factors are listed below for better understanding and decision making for authority.

**Table 8.8: List of Significant Variables of APC**

| <b>Independent Variables</b> | <b>(β)</b> | <b>Sig</b> |
|------------------------------|------------|------------|
| Occupational Group           | .111       | .027*      |
| Posting and Transfer         | -.089      | .050**     |
| Job Security                 | .273       | .000*      |
| Promotion opportunity        | -.122      | .008*      |
| Justice and Equity           | .156       | .004*      |
| Career Development           | .163       | .003*      |
| Service Seeker Behavior      | .076       | .092**     |
| Family Support               | .299       | .000*      |
| Community Support            | .151       | .000*      |
| Job Overload                 | .086       | .030*      |
| Job Ambiguity                | .120       | .008*      |

**b) Combined impact of IVs and Predictors of Continuance Professional Commitment (CPC) of the Officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.**

**Table-8.9: Hierarchical Multiple Regression Predicting Continuance  
Professional Commitment (CPC) of the Officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.**

| Independent Variables                    | Model 1 |        | Model 2 |        | Model 3 |        | Model 4 |        |
|--|---------|--------|---------|--------|---------|--------|---------|--------|
|  | (β)     | Sig    | (β)     | Sig    | (β)     | Sig    | (β)     | Sig    |
| <b>Demographic Factors</b>               |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |        |
| <b>Designation</b>                       | -.092   | .279   | -.094   | .246   | -.117   | .144   | -.075   | .363   |
| Appointment Type                         | .097    | .087** | .077    | .166   | .064    | .240   | .079    | .144   |
| Inst. Type                               | .109    | .107   | .074    | .289   | .069    | .313   | .066    | .339   |
| Inst. Location                           | -.101   | .060** | -.092   | .104   | -.127   | .028*  | -.098   | .094** |
| Occupational Group                       | -.095   | .157   | -.066   | .315   | -.073   | .252   | -.018   | .785   |
| Gender                                   | -.031   | .544   | -.067   | .175   | -.043   | .388   | -.048   | .334   |
| Age                                      | .089    | .384   | .062    | .535   | .056    | .574   | .065    | .524   |
| Job Tenure                               | .063    | .504   | .026    | .782   | -.027   | .767   | -.023   | .802   |
| Highest Ed.                              | .037    | .489   | .031    | .539   | .012    | .813   | .010    | .845   |
| <b>HRM Factors</b>                       |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |        |
| Recruitment & Selection                  |         |        | .017    | .728   | .029    | .558   | .037    | .444   |
| Posting and Transfer                     |         |        | -.043   | .465   | -.044   | .455   | -.049   | .402   |
| Job Security                             |         |        | .268    | .000*  | .288    | .000*  | .290    | .000*  |
| Promotion opportunity                    |         |        | -.083   | .147   | -.110   | .052** | -.138   | .020*  |
| Training                                 |         |        | -.084   | .140   | -.110   | .055** | -.099   | .085** |
| Salary and Benefits                      |         |        | .056    | .340   | .000    | .998   | -.003   | .965   |
| Justice and Equity                       |         |        | .008    | .907   | .046    | .495   | .070    | .313   |
| Performance Appraisal                    |         |        | .099    | .103   | .119    | .058** | .071    | .283   |
| Career Development                       |         |        | .115    | .093** | .126    | .063** | .105    | .133   |
| <b>Inst. Factors</b>                     |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |        |
| Staff Relation                           |         |        |         |        | -.129   | .020*  | -.181   | .005** |
| Staff Moral                              |         |        |         |        | -.058   | .301   | -.048   | .409   |
| Service Seeker Behavior                  |         |        |         |        | -.054   | .346   | -.054   | .356   |
| Logistic Support                         |         |        |         |        | .047    | .430   | .027    | .661   |
| Family Support                           |         |        |         |        | .241    | .000*  | .259    | .000*  |
| Community Support                        |         |        |         |        | -.060   | .271   | -.063   | .252   |
| Social Status                            |         |        |         |        | -.079   | .120   | -.073   | .151   |
| Station Expenditure.                     |         |        |         |        | .080    | .154   | .059    | .308   |
| <b>Job Stressors and Characteristics</b> |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |        |
| Job Overload                             |         |        |         |        |         |        | .098    | .058** |
| Job Conflict                             |         |        |         |        |         |        | -.163   | .003*  |
| Job Ambiguity                            |         |        |         |        |         |        | -.042   | .469   |
| Job Autonomy                             |         |        |         |        |         |        | .192    | .005*  |
| Feedback                                 |         |        |         |        |         |        | -.087   | .239   |
| Task Variety                             |         |        |         |        |         |        | -.084   | .163   |
| Co-worker Support                        |         |        |         |        |         |        | .075    | .277   |
| Boss Support                             |         |        |         |        |         |        | .002    | .983   |
| <b>Regression model summary</b>          |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |        |
| R <sup>2</sup>                           | .098    |        | .202    |        | .273    |        | .318    |        |
| Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>                  | .075    |        | .161    |        | .218    |        | .249    |        |
| R <sup>2</sup> Change                    | .098    |        | .104    |        | .071    |        | .045    |        |
| F (ANOVA)                                | 4.362   |        | 4.974   |        | 4.999   |        | 4.626   |        |

\*p<.05; \*\*p<.10

It is noted from the results in the table that all the independent variables (Demographic, HRM, Institutional, job stressors and job characteristics) of this study accounted for 31.8% ( $R^2 = .318$ , Model 4) of the variance in CPC of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. The  $R^2$  change values indicate that, demographic and HRM factors were the most important variables in influencing CPC of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre ( $R^2$  change, Model 1 and 2).

The results indicate that appointment type and ins. Location (Model 1) were the only demographic factors which significantly predicted CPC of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. The results also indicate that the inclusion of HRM, institutional factors, job stressors and job characteristics into the regression equation changed the relationship between demographic factors and CPC, such that appointment type became non significant predictors and institute location remain significant variable (Model 4).

Table also shows that, job security, promotion opportunity, and training the only HRM factors which significantly influence the CPC after inclusion of institutional factors, job stressors and characteristics into the equation (Model 4). Results also show that, institutional factors were significant predictors of CPC of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed. Cadre. Finally, job overload, job conflict and job autonomy, were the only job stressor and job characteristic which significantly influence the CPC of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre (Model 4).



According to significance level the statistically significant factors are listed below for better understanding and decision making for authority.

**Table 8.10: List of Significant Variables of Continuance Professional Commitment (CPC)**

| <b>Independent Variables</b> | <b>(<math>\beta</math>)</b> | <b>Sig</b> |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|
| Inst. Location               | -.098                       | .094**     |
| Job Security                 | .290                        | .000*      |
| Promotion opportunity        | -.138                       | .020*      |
| Training                     | -.099                       | .085**     |
| Staff Relation               | -.181                       | .005**     |
| Family Support               | .259                        | .000*      |
| Job Overload                 | .098                        | .058**     |
| Job Conflict                 | -.163                       | .003*      |
| Job Autonomy                 | .192                        | .005*      |

**c) Combined impact of IVs and Predictors of Normative Professional Commitment (NPC) of the Officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.**

**Table-8.11: Hierarchical Multiple Regression Predicting Normative Professional Commitment (NPC) of the Officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.**

| Independent Variables                    | Model 1 |        | Model 2 |        | Model 3 |       | Model 4 |        |
|--|---------|--------|---------|--------|---------|-------|---------|--------|
|  | (β)     | Sig    | (β)     | Sig    | (β)     | Sig   | (β)     | Sig    |
| <b>Demographic Factors</b>               |         |        |         |        |         |       |         |        |
| <b>Designation</b>                       | -.025   | .773   | -.033   | .683   | -.017   | .819  | .018    | .804   |
| Appointment Type                         | .097    | .092** | .053    | .338   | .036    | .480  | .046    | .350   |
| Inst. Type                               | .139    | .043*  | .028    | .682   | -.019   | .767  | -.013   | .829   |
| Inst. Location                           | -.004   | .943   | .067    | .229   | -.017   | .756  | -.015   | .782   |
| Occupational Group                       | .029    | .671   | .081    | .209   | .099    | .100  | .091    | .122   |
| Gender                                   | .058    | .254   | .018    | .705   | .009    | .854  | .009    | .833   |
| Age                                      | .048    | .646   | .004    | .968   | .014    | .877  | .042    | .649   |
| Job Tenure                               | .115    | .229   | .092    | .316   | .021    | .809  | .016    | .852   |
| Highest Ed.                              | -.019   | .727   | -.036   | .476   | -.050   | .286  | -.054   | .222   |
| <b>HRM Factors</b>                       |         |        |         |        |         |       |         |        |
| Recruitment & Selection                  |         |        | .069    | .161   | .056    | .226  | .080    | .068** |
| Posting and Transfer                     |         |        | -.021   | .726   | -.002   | .974  | -.049   | .359   |
| Job Security                             |         |        | .133    | .011*  | .150    | .004* | .148    | .003*  |
| Promotion opportunity                    |         |        | .016    | .773   | -.040   | .451  | -.102   | .055** |
| Training                                 |         |        | .105    | .062** | .064    | .236  | .059    | .258   |
| Salary and Benefits                      |         |        | -.010   | .858   | -.035   | .546  | -.065   | .248   |
| Justice and Equity                       |         |        | .090    | .157   | .094    | .139  | .142    | .024*  |
| Performance Appraisal                    |         |        | .102    | .089** | .131    | .027* | .061    | .302   |
| Career Development                       |         |        | .162    | .0168  | .156    | .015* | .153    | .015*  |
| <b>Inst. Factors</b>                     |         |        |         |        |         |       |         |        |
| Staff Relation                           |         |        |         |        | -.126   | .015* | -.185   | .002*  |
| Staff Moral                              |         |        |         |        | .051    | .337  | .018    | .740   |
| Service Seeker Behavior                  |         |        |         |        | .055    | .305  | .056    | .281   |
| Logistic Support                         |         |        |         |        | -.127   | .023* | -.209   | .000*  |
| Family Support                           |         |        |         |        | .328    | .000* | .269    | .000*  |
| Community Support                        |         |        |         |        | .005    | .921  | .029    | .556   |
| Social Status                            |         |        |         |        | -.162   | .001* | -.132   | .004*  |
| Station Expenditure.                     |         |        |         |        | .047    | .378  | -.003   | .958   |
| <b>Job Stressors and Characteristics</b> |         |        |         |        |         |       |         |        |
| Job Overload                             |         |        |         |        |         |       | .160    | .001*  |
| Job Conflict                             |         |        |         |        |         |       | -.191   | .000*  |
| Job Ambiguity                            |         |        |         |        |         |       | -.121   | .021*  |
| Job Autonomy                             |         |        |         |        |         |       | -.009   | .880   |
| Feedback                                 |         |        |         |        |         |       | .108    | .107   |
| Task Variety                             |         |        |         |        |         |       | -.015   | .786   |
| Co-worker Support                        |         |        |         |        |         |       | .029    | .642   |
| Boss Support                             |         |        |         |        |         |       | .251    | .000*  |
| <b>Regression model summary</b>          |         |        |         |        |         |       |         |        |
| R <sup>2</sup>                           | .073    |        | .223    |        | .356    |       | .445    |        |
| Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>                  | .050    |        | .184    |        | .307    |       | .390    |        |
| R <sup>2</sup> Change                    | .073    |        | .15     |        | .133    |       | .089    |        |
| F (ANOVA)                                | 3.189   |        | 5.645   |        | 7.351   |       | 7.981   |        |

