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Abstract
The present study tries to evaluate the Herzberg’s two factor theory by investigating the relationship between different factors of motivation and job satisfaction enjoyed by the banks’ officers in KPK. If we boil down all the definitions we can say that job satisfaction concentrates on all the feelings that an employee has about his job. According to management experts if employees are enjoying higher level of job satisfaction, the objectives of the organization can easily be achieved. To find the data for the research 418 questionnaires were distributed among banks’ officers in Peshawar district. Descriptive statistics, regression analysis and Cornbach alpha were used as statistical tools to analyse the data for research purpose. The outcome of the research indicates that under given circumstances many hygiene factors like relationship with supervisors, company policy, salary, social status and working conditions have substantial relationship with job satisfaction. On the other hand Herzberg’s motivators have no significant relationship with job satisfaction.
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Introduction
All the organizations whether they are small or large depend on different resources to achieve their goals and objectives. The most important resource that organizations need is human capital. Efficient and competent human capital plays drastic role to implement the basic functions of management. The same is true for banks which are mainly involved in the production of services to satisfy the needs of their customers to win their mind and heart.

Customers can be satisfied if organizations design the right product to fulfill the requirement of customers. But right and high quality product cannot be delivered without competent human resource (Bolman and Deal, 2008). Before 1990 it was believed that organization mainly
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depends on the external source to make profit but later on organization also started concentration on internal source (Grant, 2010).

Satisfied worker is one of the internal sources that support the organization to enjoy the profit. According to Spector, (1997) due to the importance of human resource for the organizations, organizations always try to use all means to maintain and retain competent employees. He further says that organizations can perform their functions efficiently and smoothly if organizations have satisfied workers. Workers satisfaction can be achieved through job satisfaction.

So far the definition of job satisfaction is concerned, according to Graham, (1982) it is measurement of a person’s feeling and attitude towards his or her feeling.

According to Buitendach and De Witt, (2005) the factors that can influence job satisfaction can be divided into two groups i.e. intrinsic factors and extrinsic factors. Intrinsic factors include advancement, values and recognition etc. Extrinsic factors include pay, working conditions and supervision etc. Social scientists also identify many personal factors that can determine job satisfaction.

In modern era without banks it could be difficult and impossible for the economy to survive. Apart from many other functions, banks mainly play the role of bridge between saving and investment. In other words it can be said that banks mobilize capital so that economy could be able to make development.

In Pakistan Banking sector has gone through many phases since 1947. In 1974, all the banks were owned by the government through the act of parliament. Nationalization negatively affected the banking sector. But in 1990 due to liberalization and deregulation now the financial institutions are playing the drastic and positive role in the development of the country (Burki and Niazi, 2003). Banks are now operating in a very competitive environment due to privatization policy. In competitive environment those banks that are inefficient cannot survive longer. Therefore, now it becomes very important for all the banks both in public and private sector to enhance the level of job satisfaction of their employees to cope with new environment.

**Research Objectives**

i). To test the two factor theory and highlight those factors that can lead to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction among banks’ officers in KPK.

ii). To understand the influence of intrinsic factors like nature of work, recognition and achievement etc. and extrinsic factors like working condition, relationship with supervisor and status etc. on job satisfaction.
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Literature Review
Different researchers conducted research to find those factors that can generate job satisfaction among workers. On the basis of their research they developed different theories to highlight the relationship between different factors and job satisfaction. Among these theories the most important theory is two factor theory presented by Herzberg et al in 1959. Two factor theory focuses on Motivators and Hygiene factors to explain the influence on job satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

Now all the organizations are concentrating on the concept of job satisfaction to improve the physical and mental well being of their workers (Spector, 1997). According to Oshagbemi (2003) and Purohit,(2004) due to the increasing importance of workers, all the organizations want to enhance job satisfaction among their workers. Whenever experts define job satisfaction, they keep three aspects in their mind. These aspects are discussed below:

Job satisfaction as emotional or cognitive reaction
Lock (1976) says that job satisfaction is positive or pleasurable emotional state that arises from the assessment of individual job experience. According to Dawis (2004) job satisfaction has two basic elements i.e. affective element and cognitive element.

Job Satisfaction as important explanation for meeting expectation
According to Vroom (1964) job satisfaction refers to “how well the outcomes meet or exceeds expectations of workers.” Mosadeghred and Yarmohammadian (2006) state that job satisfaction can be explained by understanding the difference between what worker wants to experience when he performs his job and what he experiences when actually he performs his job.

Feeling and attitude as asset of job satisfaction
In this connection Spector (2008) says that satisfaction that individual gains from job is not constant and changes with different factors and job satisfaction indicates how workers experience about the job.