\*p<.05; \*\*p<.10

The regression results in Table indicate that all the independent variables of the study accounted for 44.5% of the variance in NPC among BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre respondents. This shows that the independent variables were stronger predictors of NPC of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. The R<sup>2</sup> Change values indicate that the most important groups of independent variables were HRM factors. Appointment type and institution type were significant demographic predictors of NPC. The fact is that this effect vanishes when HRM practices were included into the regression equation. Recruitment and selection, job security, promotion opportunity, justice and equity and career development were the only HRM practices which had significant positive influence on NPC of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. This suggests that employees who were treated fairly and had the opportunity for career development and promotion became committed with the aspects of their jobs. Among the institutional factors, staff relation, logistic support, family support and social status were the significant influencing factors of NPC. Finally, Role stressors and boss support of job characteristics were significant predictors of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

According to significance level the statistically significant factors are listed below for better understanding and decision making for authority.

**Table 8.12: List of Significant Variables of Normative Professional Commitment (NPC)**

| <b>Independent Variables</b> | <b>(<math>\beta</math>)</b> | <b>Sig</b> |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|
| Recruitment & Selection      | .080                        | .068**     |
| Job Security                 | .148                        | .003*      |
| Promotion opportunity        | -.102                       | .055**     |
| Justice and Equity           | .142                        | .024*      |
| Career Development           | .153                        | .015*      |
| Staff Relation               | -.185                       | .002*      |
| Logistic Support             | -.209                       | .000*      |
| Family Support               | .269                        | .000*      |
| Social Status                | -.132                       | .004*      |
| Job Overload                 | .160                        | .001*      |
| Job Conflict                 | -.191                       | .000*      |
| Job Ambiguity                | -.121                       | .021*      |
| Boss Support                 | .251                        | .000*      |

### **8.3 Major Findings**

Previous three chapters of this study have discussed the impact of independent variables (Demographic, HRM, Institutional, Job stressors and Job characteristics) on dependent variables (Job satisfaction and Professional Commitment) separately. This chapter analyzes the combined impact of the independent variables on the dependent variables and some major findings are summarized below.

Result shows that demographic factors and HRM practices are the most influencing predictors of overall job satisfaction of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. On the other hand, job stressors and job characteristics have become non

significant predictors of overall job satisfaction. Among the 34 items, only 11 items (Inst. Location, Occupational Group, Job Tenure, Job Security, Promotion opportunity, Salary and Benefits, Justice and Equity, Career Development, Staff Moral, Family Support and Social Status) are statistically significant predictors of overall job satisfaction.

Results also indicate that, HRM factors are the most significant factor which influence the every scale of job satisfaction (overall, extrinsic, and intrinsic) and professional commitment (APC, CPC, and NPC). Regression analysis also revealed that, some of variables were significant at the time of individual impact, but those items become non significant in case of combined effect and vice versa.

Demographic factors are the second highest significant predictors of overall, extrinsic satisfaction, APC and CPC of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

Institutional items are also significant for every scale of professional commitment. Job stressors and characteristics are significant predictors of intrinsic job satisfaction and NPC of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

## **8.4 Conclusion**

This chapter has discussed the combined impact of different independents variables on the job satisfaction and professional commitment. Result shows that HRM factors are the strongest predictors of job satisfaction and professional commitment. Result also shows that independents variables contributed the highest variance in APC (59%) and the least variance in CPC (31%) among the BCS general education cadre officials.

## **Chapter Nine**

### **Summary of Findings, Conclusion and Implication**

#### **9.1 Introduction**

This is a timely work because; this is an important study regarding job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre in Bangladesh. Analyzing job satisfaction and professional commitment is significant as it impact the performance of the BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre officers. The previous chapters have measured the level of job satisfaction and professional commitment, and also have analyzed the impact of different variables on the satisfaction and commitment. Data analyses, Discussion of the results have been conducted in chapter 5, 6, 7, 8 and major findings are mentioned in each chapter of the study. This chapter will discuss the prominent findings of the study and makes reference to relevant research to support the findings of the present study. The chapter also presents the implications of research findings for practice, study's limitations and suggestions for future research.

#### **9.2 Summary of Findings**

Findings have been presented based on the result of the analysis in earlier chapters. Summary of findings of the study are discussed below.

##### **9.2.1 The level of job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre and the relationship between demographic factors with job satisfaction and with professional commitment.**

The first objective of the study was to measure the level of job satisfaction and professional commitment and to analyze the relationship between demographic

variables with job satisfaction and with commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre in Bangladesh.

### **9.2.1.1 Level of Job Satisfaction**

**Overall Job Satisfaction:** The findings suggest that majority of the general education cadre officers are satisfied with their job. In an answer of a question regarding overall satisfaction, 54.8% respondents were satisfied about their job considering every aspects of the job.

**Extrinsic Job Satisfaction:** Extrinsic job satisfaction indicates the respondents' perception to the extrinsic aspects of the job. The mean score of the extrinsic items indicates that the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre are not satisfied with their extrinsic aspects of the job.

**Intrinsic Job Satisfaction:** Intrinsic aspects are the motivating factors which increase the satisfaction level of the cadre officials. Result indicates that the level of intrinsic satisfaction of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre is not satisfactory.

### **9.2.1.2 Level of Professional Commitment**

The respondents indicated high level of APC (M=3.71) and moderate level of CPC (M=3.35) and NPC (M=3.35) present among the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre in Bangladesh. This implies that the officers are involved in their profession but they have not feeling of obligation to the profession.

### **9.2.1.3 The relationship between demographic factors with job satisfaction and with professional commitment.**

Result from the chapter 5 indicates that, individually demographic factors are significantly related to the job satisfaction and professional commitment. Designation, Appointment type, Location of Institute, Occupational group, Age, and job tenure are

significant influencing factors of job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

Designation is a positive impacting factor of job satisfaction and professional commitment. Higher designated (Professors, Associate Professors) officers are more satisfied and more committed than lower designated (Assistant Professors and Lecturers).

It is understood that there is a close relationship between appointment type of the respondents and their level of job satisfaction and level of professional commitment. Officer from 10% quota and officers from nationalization process are more satisfied and committed than the officers from direct (BCS) recruitment.

There is a close relationship between location of institution and job satisfaction and professional commitment. It is a strong significant predictor of overall job satisfaction, extrinsic job satisfaction and CPC of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. Officers of metropolitan area are more satisfied and committed than the officers from district and upazila area. Officers of rural area are dissatisfied with and less committed to their job.

Occupational group is one of the important significant demographic factor of overall, intrinsic job satisfaction and NPC of the respondents. Administrative officers are more satisfied with and committed to their job.

Job tenure is also a strong significant influencing factor of overall job satisfaction, extrinsic job satisfaction, APC, and CPC of BCS general education cadre officers. Officers with 0-4 year service reflect higher level of satisfaction than officer with 5-10 and 11-15 year service groups. On the other hand, officers with 16 and above year service have highest level of satisfaction. This situation may be attributed to the fact that officers with less than 4 years service believe that this profession will



be able to meet their career expectation. Officer's expectations are high at the time of appointment, but when these expectations are not met, the resultant effect leads to a decrease in job satisfaction and remains relatively low for the next few years of service. Again, after 15 years of service, officer's satisfaction level increase.

## **9.2.2 The relationship between HRM factors with job satisfaction and with professional commitment.**

### **9.2.2.1 Perception of Respondents to HRM Practices**

Perception of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre to HRM practice is not satisfactory. Respondents are pleased only with recruitment & selection and job security variables out of nine important HRM practices. They are less satisfied with salary & benefits, justice & equity and career development. The mean score shows that the civil servants of education cadre are dissatisfied with their promotion, posting & transfer, and performance appraisal system.

### **9.2.2.2 HRM Practices and Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment**

This study has identified some HRM practices which influenced job satisfaction and professional commitment among the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre in Bangladesh.

Recruitment and selection is an important HRM practice that helps to appoint necessary manpower in an organization. Although the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre are pleased to this practice, the relationship with job satisfaction and with professional commitment is not statistically significant.

Results indicate that Posting and Transfer is one of the significant impacting HRM factors of overall job satisfaction, extrinsic job satisfaction, and APC. Maximum respondents opined that persuasion is needed for better posting in BCS

(Gen. Ed.) cadre. This also implies the absence of a sound and effective posting and transfer policy in BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre in Bangladesh.

Job security is significantly related to job satisfaction and professional commitment of the general education cadre officers. The factor is associated with every scale of satisfaction (overall, extrinsic, intrinsic) and commitment (APC, CPC, NPC). The officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre are expressed that job security is their motivating factor to stay in this job.

Promotion is the most significant impacting HRM factors of job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. In the subscale statement, there were strong disagreement with the positive statement and strong agreement with the negative statement with the promotion opportunities. Studies show that promotion recognized a de-motivating HRM factor in BCS service in Bangladesh. Descriptive statistics also show that BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre officers are comparatively dissatisfied with their promotion. This HRM factor is neither timely (in general) nor merit based in especially administrative post. Although there is a career path in BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre but due to biased, intra cadre conflict partisan and poor management culture the officers cannot reach to the deserved hierarchical ladder on time.

Though the descriptive statistics indicate of dissatisfaction regarding training system, the factor is significantly related to only intrinsic satisfaction and normative professional commitment. Training develops skill of officers but the study indicates no significant association with job satisfaction and professional commitment.

Salary and benefits is a positive influencing HRM factor of overall job satisfaction, extrinsic job satisfaction, APC, and CPC among the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. Arithmetic mean of descriptive statistic indicates that the

respondents are least satisfied with their salary and benefits. According to Herzberg's motivation hygiene-theory, salary & benefits is a hygiene factor, therefore lack of a handsome salary would cause dissatisfaction of the officers. Previous studies showed that salary is not motivating factors of BCS officers. Jahan (2006) explained that despite salary is a de-motivating factor, meritorious and bright students are still attracted to join BCS. The study of Karim also revealed that most of civil officers in Bangladesh joined the civil service being inspired by status, public service than salary. But this study revealed that the perception of civil service officers have changed to salary & benefits. This study found that salary has significant impact on job satisfaction and professional commitment.

This study found that BCS general education cadre officers are not satisfied with the practice of justice & equity in their job. Results also indicate that justice & equity is significantly associated with overall job satisfaction, affective professional commitment and normative professional commitment. The positive relationship suggest that the satisfaction and commitment levels of the officers increased when they perceived their controlling authority to be fair and just in determine their rewards.

Performance appraisal is an important HRM practice which is directly related to promotion of the officer. This factor is positively related to both extrinsic and intrinsic job satisfaction of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. Though the respondents are not satisfied with their present performance appraisal system, regression result shows that it has no significant relationship with professional commitment of the education cadre officers.

This study has found that career development is a significant predictor of job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre.

Though the education cadre officers are not satisfied with their career development, it has significant influence on overall job satisfaction, extrinsic job satisfaction and every scale of professional commitment. This finding is consistent with previous studies and also implies that the officers who had good prospect for career development were likely to be more satisfied with their job and become psychology attached to their profession. As a result, they can contribute positively to their institution.

### **9.2.3 The relationship between Institutional factors with Job satisfaction and with Professional commitment.**

#### **9.2.3.1 Perception to the Institutional (Internal and External) Factors**

The study has found that the collegial relation in BCS education cadre is good. Results of the descriptive statistics indicate that there is insufficient logistic support in this cadre. The study also found that respondents have satisfactory family support to do their job. But the attitude of the society regarding status of this job is not satisfactory. Another important thing is that, the officers are suffering to match with family expenditure of the job station and their actual income.

#### **9.2.3.2 The Institutional (Internal and External) Factors and Job Satisfaction and Professional commitment**

Regression result indicates that there are some institutional factors which have significant influence on job satisfaction and professional commitment.

Collegial relation has significant association with overall job satisfaction, extrinsic job satisfaction, intrinsic job satisfaction, and APC of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre of Bangladesh. This means that a good interpersonal relationship makes them pleased and develops attachment with the profession.

Morality of the officer has important influence on every scale of job satisfaction and CPC of the respondents. Family support and community support are significant predictors of job satisfaction and professional commitment. Logistics support is also associated with extrinsic, intrinsic job satisfaction and continuance professional commitment.

#### **9.2.4 The relationship between Job Stressors and Job Characteristics with Job satisfaction and with Professional commitment.**

##### **9.2.4.1 The Job Stressors and Job satisfaction and Professional commitment.**

Job stressors have significant impact on job satisfaction and professional commitment. Mean score indicates that a moderate level of job overload exist in the profession. Findings also suggest that a clear and fruitful policies and guideline for the duties is required in this cadre. Among the factors, job conflict and job ambiguity are the most significant influencing factors of job satisfaction and professional commitment.


##### **9.2.4.2 The Job Characteristics and Job satisfaction and Professional commitment.**

The officers of general education cadre are moderately pleased with their job characteristics items except work variety. Co-workers and boss are cordial to do their duties. On the other hand, multifarious duties are absence in their profession. Job autonomy, task variety and boss support have important impact on job satisfaction and professional commitment of the BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre officers.

### **9.2.5 Combined influence and Common Factors of job satisfaction and Professional Commitment**

This study also has found out relationship the factors with the dependent variables in combined and has listed summary of the significant factors in chapter eight. The factors were related either positively or negatively with the job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. These factors are combined to form model of common predictors among BCS general education cadre officers in this section.


**Figure- 9.1: Model of Common Significant Predictors of Job Satisfaction of the Officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre**



The model in figure 9.1 shows that job security, justice & equity and staff morality are common influencing factors of overall, extrinsic and intrinsic job satisfaction. Occupational group, job tenure and social status are common predictors of overall and intrinsic job satisfaction. On the other hand, job ambiguity, station expenditure, and boss support are the common significant factors of extrinsic and intrinsic job satisfaction of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre. Officers' satisfaction is negatively influenced by job tenure, social status and station expenditure. This indicates that the facilities regarding these factors are not satisfactory in this cadre.



**Figure- 9.2: Model of Common Significant Predictors of Professional Commitment of the Officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre**



Note:\*Job Ambiguity is a positive predictor of Affective Professional Commitment and negative predictor of Normative Professional Commitment.

Figure 9.2 shows a set of significant predictors of professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre in Bangladesh. Job security, promotional opportunity, family support and job overload are only factors which influenced the three dimension of professional commitment. Promotional opportunity and job overload negatively influenced the officers' commitment which means the limitation of promotional facilities and boring on job overload. Job security, promotional opportunity, justice & equity, career development, family support, job overload and job ambiguity influenced officers' attachment and sense of belonging to their profession. Job security, promotional opportunity, collegial relation, family support, job overload and job conflict influence CPC of the cadre officers' which suggests that officers are willing to endure limited facility due to limited alternative job opportunity. Job security, promotional opportunity, justice & equity, career development, collegial relation, family support, job overload, job conflict and job ambiguity influenced officers' loyalty and obligation to remain in their profession.

### **9.3 Conclusion**

The main objective of this study was to evaluate the levels of job satisfaction and professional commitment of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre and to analyze the factors that impact the job satisfaction and professional commitment of them. This study has found that the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre are satisfied with recruitment system, job security, collegial relation, logistics support, family support, job load, job conflict, job autonomy, feedback, coworker support and are low satisfied with posting & transfer, promotion opportunity, training, salary & benefits, performance appraisal, career development, community support, social status, and

task variety. The study has also examined the relationship between dependent variables and independent variables.

Officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre, the indispensable part of the education sector providing their service to make the future generation knowledge based human resources. They have the responsibility to develop a well educated nation. So the officers of education cadre must be well conversant and have deep knowledge in respective subjects. Conducive service environment and justice at every stage of service inspire them to deliver better and honest service. Regular promotion and timely selection grade can motivate them highly. The uniformity and fair practice in respect of promotion, posting and giving selection grade need to build the BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre as an efficient workforce. Though education is an important sector of the country, government of the country is not cordial enough for welfare of the education cadre. So, necessary initiative should be taken in the greater interest of education and nation.

#### **9.4 Policy Implication**

Findings reported in the present study have several practical implications for BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre in Bangladesh. The study has found out the level of job satisfaction and professional commitment of the general educational cadre officers and perception regarding the job related factors. This study also has identified several demographic, HRM, institutional, job stressors and job characteristics variables which impact job satisfaction and professional commitment.

To enhance job satisfaction and commitment and to improve overall performance of the general education cadre officers, following suggestions are made for the policy makers.

1. Several types of appointment system create many intra cadre problems in the education cadre in Bangladesh. So the appointment of the officer should be only the direct recruitment process through Public Service Commission (PSC). In case of nationalization of private college, absorbed teachers should be treated as non-cadre officers and their seniority should be counted separately.
2. A sound and effective posting & transfer policy need to be formulated which will ensure the right person in the right position in this cadre. The policy should also provide opportunity for every officer to serve each type of institute (Master's College, Degree College, Madrasha, TTC, Commercial Inst.) and each type of location (Metropolitan, District Sadar, Upazila Sadar and Rural.).
3. Promotion procedure and promotional opportunities have a positive relationship with job satisfaction and professional commitment and this study has shown the same in education cadre. Promotion related problems frustrate the cadre officers. So here are some suggestions that can minimize the problems.
  - Batch basis promotion should be practiced instead of subject basis promotion.
  - On time promotion is needed to develop the satisfaction of the officers.
  - Up-gradation of existing post and creation of new post.
  - Practice of In situ promotion should be continued.
  - Posting only the education cadre officer on the scheduled post of education cadre.
4. Effective training develops psychological attachment, willingness to contribute, skill and subjective knowledge. Well-designed training policies, sufficient subjective training program, qualified trainers are very important for

effective training program. It is suggested that authority systematically develop training system to ensure that the officers of education cadre attain and maintain appropriate levels of skills related to the basics of teaching and service.

5. Data from this study showed that BCS general education cadre officers were less satisfied with their salary and benefits. It is therefore suggested that the government endeavour to build a competitive and motivational individual salary structure for the education cadre. Sufficient medical facilities, transportation facilities for family; housing facilities; sufficient loan facilities are needed in the education cadre. Rural allowance like Hill track allowance should be introduced for staying the officers at rural areas. Non financial motivation like appreciation, conducive work environment to be provided to honour the education cadre officers.
6. The authority should provide facilities to the cadre officers to attend research work, seminar, conference and workshop for their career development.
7. Fair salary and benefits comparing to other same class job should be offered. Justice in posting & transfer, in promotion and in training are important for improve the level of satisfaction and commitment of the education cadre officers.
8. Performance appraisal system is one of the most problematic HRM activities in government employees in Bangladesh. The present appraisal system (ACR) is very important for confirming the officer and their promotion. Many clause of the present ACR form are ambiguous and unnecessary to the job. It is suggested to develop clear performance indicators and clause related to

officer's responsibility to ensure the accuracy of assessment. It is also suggested to train the appraisers about the assessment.

9. Data from the study indicate that weak morale problem exist among the education cadre officers. It is suggested to arrange morale training for the officers, to practice democracy in college, to ensure accountability and transparency in financial matters.
10. Dignity of teachers should be addressed socially, nationally and politically.
11. This study has found that job stressors had a negative impact on job satisfaction and professional commitment. Authority should adopt strategies such as regular and extensive communication between officers and controlling officers so that potential job conflict, overload and ambiguity can be identified. Management should focus on autonomy, feedback and clear job description to improve the performance. Optimal class size is important to avoid excessive workload.
12. Scope of multifarious activities like plantation, debating program, seminar, sports, anti-drugs council etc should be arranged to avoid monotony of routine work.

## **9.5 Limitations of the Study**

As like other studies, this research has some limitations which should be taken cognizance. Findings of the study should be interpreted with caution due to those weak points.

Firstly, the surveyed officers were only from general education cadre of Bangladesh. Therefore, the findings of this study cannot be generalized to other cadre services or to other sectors such as manufacturing, banking and service.

Secondly, this study has covered only job satisfaction and professional commitment issues of organizational behavior.

Thirdly, this study is based on the current position and situation of the respondents regarding some distinct factors. It did not consider the past position and future expectations about the service.

Finally, due to time and cost constraints, the research was conducted on selected institution of selected districts in Bangladesh.

## **9.6 Contribution to Knowledge**

This study has contributed to present knowledge in various ways. This study is an addition to earlier research about the relationship between several distinct variables and two work related attitudes named job satisfaction and professional commitment. The study has shown that job satisfaction and professional commitment are important to employees irrespective of their service sector. Besides, this study provides a picture of job satisfaction and professional commitment level of the officers of BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre in Bangladesh. Finally, this study extends the body of knowledge by analyzing impact of personal factors, HRM practice, institutional aspects, job stressors and job characteristics on the job satisfaction and professional commitment among BCS general education cadre officers which have rarely been analyzed in prior research in a single study.