Determinant of job satisfaction/Factors that can influence job satisfaction
There are many elements that can influence the contentment that workers experience from their jobs. According to Glisson and Durick (1988) there are three changeable elements that can have impact on job satisfaction. The first element is related with the features of organization in which individuals work. The second element is related with the characteristics of work and third one focuses on those features that explain the personality of worker.
Mullins (2006) emphasis that individual factors, social factors, factors attached with the way of life and the factors affecting the organization internally and externally have impact on job fulfillment. On the basis of literature review it can be said that factors that can influence job satisfaction can be split up into two main categories i.e. demographic factors and factors related with workplace and job.

Demographic factors
Personal or demographic factors include marital status, sex, educational level and age etc. As individuals have differences in terms of personalities, abilities and attitudes, therefore they have their own perceptions towards job. Mullins (2005) also emphasis that these differences have influence on workers’ perception and performance.

Factors related with workplace and with job
Achievement
Employee feels sense of achievement when he completes given task before the prescribed time period and receives appreciation. This situation can enhance his level of job satisfaction. On the other hand if employee fails to complete the given task in the prescribed time period or fail to perform his task in well manner, his level of job satisfaction will be lower. According to Herzberg et al (1959) the relationship between job satisfaction and achievement is positive.

Recognition
Spector (1997) says that recognition is a contingent benefits that could be in money form or in some other form and those workers who perform in better way can enjoy it. According to Al-Moaely (2006) lack of recognition can lead to dissatisfaction among workers. On the other hand Green (2009) says that recognition can lead to increase in total job satisfaction and vice versa.

Promotion opportunities
Promotion means the growth in employees’ position within the organizations and it leads to increase in responsibility, status and increase in financial benefits. Many researchers believe that if there is promotion opportunities, contentment from job will rise and vice versa (Levinson, 1983; Tutuncu and Kozak, 2006).

Nature of work and job satisfaction
According to Luthans (1995) essence of work performed by individual can influence the level of contentment that workers derive from their job. In other word nature of work can influence the level of job satisfaction.
Advancement
Advancement has a broad definition such as a career move within or outside the same company based on training proficiency or work experience. This can be referred as expected and unexpected chance of promotion.

Possibility of Growth
Possibility of growth means the opportunity of advancement within the organization and the opportunity to learn new skills. If workers feel that their chance of growth is lacking, their level of satisfaction will fall.

Responsibility
Sense of responsibility will arise among workers when they are allowed to perform certain tasks by their own way or when they can make certain decisions independently. If workers feel that they can decide about different issues by their own way, their level of job satisfaction will rise and vice versa. According to Herzberg et al (1959) there is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and responsibility.

Salary
According to Herzberg et al (1957) salary cannot be considered as job satisfaction’s predictor. But later researchers started believing that salary has influence on job satisfaction. Research carried out by Dyer and Theriault (1976) suggests that the effect of salary on job satisfaction cannot be ignored because what a worker earns in money form against his effort has paramount effect on his job satisfaction.

Supervision
The importance of relationship between supervisors and subordinate cannot be denied. If supervisors participative and democratic, workers can be motivated so that they could use their full capacities to contribute towards organization’s goals (Vroom, 1964).

Working conditions
Many researches carried out to find the connection between working environment and job satisfaction reveal that there is connection between them. According to Chase (1951) workers will feel dissatisfaction if they are working in poor surroundings with less facilities. Arnold and Feldman (1996) highlight those factors that form the work environment. These factors include ventilation, working hours and temperature etc.

Company policy and administration
There are certain set rules and regulation that all the employees of organization have to follow. According to Lock (1976) organization
should make clear and transparent rules and policies so that all the members of organization could be able to follow them with confidence and clear mind. Otherwise there will be dissatisfaction among employees.

Social status
According to Green (2001) if workers are respected by the society due to their job, the level of contentment from job will rise. But Nazim (2008) found no relationship between social status and job satisfaction.

The relationship with co-workers
Co-workers at workplace have great influence on workers’ productivity and job satisfaction. According to Price and Muller (1981) if there is positive relationship among co-workers, there could be increase in job satisfaction.

Job security
According to Herzberg (1968) job security can be defined as degree to which any organization is recognized to offer consistent career for employees. If consistency in career, insurance and retirement benefits are enjoyed by employees through job, their level of satisfaction from job will be higher.

Theories of Job Satisfaction
Theories related with job satisfaction can be split up into two groups. The first set of theories is known as content theory and the second set of theories is known as process theory (Campbell et al., 1970).

Content theories of job satisfaction
Content theories of job satisfaction suggest that management can find the needs of workers if management focuses on the behaviour of workers at the workplace. Once the workers needs are identified management can anticipate the behaviour of workers. Content theory focuses on the needs of workers and their arrangement on priority bases by individual to get satisfaction. The leading content theories include:

a) Maslow’s theory of hierarchy of needs proposed by Abraham Maslow in 1943.
b) Herzberg’s two factor theory proposed by Frederick Herzberg in 1959.
c) McGregor’s X and Y theory proposed by McGregor in 1960.
d) McClelland’s learned need theory proposed by David McClelland in 1961.
e) Aderfer’s ERG theory proposed by Clayton Alderfer in 1969.
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Herzberg’s Two Factor Theory
To meet the requirement of present research focus is given to Herzberg two factor theory of job satisfaction. Herzberg’s two factor theory appeared first time in 1959. To develop theory about job satisfaction he questioned 203 workers belonging to accounting firms and engineering firms in Pittsburg (Herzberg et al, 1959). From investigation he came to conclusion that intrinsic factors including achievement, work itself, promotion, responsibility and recognition can enhance job satisfaction and their absence will not lead to dissatisfaction but will lead to no satisfaction.