## **9.7 Directions for Future Research**

After successfully completion of the objectives of this study, several areas remain unclear and require to be addressed by future researcher. This study can be used as a stepping stone for further exploratory research towards a more clear understanding of job satisfaction and professional commitment.

A comparative study may be undertaken between male and female officers in same cadre or between general education cadre and other cadre.

This study confined itself to selected BCS (Gen. Ed.) cadre in Bangladesh. Same type of research should be extended to other BCS cadre and to other sectors such as universities, banking, and health service.

Finding of this study indicates that social status of the education cadre officers are decreasing. So, reasons behind those and perception of the society to BCS general education cadre service may be the important area of future research.

Finally, this study has considered some selected demographic, HRM, intuitional and job related variables to analyze job satisfaction and professional commitment. This aim also indicates that political and legal factors are important determinant of job satisfaction and commitment. Therefore, the inclusion of such factors in a single study or separately would further enhance our understanding of the factors influencing job satisfaction and professional commitment.



## Bibliography

### Books

- Abedin, M. Zainul. *A Handbook of Research*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed.; Dhaka: Book Syndicate, 2010.
- Ahmed, S.G. *Public Personnel Administration in Bangladesh*. Dhaka: The City Press, 1986.
- Ali, A.M.M. S. *Civil Service Management in Bangladesh*. Dhaka: University Press Limited, 2007.
- Ali, A.M.M. S. *Bangladesh Civil Service: A Political-Administrative Perspective*. Dhaka: University Press Limited, 2004.
- Aminuzzaman, S. M. *Introduction to Social Research*. Dhaka: Bangladesh Publisher, 1991.
- Arnold, H. J. and Feldman, D. C. *Organizational Behaviour*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1986.
- Bernard, H.R. *Research Methods in Anthropology: Qualitative and quantitative methods*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed.; Walnut Creek, California: AltaMira Press, 2002.
- Blum, M. and Naylor, J. *Industrial Psychology: It's Theoretical and Social Foundation*. New York: Harper and Row, 1986.
- Colman, A.M. *Oxford Dictionary of Psychology*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Davis Keith. *Human Behaviour at Work: Organizational Behaviour*. New Delhi: Tata McGraw Hill, 1977.
- Dessler, G. *Personnel management*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed.; New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc.1988.
- Dwivedi, R. S. *Human Relation and Organizational Behaviour*. New Delhi: Oxford and JBH Publishing Company, 1979.
- Gordon, J. R. *A Diagnostic Approach to Organizational Behaviour*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1987.

- Haque, A. S. *Paradoxes in Public Administration Dimension of Development*. Dhaka: The University Press Limited, 1990.
- Herzberg, F. *Work and the nature of man*. Cleveland: World Publishing, 1966.
- Hood, C. and Lodge, M. *Politics of Public Service Bargains*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Hoppock, R. *Job Satisfaction*. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1935.
- Islam, S. M. *Motivational Intervention in Productivity Improvement*. Dhaka: Bangladesh Public Administration Training Centre, 2002.
- Jayakumar, R. *Organizational Behaviour*. 1<sup>st</sup> Ed.; Chennai: Margam Publications, 2006.
- Khan, M.M. *Administrative Reforms in Bangladesh*. Dhaka: University Press Limited, 1998.
- Khandwalla, P. *Organizational Designs for Excellence*. New Delhi: Tata McGraw Hill publishing company Ltd., 1992.
- Kothari, C. R. *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques*. 5<sup>th</sup> ed. New Delhi: Wiley Eastern Limited, 1985.
- Locke, E.A. *The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction*. Chicago IL: Rand McNally, 1976.
- Luthans, F. *Organizational behavior*. 9<sup>th</sup> ed.; New York: McGraw-Hill, 2002.
- Maslow, A.H. *Motivation and personality*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.; New York: Harper and Row, 1970.
- Memoria, C.B. and Gankar, S. V. *Personnel Management: Text and Cases*. Mumbai: Himaloya Publishing House, 2004.
- Mia, Firoz. *Bangladesh Service Rules Part-1 & Part-2*. 16<sup>th</sup> ed.; Dhaka: Raddur Publisher, 2008.
- Mia, Firoz. *Service Rules*. 40<sup>th</sup> ed.; Dhaka: Raddur Publisher, 2010.
- Morshed. *Bureaucratic Response to Administrative decentralization*, Dhaka: University Press Ltd., 1987.

- Nardi, P.M. *Doing Survey Research: A Guide to Quantitative Methods*. Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, 2003.
- Pestonjee, D.M. *Organizational Structure and Job Attitudes*. Kolkata: The Minerva Associates, 1973.
- Rao Kamaleshwar. *Job Satisfaction and Work Motivation*. Jaipur: Print well Publishers, 1996.
- Robbins Stephen P. and Judge Timothy A. *Organizational Behavior*. 13<sup>th</sup> ed.: New Delli: Printic Hall of India Private Ltd., 2009.
- Shawkat A. M. M. Ali. *Bangladesh Civil Service: A Political Administrative Perspective*. Dhaka: University Press Limited, 2004.
- Spector, P.E. *Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes and Consequences*. California: SAGE Publication Inc., 1997.
- Turabian, K. L. *A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses, and Dissertations*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1972.
- Usha Sharma and Sharma B.M. *Women and Professionals*. New Delhi: Commonwealth Publishers, 1995.
- Vroom, V.H. *Work and motivation*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964.

### **Journal Articles**

- Absar Md. Nurul, et al. "Impact of Human Resource Practice on Job Satisfaction: Evidence from Manufacturing Firms in Bangladesh." *Economic Science Series*, Vol.12, No.2, (2010).
- Abu-Bader and H. Soleman. "Work satisfaction, burnout, and turnover among social Workers in Israel: A casual diagram." *International Journal of social welfare*, 9(3),(July,2000).[http://journals.ohiolink.edu/ejc/article.cgi?issn=13696866&issue=v09i0003&article=191\\_wsbatawiiacd](http://journals.ohiolink.edu/ejc/article.cgi?issn=13696866&issue=v09i0003&article=191_wsbatawiiacd) (accessed on Nov 12, 2012)

- Ahsan Nilufar et al. "A Study of Job Stress on Job Satisfaction among University Staff in Malaysia: Empirical Study." *European Journal of Social Sciences*, Volume 8, Number 1 (2009).
- Ali Taskina and Akther Ireen. "Job Satisfaction of Faculty Officers in Private University-In Context of Bangladesh." *International Business Research*, vol. 2, no.4, (October, 2009).
- Allen, N. J. & Meyer, J.P. "The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organisation." *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, (1990)
- Angelo, J. et al. "Psychological and Physical Well-Being During Unemployment: A Meta- Analytic Study." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90 (1), (2005).
- Bagraim Jeffrey J. "The Dimensionality of Professional Commitment." *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 29 (2) (2003).
- Christensen, T and Lagreid, P. "Trust in Government: The Relative Importance of Service Satisfaction, Political Factors, and Demography." *Public Performance & Management Review*, [ejournal]28 (4), Available through: JSTOR (2005) <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3381308> [Accessed 06 October 2011]
- Creswel, W. J. "Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods," SAGE publication. *Academy of Management Review* 2007, Vol. 32, No. 2, (2003).
- Debnath, A.K., Barmon, B.K. and Biswas, M. "Motivation of Civil Servants in Bangladesh: A Comparative Study of Technical Cadres and Administrative cadres." *World Review of Business Research*, [Online]1(4). (2011). Available at: <www.wbiaus.org> [Accessed 23 august, 2013].
- Faruqui G. A. and Islam S. "Evaluation of faculty's job satisfaction in private universities." *Journal of Business Studies*, 1(2), (2005).

- Glisson, C. and Durick, M. "Predictors of Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment in Human Service Organizations." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, [e-journal] 33(1), (1988). Available through: JSTOR<  
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2392855>> [Accessed 06 October, 2013].
- Griffin, G. R., Dunbar, R. and McGill, M. "Factors associated with job satisfaction among police personnel." *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 6, (1978)
- Haque, A. S. and Firowz, A. "Public Personnel Administration: Tradition, Problems and Issues in Bangladesh." *Asian Journal of Public Administration*, 14(1), (1992).
- Haque, A. B. M. Z. "Quality of Working Life and Job Satisfaction of Industrial Workers in relation with the size of the Organization." *Bangladesh Journal of psychological studies*, 2(1), (1992),
- Haque K. E. et al, "Impact of Teachers' Professional Development of School Development- An Analysis on Bangladesh Standpoint", *Asia Pacific Educ. Rev.* (2011).
- Harrison et al. "How Important are Job Attitudes? Meta-Analytic Comparisons of Integrative Behavioral Outcomes and Time Sequences." *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 49, No. 2, (2006)
- Hasan M. S., et al. "Job satisfaction and Training for Organizational Effectiveness: An Empirical Study on Bangladesh Civil Service Officers." *Journal of BPATC*, (2010).
- Hossain, M.M. "Job Satisfaction and Job Behavior of Private Sector Industries and Supervisors in Bangladesh." *Bangladesh Journal of psychological studies*, 13, (1992).
- Hossain, M.H. "Job Satisfaction of Industrial workers in Bangladesh: A Study of Textile Enterprises." *The Journal of Management Studies*, 1(8 & 9), (2003).
- Jessen, J.T. "Job satisfaction and social rewards in the social services." *Journal of Comparative Social Work*, Norwegian Social Research (NOVA), Norway, .(2010).

- Kamal, Y. and Ferdousi, M. "Job satisfaction: A study on different Types of Job in Bangladesh." *The Bangladesh Accountant*, 61(34), (2008).
- Kalleberg, A.L. "Work values and job rewards: a theory of job satisfaction." *American Sociological Review*, 42(February, 1977).
- Kernbach, S. and Schutte, N.S. "The impact of service provider emotional intelligence on customer satisfaction." *Journal of Services Marketing*, 19(7), (2005).
- Khaleque, A. and Rahman, M.A. "Perceived importance of job facets and overall job Satisfaction of industrial workers." *Human Relations*, 40 (7), (1987).
- Kim, S. "Participative Management and Job Satisfaction: Lessons for Management Leadership." *Public Administration Review*, (2002). [e-journal] 62(2), Available through: JSTOR<<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3109906>> [Accessed 22 October 2012].
- Kim, S.M. "Individual-level Factors and Organizational Performance in Government Organizations." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 15 (2), (2005).
- Kinicki, A.J., McKee-Ryan, F.M., Schriesheim, C.A. & Carson, K.P. 'Assessing the construct validity of the Job Descriptive Index: A review and meta-analysis.' *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), (2002). available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11916208> [Accessed on 22 October, 14]
- Koh, H.C. and Boo, E.H.Y. "The Link between Organizational Ethics and Job Satisfaction: A Study of Managers in Singapore." *Journal of Business Ethics*, [e-journal] 2 (special issue on work), (2001). Available through: JSTOR <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/25074465>> [Accessed 22 October, 2014].
- Lambert E. G. and Hogan N. "The importance of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in shaping turnover intent: A test of a causal model." *Criminal Justice Review*, 34 (1) (2009).

- Liebenberg, J. and Barnes, N. "Factors Influencing A Customer-Service Culture in a Higher Education Environment." *Journal of Human Resource Management*, (2004).
- Mamun Md. Ziaul Haque, Hossain Anwar and Islam Nazrul. "A Comparative Study of Job Satisfaction of the Senior Male and Female Executives I Bangladesh." *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 7, Dept. of Business Administration, Jahangirnagar University, Dhaka. (2005).
- McCue,C.P. and Gianakis,G. A. "The Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Performance: The Case of Local Government Finance Officers in Ohio." *Public Productivity & Management Review*, .(1997). [e-journal] 21(2), Available through: JSTOR <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3380882>> [Accessed 06 October,2013].
- Mostakim, G. "The need for Career Planning in Public Sector Organizations." *Bangladesh Journal of Public Administration*, Vol.vii, no.i & ii, Dhaka (1999).
- Mottaz C. J. "An Analysis of the Relationship between Work Satisfaction and Organizational Behavior", *The Sociological Quarterly*, 28 (4), (1987).
- Nagy, M.S. "Using a single-item approach to measure facet job satisfaction." *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 75(1), (2002).
- Nel,W. and Haycock, E. "Service Excellence: Customer Satisfaction Measurement in Local Government." *Greeners Journals Industries*. [Online] Available at: [http://soc.kuleuven.be/io/performance/paper/WS4/WS4\\_Nel\\_Haycock.pdf](http://soc.kuleuven.be/io/performance/paper/WS4/WS4_Nel_Haycock.pdf) [Accessed 11September 2013].71
- Park, S.M. and Rainey, H.G. "Antecedents, Mediators, and Consequences of Affective, Normative, and Continuance Commitment: Empirical Tests of Commitment Effects in Federal Agencies." *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 27, ( 2007).
- Poister,T.H. and Harris, R.H. "Service Delivery Impacts of TQM: A Preliminary Investigation." *Public Productivity & Management Review*, .(1996). [e-journal] 20 (1),Available through: JSTOR < <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3380605>> [Accessed 22 October,2014].

- Pronay Bala. "Job Satisfaction of Non-government College Teacher in Bangladesh," *Journal of Education and Practice*, Vol. 2 No. 4, (2011).
- Rahman, M. Mizanur and Chowdhury, M.. Solaiman. "Job Satisfaction and Teachers Turnover: A Study on Private Universities in Bangladesh." *Bangladesh Research Publications Journal*, Vol. 7, Issues. 2, (Agust,2012).
- Rifayat, M., Rasul, M. Tauhid, and Ullah G.M. Wali. "Analysis of the Factors that Affect on Satisfaction Case Study on Private Companies Employees of Bangladesh", *European Journal of Business and Management*. V. 4 No. 4, (2012). [www.iiste.org](http://www.iiste.org), ( accessed on 10, Nov,2012)
- Saari, L. M. and Judge, T. "AN EMPLOYEE ATTITUDES AND JOB SATISFACTION." *Human Resource Management*, 43(4), (2004).
- Sukamolson, S. "Fundamentals of Quantitative Research Language Institute."(n.d) Available at: <http://www.culi.chula.ac.th/e-Journal/bod/Suphat%20Sukamolson.pdf> [Accessed 15 October 2013].
- Schneider, B. and Dachler, H.P. "A note on the stability of the job descriptive index." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, (1978).
- Smith, B.D. "Job retention in child welfare: Effects of perceived organizational support, supervisor support, and intrinsic job value." *Children and Youth Services Review*, 27, (2005).
- Vandenabeele, W., Deprė, R., Hannagan, A. and Yan, S. "The Motivational Patterns of Civil Servants." *VIEŠOJI POLITIKA IR ADMINISTRAVIMAS*,13, (2004).
- Vandenberg R. J. and Scarpello V. "A longitudinal assessment of the determinant Relationship between employee commitment to the occupation and the organization", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 15.(1994)
- Vermeeren, B., Kuipers, B. and Steijn, B. "The Two Faces of the Satisfaction Mirror: A Study of Work Environment, Job Satisfaction and Customer Satisfaction in Dutch Municipalities." *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, (2011).



- Wright, B. E. and Kim, S. "Participation's Influence on Job Satisfaction: The Importance of Job Characteristics." *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 24, (2004).
- Yang, K. and Pandey, S. "How do perceived political environment and administrative Reform affect employee commitment. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 19(2), (2009).
- Yang, K. and Kassekert, A. "Linking Management Reform with Employee Job Satisfaction: Evidence from Federal Agencies. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 20, (2009).
- Yee, R.W.Y., Yeung, A.C.L. and Cheng, T.C.E. "The Impact of Employee Satisfaction on Quality and Profitability in High-contact Service Industries. *Journal of Operations Management*, (2008). [Online] Available at <<http://www.business.uzh.ch/professorships/som/stu/Teaching/HS09/doc/sem1/YeYeungCheng2008.pdf>> [Accessed 18 September 2013].
- Zafarullah H. and Haque A.S. "Public Management for Good Governance: Reforms, Regimes, and Reality in Bangladesh". *International Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. 24, No. 12. (2001)

### Website

- Kim, P. S. and Monem, M. *Civil service Reform in Bangladesh: All Pay but hardly Any Work*. (nd). [Online] Available at: <<http://www.irspm2008.bus.qut.edu.au/>> [Accessed 18 September 2012].
- Norris, P. *Still a Public Service ethos? Work Values, Experience and Job Satisfaction Among Government Workers*. (2004). [Online] Available at <<http://ksghome.harvard.edu/~pnorris/acrobat/public/coservice.pdf>> [Accessed 18 September 2011]
- Pandey, P.K. and Wright, E. W. *Public Service Motivation and the Assumption of Person—Organization Fit: Testing the Mediating Effect of Value Congruence*. (2006). [Online] Available at: <[aas.sagepub.com/content/40/5/502.full.pdf](http://aas.sagepub.com/content/40/5/502.full.pdf)> [Accessed 23 august 2011].

## **Dissertation/Thesis**

- Butt Zahir Uddin. "The Relationship between Occupational Stress and Organizational Commitment in Nongovernmental Organization of Pakistan." PhD diss. National University of Modern Language Islamabad, 2009. <http://eprints.hec.gov.pk/7207/> (accessed on 16 June 2012).
- Chakraborty, D. "Career Planning in Bangladesh Civil Service (Administration) Cadre: A Critical Assessment." MA Thesis (unpublished), IGS, BRAC University, Dhaka. (2008).
- Gokhan Tahir. "An Integrative Model of Job Characteristics, Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment and Organizational Citizenship Behavior", PhD diss. Middle East Technical University, 2006. <https://etd.lib.metu.edu.tr/upload/12607347/index.pdf>, (accessed on 26 June 2012)
- Kadyschuk Ronald. "Teacher Commitment: A study of the Organizational Commitment, Professional Commitment, and Union Commitment of Teachers in Public Schools in Saskatchewan", PhD diss, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, 1997. <http://library.usask.ca/theses/available/etd-10212004-000011/unrestricted/nq23977.pdf>, (accessed on 20 July, 2012).
- Karim, M.R. "Enhancing Performance through Motivation: A Study of Bangladesh Civil Service." MA Thesis (unpublished), Institute of Governance Studies, Brac University: Dhaka, (2009).
- Kipkebut Dinah Jeruto. "Organisational Commitment and Job satisfaction in higher educational institutions: the Kenyan case", PhD diss. Middlesex University, 2010, <http://eprints.mdx.ac.uk/6509/> (accessed on 26 June, 2012)
- Myers Karen . "Factors Affecting Job Satisfaction and Retention of Beginning Teacher", PhD diss. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 2005. <http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/theses/available/etd-11152005-2907/unrestricted/final.pdf>, (accessed on 9 May, 2012)

Sarker,P. “*The Role of the Upazila Nirbahi Officer (UNO) in Coordination Process at Upazila Administration in Bangladesh,*” Master’s Thesis. North South University, Dhaka. (2011).

Siddika Mir Taifa. “Job Satisfaction: A study on Civil Servant Working at Field Level in Bangladesh”. Masters Thesis, North South University, Bangladesh, 2012.

Tasnim, S. “*Job Satisfaction among Female Teachers: A study on primary schools in Bangladesh*”. Masters Thesis. University of Bergen, Norway, (2006). Available at: <<http://hdl.handle.net/1956/1474>> [Accessed 16 September 2013].

### **Working Paper**

Chaudhury, N. and Hammer, J. S. "Ghost Doctors: Doctor Absenteeism in Bangladeshi Health Centers." *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper* 3065, (2003).

Jahan, F. Public Administration in Bangladesh, CGS Working Paper-1, BRAC University, Dhaka. (2006). Available at: <[www.cgs-bu.com](http://www.cgs-bu.com)> [ Accessed 3 March 2012).

### **Report**

Hasan, M.S. et al. Job satisfaction and Training for Organizational Effectiveness: An Empirical Study on Bangladesh Civil Service Officers, BPATC, Dhaka,(2010).

Bangladesh Bureau of Educational Information and Statistics (BANBEIS), Ministry of Education, Dhaka.

Government of the Peoples Republic of Bangladesh, Cabinet Division, GoB,Dhaka.

## Appendix A

### LETTER OF INTRODUCTION AND QUESTIONNAIRE

#### LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

Dear Sir/Madam,

**Sub: Questionnaire for BCS (Gen. Ed) Cadre**

I am a member of BCS (Gen. Ed) cadre currently pursuing Ph.D. studies at IBS, Rajshahi University. The title of my study is “**Job Satisfaction and Professional commitment: A Study on Bangladesh Civil Service General Education Cadre**”. A questionnaire has been developed addressing some factors related to your job satisfaction and your commitment to your profession. Please complete the questionnaire based on your experience.

Your institution has been selected purposively to participate in this study and consequently, you have been selected as a respondent through a sample procedure. Your assistances are essential in developing a general picture of the issues.

I assure you that the information you provide will only be used for research purposes and will be treated with strict **CONFIDENTIALITY**. If you have any queries about this study, please contact me on the address below. I humbly beg your kind cooperation for helping the research work by sharing your valuable opinion and work experience.

Thank you very much.

Md. Wahiduzzaman

Ph.D. Fellow (2011-12)

Institute of Bangladesh Studies (IBS)

Rajshahi University.

&

Lecturer (Management)

BCS (Gen. Ed.) Cadre. ID. No. 016891

E-mail: [wzamanmgt@yahoo.com](mailto:wzamanmgt@yahoo.com)

Mob: 01712687245

## QUESTIONNAIRE

### SECTION ONE (Demographic Factors)

**Please complete the following section which asks for about you and your job.**

|    |   |
|----|---|
| 1  | <b>Name:</b>  |
| 2  | <b>Basic Designation (Please tick):</b> Professor /Associate Professor / Assistant Professor<br>/Lecturer   |
| 3  | <b>Discipline:</b>  |
| 4  | <b>Type of Appointment (Please tick):</b> PSC / BCS (batch).../ 10% Quota / Nationalized  |
| 5  | <b>Name of your Institution (College/Office) :</b>  |
| 6  | <b>Location of the Institution (Please tick):</b> Metropolitan / Municipal / Rural  |
| 7  | <b>Occupational Group (Please tick):</b> Academic staff / Administrative staff  |
| 8  | <b>Occupational Designation (Administrative staff only, such as Principal/ VP/ AD..):</b>   |
| 9  | <b>Gender (Please tick):</b> Male / Female  |
| 10 | <b>Age:</b> [Below 30] / [30 – 39] / [40 – 49] / [50 and above]   |
| 11 | <b>Marital status:</b> Single / Married / Other (Please specify)  |
| 12 | <b>Length of your present profession:</b> [0 – 4] / [5 – 10] / [11 – 15] / [16 and above]   |
| 13 | <b>Length of your current position?</b> [Below 1 year] / [1 – 4] / [5 – 10] / [11 and above]  |
| 14 | <b>Please select the highest educational qualification you hold from below:</b> Bachelor's degree / Masters/ M. Phil / M. Phil(Ongoing ) / Ph.D./ Ph. D (Ongoing)/others (Please specify)               |
| 15 | <b>Please specify if you are involved in any income generating activities such as:</b> Part time lecturing (e.g. other institutions), Consultancies, Coaching, Private Tuition, Other (Please specify): |

**SECTION TWO (Job Satisfaction Statements)**

**Please indicate the extent to which you are satisfied or dissatisfied with the following aspects of your job by marking the appropriate box. Kindly answer all the statements. Use the scales as shown below:**

**1**                      **2**                      **3**                      **4**                      **5**  
**Extremely**          **Dissatisfied**      **Neither Satisfied**      **Satisfied**          **Extremely**  
**Dissatisfied**                      **nor Dissatisfied**                      **Satisfied**

|    |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1  | The physical work conditions  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2  | The freedom to choose your own method of working                                    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3  | Your attitude to fellow colleagues  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4  | The recognition you get for good work   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5  | Perception to your immediate boss   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6  | The amount of responsibility you are given  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7  | Your present salary structure   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8  | The opportunity to use your abilities   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9  | Union relationship between the administration and members in your profession        | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10 | Your chance of promotion  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11 | Your posting and transfer system  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12 | Your performance appraisal system (ACR).  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13 | The way your institution is managed   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14 | The present social status of your profession  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15 | Your hours of work  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16 | The amount of variety in your job   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17 | Your job security   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 18 | <i>Now, considering everything, how satisfied are you with your job in general?</i> | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

**SECTION THREE (Professional Commitment Statements)**

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements by marking the appropriate boxes. Use the scales as follows:

|                          |                 |                                   |              |                       |
|--------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|-----------------------|
| <b>1</b>                 | <b>2</b>        | <b>3</b>                          | <b>4</b>     | <b>5</b>              |
| <b>Strongly Disagree</b> | <b>Disagree</b> | <b>Neither agree nor disagree</b> | <b>Agree</b> | <b>Strongly Agree</b> |

|                                   |  |   |   |   |   |   |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1                                 | I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this Profession  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2                                 | I really enjoy telling people what a wonderful profession my job is  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3                                 | I always feel as if this profession's problems are my own  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4                                 | I feel a lot of emotional attachment to my profession  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5                                 | My profession has a great deal of personal meaning for me  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6                                 | I feel a strong sense of belonging to my profession  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7                                 | It would be very hard for me to leave my profession right now, even if I wanted to   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8                                 | Too much in my life would be disrupted if I wanted to leave my profession now  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9                                 | Right now, staying with my profession is a matter of necessity   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10                                | I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving my job in this profession   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11                                | I would not leave working for my profession right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it             | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12                                | Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave working in my profession right now               | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13                                | I do not feel any sense of obligation to remain with my current profession   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14                                | I owe a great deal of loyalty to my profession considering all it has done for me (e.g. training, medical assistance, etc) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15                                | I would feel guilty if I left my profession right now  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16                                | I believe that this profession deserves my loyalty   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| <b>SECTION FOUR (HRM Factors)</b> |  |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1                                 | The recruitment and selection processes in this cadre are fair   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2                                 | Posting and Transfer policy is fair in this cadre.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

|    |  |   |   |   |   |   |
|----|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3  | My posting place is appropriate  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4  | Persuasion is needed for better Posting  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5  | Transfer and Posting Policy should be based on academic qualification, merit and job experience    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6  | I am secured in my job   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7  | Regardless of economic conditions, I will continue to have a job in my profession                  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8  | I have a good chance to get ahead in this profession   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9  | I have the opportunity for further advancement in my profession                                    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10 | Promotions are based on rules rather than skills and competency.                                   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11 | I have been well-trained by the profession for my present job                                      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12 | There are many training opportunities offered by my profession to help me to perform my job better | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13 | I am paid a great deal of money for performing my job  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14 | I get regular salary raises in my profession   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15 | I make a considerable amount of money on my job  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16 | In total, my cash compensation is quite small  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17 | I need additional income to make ends meet   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 18 | I am satisfied with my pay relative (compared) to other employees with similar rank.               | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 19 | I am satisfied with my pay relative to other employees outside this cadre with similar jobs        | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 20 | I am rewarded fairly for the amount of effort that I put in my job                                 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 21 | I am rewarded fairly considering the responsibilities I have                                       | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 22 | I am not rewarded fairly in view of my experience  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 23 | Overall, the rewards I receive in this profession are quite fair                                   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 24 | I am satisfied with the way my profession provides me with feedback on my performance              | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 25 | I think that my profession attempts to conduct performance appraisals in the fairest way possible  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 26 | Prevailing ACR system is useful for performance appraisal  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 27 | New kind of performance appraisal is needed  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 28 | All important information about the profession is communicated to members of cadre                 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |



|  |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 29   | My profession is supportive in developing the careers of its members                        | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 30   | I am satisfied with the success I have achieved in my career since I joined this profession | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 31   | I am satisfied with the progress I have made towards achieving my overall career goals      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| <b>SECTION FIVE (Internal &amp; External Factors of Institution)</b> |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1  | We have a good interpersonal relation within colleague.                                     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2  | My colleagues are cordial to solve the problems of each other.                              | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3  | All the staff posses' strong morality.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4  | The students/ clients of the institution are well behaved.                                  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5  | The quality of the students has an impact on teacher's performance.                         | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6  | The result of the institution influences the staff satisfaction.                            | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7  | Sufficient classroom facilities are essential for proper class management.                  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8  | The institution provides sufficient ICT support that you need.                              | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9  | You are supplied sufficient materials for your work.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10   | My parents inspired me to be a member of this profession.                                   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11   | I am satisfied with family support in my profession.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12   | I am honored in my community as a member of education cadre.                                | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13   | My community prefers other profession that has more financial benefit.                      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14   | I think the social status of this profession is changing.                                   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15   | I am satisfied with the present social status as a member of education cadres               | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16   | The house hold expenditures of my job station are comparatively higher.                     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17   | My income is sufficient enough to meet up my all needs in the job station.                  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| <b>SECTION SIX (Job Stressors &amp; Characteristics)</b>             |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1  | I am given enough time to do what is expected of me on the job                              | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2  | It seems to me that I have too much work for one person to do                               | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3  | I often have to work extra hours because of staff shortages                                 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4  | I have the freedom to do pretty much what I want on my job                                  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

|    |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5  | I have the opportunity for independent thought and action on my job   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6  | I work pretty much by myself when performing my tasks   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7  | I receive sufficient feedback from my boss on how well I am doing my job  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8  | I have the opportunity to find out how well I am doing on my job  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9  | I have adequate information to know whether I am performing my job well or poorly                               | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10 | I have the opportunity to do a number of different things in my job   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11 | There is a considerable amount of variety in my job   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12 | I sometimes have to break a rule or policy in order to carry out an assignment                                  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13 | I receive an assignment without adequate resources or materials to carry it out                                 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14 | I have clear, planned goals and objectives for my job   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15 | I know what my responsibilities are in the work place   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16 | There is clear explanation of what has to be done in my job   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17 | There is a lack of adequate policies and guidelines in my profession to help me in my job                       | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 18 | My co-workers are helpful in getting my job done  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 19 | My co-workers provide me with important work-related information and advice that make performing my work easier | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 20 | My co-workers can be relied upon when things get tough on my job  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 21 | The Head of my Department/Institution cares about my opinions   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 22 | The Head of my Department/ Institution lets me know how well I am performing my job                             | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 23 | When I feel problem in my job, I can rely on the Head of my Department/ Institution for help                    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

**Please mention bellow, if you have any comments or suggestion about the issues. All suggestions will be valuable in the final outcomes of this study.**

***Thank You for Your Kind Cooperation to Complete This Questionnaire.***

## Appendix B

### Session of Focus Group Discussion (FGD) and Checklist

| No. | Venue                                    | No. of Participants |  |
|-----|--|---------------------|--|
| 1   | BCS (Gen. Ed.) Association Office, Dhaka | 15                  |  |
| 2   | New Govt. Degree College, Rajshahi       | 10                  |  |
| 3   | Kushtia Govt. Girls College, Kushtia     | 12                  |  |
| 4   | Govt. Shah Sultan College, Bogra.        | 14                  |  |

### A Checklist

**Title: Job Satisfaction and Professional Commitment: A Study on BCS  
(Gen. Ed.) Cadre**

1. Do you find your job satisfying enough, and are you happy with your profession? Which aspects give you the most satisfaction?
2. Do you think that satisfaction and commitment level differ in relation to personal factors? (Such as appointment type, college category, location of the college, age, gender etc)
3. What is your opinion about selection, posting and transfer system of this cadre? (Is the selection process is fair, is there any appropriate & applicable transfer policy?)
4. Are you satisfied with your present salary structure?  
  
Considering your skill, responsibility, effort, do you think your present salary is satisfactory and comparable to people of similar qualification in Bangladesh?  
  
How can this be improved?
5. Can you describe the promotion prospect in this cadre?  
  
Are you satisfied with it? (if not, why)

What is your suggestion to improve the promotion procedure?

6. In your opinion, do you think that the training provided to this cadre is appropriate and adequate?
7. What is your evaluation regarding performance appraisal (ACR) system?
8. Do you satisfy with your status as a cadre?  
Does it earn you respect among family, friends and society?  
Does it affect your commitment to your profession?
9. In your opinion, what are the aspects of your job station impact your satisfaction and commitment? (such as intra colleague relation, infrastructure, students behavior, etc)
10. Do you feel your job is monotonous? Why?
11. Is there any opportunity to prove your creativity in your job? Please specify.
12. Do you think that the members of this cadre are loyal to the profession and they feel the cadre's problems are own?
13. Please specify any other issues that impact job satisfaction and commitment of the members of this cadre.

Thank you for kind cooperation.

## Appendix C

Summary of Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients for study variables

| SL. No. | Variables                  | No. of Items | Reliability Coefficient Alpha |
|---------|----------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|
| 1       | Overall Job Satisfaction   | 17           | .804                          |
| 2       | Extrinsic Job Satisfaction | (9)          | .618                          |
| 3       | Intrinsic Job Satisfaction | (8)          | .712                          |
| 4       | Affective Commitment       | 6            | .804                          |
| 5       | Continuous Commitment      | 4            | .717                          |
| 6       | Normative Commitment       | 6            | .601                          |
| 7       | Recruitment & Selection    | 1            | **                            |
| 8       | Posting and Transfer       | 4            | .512                          |
| 9       | Job Security               | 2            | .375                          |
| 10      | Promotion opportunity      | 3            | .574                          |
| 11      | Training                   | 2            | .600                          |
| 12      | Salary and Benefits        | 5            | .586                          |
| 13      | Justice and Equity         | 6            | .814                          |
| 14      | Performance Appraisal      | 5            | .719                          |
| 15      | Career Development         | 3            | .754                          |
| 16      | Staff Relation             | 2            | .779                          |
| 17      | Staff Moral                | 1            |                               |
| 18      | Service Seeker Behavior    | 3            | .427                          |
| 19      | Logistic Support           | 3            | .443                          |
| 20      | Family Support             | 2            | .801                          |
| 21      | Community Support          | 2            | .321                          |
| 22      | Social Status              | 2            | .617                          |
| 23      | Station Expend.            | 2            | .343                          |
| 24      | Job Overload               | 3            | .372                          |
| 25      | Job Conflict               | 3            | .335                          |
| 26      | Job Ambiguity              | 3            | .317                          |
| 27      | Job Autonomy               | 3            | .712                          |
| 28      | Feedback                   | 3            | .756                          |
| 29      | Task Variety               | 2            | .694                          |
| 30      | Co-worker Support          | 3            | .827                          |
| 31      | Boss Support               | 3            | .715                          |

**Appendix D: Correlation Matrix for HRM factors and Job satisfaction and professional commitment**

| Factors | RS              | PT             | JS             | P              | T              | SB             | JE             | PA             | CD             | OJS            | Ex.JS          | In.JS          | APC            | CPC            | NPC |
|---------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----|
| RS      | 1               |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |     |
| PT      | .073<br>.157    | 1              |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |     |
| JS      | -.013<br>.796   | .054<br>.299   | 1              |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |     |
| P       | -.139**<br>.007 | .052<br>.318   | .286**<br>.000 | 1              |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |     |
| T       | .110*<br>.033   | .207**<br>.000 | .176**<br>.001 | .031<br>.546   | 1              |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |     |
| SB      | .080<br>.123    | .285**<br>.000 | .174**<br>.001 | .151**<br>.003 | .279**<br>.000 | 1              |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |     |
| JE      | .123*<br>.017   | .309**<br>.000 | .229**<br>.000 | .140**<br>.007 | .290**<br>.000 | .546**<br>.000 | 1              |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |     |
| PA      | .181**<br>.000  | .362**<br>.000 | .106*<br>.041  | -.033<br>.522  | .351**<br>.000 | .295**<br>.000 | .396**<br>.000 | 1              |                |                |                |                |                |                |     |
| CD      | .141**<br>.006  | .284**<br>.000 | .205**<br>.000 | .320**<br>.000 | .399**<br>.000 | .391**<br>.000 | .523**<br>.000 | .502**<br>.000 | 1              |                |                |                |                |                |     |
| OJS     | .051<br>.329    | .239**<br>.000 | .338**<br>.000 | .186**<br>.000 | .196**<br>.000 | .301**<br>.000 | .377**<br>.000 | .219**<br>.000 | .408**<br>.000 | 1              |                |                |                |                |     |
| Ex.JS   | .135**<br>.009  | .421**<br>.000 | .356**<br>.000 | .183**<br>.000 | .320**<br>.000 | .314**<br>.000 | .359**<br>.000 | .456**<br>.000 | .449**<br>.000 | .443**<br>.000 | 1              |                |                |                |     |
| In. JS  | .121*<br>.019   | .250**<br>.000 | .322**<br>.000 | .188**<br>.000 | .307**<br>.000 | .239**<br>.000 | .333**<br>.000 | .433**<br>.000 | .402**<br>.000 | .427**<br>.000 | .695**<br>.000 | 1              |                |                |     |
| APC     | .043<br>.402    | .093<br>.073   | .463**<br>.000 | .174**<br>.001 | .262**<br>.000 | .335**<br>.000 | .429**<br>.000 | .230**<br>.000 | .452**<br>.000 | .387**<br>.000 | .378**<br>.000 | .353**<br>.000 | 1              |                |     |
| CPC     | .040<br>.439    | .127*<br>.014  | .306**<br>.000 | .037<br>.480   | .103*<br>.046  | .189**<br>.000 | .202**<br>.000 | .203**<br>.000 | .226**<br>.000 | .200**<br>.000 | .190**<br>.000 | .187**<br>.000 | .417**<br>.000 | 1              |     |
| NPC     | .130*<br>.012   | .140**<br>.007 | .245**<br>.000 | .111*<br>.032  | .272**<br>.000 | .205**<br>.000 | .302**<br>.000 | .279**<br>.000 | .348**<br>.000 | .296**<br>.000 | .308**<br>.000 | .381**<br>.000 | .515**<br>.000 | .443**<br>.000 | 1   |

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). \* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**Appendix E:** Correlation Matrix for Institutional factors and Job satisfaction and professional commitment

| Factors | SR             | SM             | SSB            | LS             | FS             | CS              | SS             | SE              | OJS            | Ex.JS          | In.JS          | APC            | CPC            | NPC |
|---------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----|
| SR      | 1              |                |                |                |                |                 |                |                 |                |                |                |                |                |     |
| SM      | .352**<br>.000 | 1              |                |                |                |                 |                |                 |                |                |                |                |                |     |
| SSB     | .282**<br>.000 | .356**<br>.000 | 1              |                |                |                 |                |                 |                |                |                |                |                |     |
| LS      | .252**<br>.000 | .236**<br>.000 | .361**<br>.000 | 1              |                |                 |                |                 |                |                |                |                |                |     |
| FS      | .240**<br>.000 | .184**<br>.000 | .318**<br>.000 | .212**<br>.000 | 1              |                 |                |                 |                |                |                |                |                |     |
| CS      | .069<br>.184   | .117*<br>.023  | .180**<br>.000 | .130*<br>.012  | .176**<br>.001 | 1               |                |                 |                |                |                |                |                |     |
| SS      | .011<br>.829   | .067<br>.194   | .094<br>.070   | .198**<br>.000 | .030<br>.569   | .219**<br>.000  | 1              |                 |                |                |                |                |                |     |
| SE      | .073<br>.159   | -.103*<br>.046 | -.068<br>.192  | .027<br>.607   | -.086<br>.098  | -.157**<br>.002 | -.104*<br>.044 | 1               |                |                |                |                |                |     |
| OJS     | .229**<br>.000 | .240**<br>.000 | .209**<br>.000 | .202**<br>.000 | .303**<br>.000 | .298**<br>.000  | .059<br>.254   | -.058<br>.261   | 1              |                |                |                |                |     |
| Ex.JS   | .351**<br>.000 | .393**<br>.000 | .253**<br>.000 | .389**<br>.000 | .288**<br>.000 | .279**<br>.000  | .108*<br>.037  | -.061<br>.242   | .443**<br>.000 | 1              |                |                |                |     |
| In. JS  | .352**<br>.000 | .300**<br>.000 | .187**<br>.000 | .311**<br>.000 | .256**<br>.000 | .192**<br>.000  | .023<br>.659   | -.011<br>.834   | .427**<br>.000 | .695**<br>.000 | 1              |                |                |     |
| APC     | .272**<br>.000 | .187**<br>.000 | .394**<br>.000 | .242**<br>.000 | .513**<br>.000 | .372**<br>.000  | .087<br>.094   | -.131*<br>.011  | .387**<br>.000 | .378**<br>.000 | .353**<br>.000 | 1              |                |     |
| CPC     | .011<br>.839   | .036<br>.483   | .111*<br>.032  | .187**<br>.000 | .292**<br>.000 | .079<br>.128    | -.001<br>.980  | -.110*<br>.033  | .200**<br>.000 | .190**<br>.000 | .187**<br>.000 | .417**<br>.000 | 1              |     |
| NPC     | .079<br>.126   | .202**<br>.000 | .246**<br>.000 | .086<br>.095   | .415**<br>.000 | .156**<br>.002  | -.088<br>.089  | -.144**<br>.005 | .296**<br>.000 | .308**<br>.000 | .381**<br>.000 | .515**<br>.000 | .443**<br>.000 | 1   |

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). \* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).


**Appendix F: Correlation Matrix for Job stressors & Job characteristics and Job satisfaction and professional commitment**

| Factors | JO              | JC              | JAm            | JAu            | FB             | TV             | CS             | BS             | OJS            | Ex.JS          | In.JS          | APC            | CPC            | NPC |
|---------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----|
| JO      | 1               |                 |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |     |
| JC      | .166**<br>.001  | 1               |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |     |
| JAm     | -.060<br>.246   | -.285**<br>.000 | 1              |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |     |
| JAu     | -.231**<br>.000 | -.167**<br>.001 | .237**<br>.000 | 1              |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |     |
| FB      | -.175**<br>.001 | -.149**<br>.004 | .332**<br>.000 | .598**<br>.000 | 1              |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |     |
| TV      | .003<br>.953    | -.099<br>.055   | .235**<br>.000 | .418**<br>.000 | .415**<br>.000 | 1              |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |     |
| CS      | -.045<br>.387   | -.039<br>.458   | .317**<br>.000 | .404**<br>.000 | .470**<br>.000 | .196**<br>.000 | 1              |                |                |                |                |                |                |     |
| BS      | -.186**<br>.000 | -.193**<br>.000 | .374**<br>.000 | .534**<br>.000 | .708**<br>.000 | .394**<br>.000 | .500**<br>.000 | 1              |                |                |                |                |                |     |
| OJS     | -.068<br>.191   | -.142**<br>.006 | .162**<br>.002 | .169**<br>.001 | .195**<br>.000 | .180**<br>.000 | .144**<br>.005 | .278**<br>.000 | 1              |                |                |                |                |     |
| Ex.JS   | -.131*<br>.011  | -.213**<br>.000 | .323**<br>.000 | .421**<br>.000 | .459**<br>.000 | .241**<br>.000 | .344**<br>.000 | .530**<br>.000 | .443**<br>.000 | 1              |                |                |                |     |
| In. JS  | -.077<br>.137   | -.114*<br>.028  | .323**<br>.000 | .504**<br>.000 | .519**<br>.000 | .298**<br>.000 | .335**<br>.000 | .540**<br>.000 | .427**<br>.000 | .695**<br>.000 | 1              |                |                |     |
| APC     | .043<br>.411    | -.062<br>.232   | .312**<br>.000 | .317**<br>.000 | .320**<br>.000 | .304**<br>.000 | .276**<br>.000 | .382**<br>.000 | .387**<br>.000 | .378**<br>.000 | .353**<br>.000 | 1              |                |     |
| CPC     | .034<br>.510    | -.189**<br>.000 | .092<br>.077   | .230**<br>.000 | .121*<br>.019  | .074<br>.155   | .074<br>.151   | .179**<br>.001 | .200**<br>.000 | .190**<br>.000 | .187**<br>.000 | .417**<br>.000 | 1              |     |
| NPC     | .074<br>.151    | -.145**<br>.005 | .080<br>.120   | .216**<br>.000 | .307**<br>.000 | .206**<br>.000 | .169**<br>.001 | .400**<br>.000 | .296**<br>.000 | .308**<br>.000 | .381**<br>.000 | .515**<br>.000 | .443**<br>.000 | 1   |

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). \* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).



**Appendix G: BCS Composition and Cadre Rules of 1980 (General Education Part)**



| CONTENTS |   | page    |
|----------|---|---------|
| 1.       | Administration.....                           | 3097 3  |
| 2.       | Agriculture.....                              | 2049 6  |
| 3.       | Ansar.....                                    | 205 7   |
| 4.       | Audit and Accounts .....                      | 131 8   |
| 5.       | Co-operative .....                            | 163 9   |
| 6.       | Customs and Excise .....                      | 103 10  |
| 7.       | Economic .....                                | 267 10  |
| 8.       | Family Planning .....                         | 322 11  |
| 9.       | Fisheries .....                               | 191 12  |
| 10.      | Food .....                                    | 129 13  |
| 11.      | Foreign Affairs .....                         | 252 13  |
| 12.      | Forest .....                                  | 103 15  |
| 13.      | General Education .....                       | 1018 15 |
| 14.      | Health .....                                  | 7711 17 |
| 15.      | Informatin .....                              | 556 20  |
| 16. X    | Judicial .....                                | 615 22  |
| 17.      | Livestock .....                               | 1210 22 |
| 18.      | Police .....                                  | 595 23  |
| 19.      | Postal .....                                  | 159 24  |
| 20.      | Public Health Engineering .....               | 112 25  |
| 21.      | Public Works .....                            | 577 26  |
| 22.      | Railway Engineering .....                     | 222 28  |
| 23.      | Railway Transportation and<br>Commercial..... | 61 29   |
| 24.      | Roads and Highways .....                      | 337 30  |
| 25.      | Secretariat .....                             | 562 31  |
| 26.      | Statistical .....                             | 107 32  |
| 27.      | Taxation .....                                | 328 33  |
| 28.      | Technical Education .....                     | 194 34  |
| 29.      | Tele-Communication .....                      | 476 36  |
| 30.      | Trade .....                                   | 112 36  |
| 31.      | Seniority Rules .....                         | 39      |

B C S (Reorganisation) Order of 1980 was issued by the Government under No. S. R. O. 286-L / 80 ED (IC) / SII- 92- 80- 98 Dated 1 - 9 - 1980. The order was amended under No. S. R. O. 347 -L / 86 / ME ( IC ) - 4 / 85 dated 31 - 8 - 1986 as above.

### Notification

No.S.R.O.292-L/80/ED/IC/SII-4/80-106 dated 1-9-1980.

**1. Short title** — These rules may be called the BCS (Forest) Composition and Cadre Rules of 1980.

**2. Definitions** — In these rules, unless there is anything repugnant in the subject or context — (a) (b) (c) (d) same as BCS (Admn.); (e) "Service" means the BCS (Forest).

**3. Constitution of Service** — (1) There shall be constituted a service to be called the BCS (Forest).

(2) The Service shall consist of —

(a) ~~Persons who were members of the erstwhile East Pakistan Senior Forest Service on or before 25 March 1971;~~

(b) and (c) same as BCS (Admn).

4—5—6—7—8—9—10— same as BCS (Admn.).

### The Schedule (see rule 4)

No.S.R.O. 364-L/85/ME(IC)/SII-4/84 dated 12-8-1985.

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 1. Chief Conservator of Forests.....   | 1.  |
| 2. Deputy C.C. of Forests .....  | 3.  |
| 3. Conservator of Forests / Director.....  | 7.  |
| 4. Deputy Conservator and Assistant Chief Conservator of Forests/ Divisional / Additional Divisional Forests Officer / Professor, Forest College ..... | 41. |
| 5. Sub-divisional Forests Officer.....   | 6.  |
| 6. Assistant Conservator of Forests.....   | 45. |

-----  
Total = 103.

### Notification

No.S.R.O.307-L/80/ED/IC/SII-1/80-116 dated 1-9-1980.

**1. Short title** — These rules may be called the BCS (General Education) Composition and Cadre Rules of 1980.

**2. Definitions** — In these rules, unless there is anything repugnant in the subject or context — (a) (b) (c) (d) same as BCS (Admn.); (e) "Service" means the BCS (General Education).

**3. Constitution of Service** — (1) There shall be constituted a service to be called the BCS (General Education)

(2) The Service shall consist of —

(a) Persons who were members of the erstwhile EPJES, EPES and EPSES and who were appointed substantively to Class I permanent posts on the Education side in or under the erstwhile Central Government in the Ministry of Education and non-teaching posts in the technical institutions of the erstwhile East Pakistan on or before 25 March 1971;

(b) and (c) same as BCS (Admn).

4—5— same as BCS (Admn.).

6. Procedure for recruitment— (1) same as BCS (Admn.).

(a) and (b) same as BCS (Admn.).

The School and Inspection branch and the College branch will remain separate upto the stage of TK. 1400-75-2225 NNS (TK. 2800-125-4425 MNS) and at this stage the two branches will merge into a unified cadre and the equivalent post in the Directorate will be filled in by transfer from this unified cadre. Promotion to higher posts will be from this unified cadre depending on seniority and qualification as prescribed.

(2) Lateral entry upto 20 percent of duty posts in exceptional cases.

(3) (4) (5) same as BCS (Admn.). (2) (3) (4).

7—8—9—10—same as BCS (Admn.).

#### The Schedule (see rule 4)

|  |      |
|--|------|
| A. Director of Public Instruction .....  | 1.   |
| B. Joint Director of Public Instruction.....   | 1.   |
| C. Deputy Director of public Instruction (D.D.P.I.).....   | 3.   |
| D. Assistant/Director of Public Instruction (ADPI).....  | 8.   |
| E. Deputy Assistant Director of Public Instruction (DADPI) .   | 10.  |
| F. Education Officer .....   | 1.   |
| G. Specialist (Adult Education).....   | 1.   |
| note-The posts belong to both the College Branch and the School and Inspection Branch.                   |      |
| <b>College Branch:</b>   |      |
| H. Principal (Hons. College) and T.T.College Offering M. Ed.....   | 13.  |
| I. (i) Principal (Non-Hons. College).....  | 3.   |
| (ii) Director, Bangladesh Education Extension and Research Institute (BEERI).....                        | 1.   |
| (iii) Principal, T.T. College (Non-offering M.ED.).....  | 3.   |
| (iv) Principal, Alia Madrasah.....   | 2.   |
| (v) Head Maulana, Alia Madrasah.....   | 1.   |
| J. (i) Principal, Intermediate College and Residential Model School.....                                 | 2.   |
| (ii) Vice-Principal (Non-Hons. College).....   | 4.   |
| (iii) Vice-Principal (T.T. College).....   | 4.   |
| (iv) Associate Professor (Hons.and General College).   | 16.  |
| K. Deputy Director, BEERI.....   | 1.   |
| L. (i) Assistant Professor.....  | 178. |
| (ii) Counsellor.....   | 2.   |
| (iii) Specialist, BEERI .....  | 17.  |
| (iv) Assistant Professor (Alia Madrasah), Additional Head Maulana and Superintendent, High Madrasah..... | 4.   |
| (v) Principal, Rajshahi Govt. Madrasah.....  | 1.   |

|  |      |
|--|------|
| M. (i) Lecturer of Colleges including T. T. College, Alia Madrasah, AFE, College of Arts and Crafts, Home Economics College..... | 462. |
| (ii) Assistant Maulvi (Alia Madrasah).....   | 5.   |
| Total no of Duty posts in College Branch.....  | 719. |
| (iii) Deputation, leave, training reserve 10 percent of the post in the lowest hierarchy.....                                    | 47.  |
| <b>School and Inspection Branch :</b>  |      |
| A (i) Inspector of Schools (IS) (Interchangeable with A.D.P.I.)...   | 4.   |
| (ii) Inspectress of Schools (I.Sc.) (Interchangeable with A.D.P.I.).....   | 4.   |
| B. (i) Headmasters (Government Secondary Schools).....   | 31.  |
| (ii) Headmistress (Governmentt Secondary Schools).....   | 16.  |
| (iii) Superintendent, primary Training Institutes .....  | 24.  |
| (vi) District Education Officer.....   | 17.  |
| C. (i) District Inspector of Schools.....  | 17.  |
| (ii) Assistant Inspector of Schools.....   | 4.   |
| (iii) Assistant Inspectress of Schools.....  | 4.   |
| D. (i) Assistant Headmaster (Govt. Secondary Schools).....   | 35.  |
| (ii) Assistant Headmistress (Govt. Secondary Schools).....   | 24.  |
| (iii) Assistant Superintendent, Primary Training Institutes.....   | 47.  |
| Category A to G.....   | 25.  |
| College Branch.....  | 766. |
| ✓ School and Inspection Branch.....  | 227. |
| -----  |      |
| Total = 1018.  |      |