On the other hand hygiene factors including policies, supervision, interpersonal relation, salary, security and status if presence can reduce dissatisfaction but cannot enhance job satisfaction. In other words his investigation suggests that job fulfillment and job dissatisfaction are influenced by two different set of factors. That is why job satisfaction and dissatisfaction cannot be measured at the same sequence.

Criticism on the Outcome of Two Factor Theory
Research carried out by Lindsay, Mark and Glow (1967) suggests that same factors can influence both job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. They came to conclusion that Herzberg use of two distinct continuums for job satisfaction and dissatisfaction should be revalued.

Hill and Ridgeway (1970) carried out research on two factor theory but their research does not give any backing for two factor theory. Fetehi et al (1987) say that two factor theory is over simplified form of job satisfaction and it can be used as consistent model. In the same way research conducted by Ogunlana and Chang (1998) does not provide any support for two factor theory.

Studies favoring two factor theories
Herzberg (1965) carried out research with lower level managers in Finland. His research endorsed his previous research. Schwab and Heneman (1970) conducted research using the same method as used by Herzberg. Finding matches the result of Herzberg two factor theory. Research conducted by Gaziel (1986) also shows that motivating factors and hygiene factors are not similar.

Process theory of job satisfaction
The process theories concentrates on more factors than only accepting the basic requirement that motivates the people. Schermerhorn et al (2005) say that process theories try to investigate the cognitive process that has impact on behaviour. The main process theories include the
Equity theory, Vroom’s Expectancy theory, Porter/Lawler Expectancy model, Goal setting theory and job characteristics theory.

Research Hypotheses
The current study will be testing the following hypotheses through empirical data collected through a self-administered survey questionnaire:

H1: Achievement of banks’ officers of KPK has impact on level of job satisfaction.

H2: Recognition affects the level of job satisfaction of KPK bankers.

H3: Nature of work has connection with the level of job satisfaction of bankers.

H4: Increase in responsibility has impact on the level of job satisfaction.

H5: There is substantial relationship between advancement and the level of job satisfaction.

H6: The possibility of growth has connection with job satisfaction.

H7: Promotion of banks’ officers in KPK has influence on the level of job satisfaction.

H8: Company policy has influence on the level of job satisfaction of KPK bankers.

H9: The way bankers are supervised has influence on the level of job satisfaction.

H10: Relationship with co-workers has impact on the level of job satisfaction.

H11: Working conditions in KPK banks has impact on job satisfaction.

H12: Salary of bankers has connection with the level of job satisfaction.

H13: Social status has significant relationship with job satisfaction.

H14: Job security has substantial impact on the level of job satisfaction.

Methodology
The present research was causal in nature and based on primary data. The population for this study consists of OG1, OG11 and OG111 banks officers in both public and private sector banks in Peshawar district. There are about 173 main branches of banks in Peshawar with 750 banks’ officers ranking from OG1, OG11 and OG111. For research purpose I focused only on those banks that have more than four bank officers. In this way total number of bank officers came 625. Out of 625 banks’ officers questionnaires were distributed to 67% banks’ officers which came 418. In this research random sampling is used.

All data was obtained through questionnaires adopted from Jan FA (1994). It took about four months to distribute and to collect...
questionnaires duly filled by the bankers. Three hundred and seventy seven officers returned questionnaires. Out of which 350 were duly completed for research propose. These were coded for research. Descriptive analysis for the analysis of demographic characteristics, regression for the analysis of relationship between different factors and job satisfaction and cronbach alpha for the assessment of reliability of questionnaires were applied to fulfill the requirement of research.

Reliability of questionnaires
The questions were on the 5-point Likert Scale with responses ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”. In order to determine whether the questionnaire could reliably measure the variables, Cronbach alpha test were conducted. The reliability values show that questionnaire is reliable because all the values are more than 0.7.

Table 1: Reliability of motivator factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Number of questions</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.703</td>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work itself</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.802</td>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.915</td>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Overall Reliability of Motivator factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alfa</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall (Motivators)</td>
<td>0.949</td>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Reliability of Hygenenes’ Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Number of questions</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bank policy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.720</td>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with peers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work security</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with supervisors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.894</td>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working conditions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay satisfaction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.829</td>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social status</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Overall Reliability of Hygiene factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alfa</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall (Hygiene)</td>
<td>0.925</td>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Reliability of job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Number of questions</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Presentation of data and data analysis

Descriptive statistics of the study

Table 6: Description of age of banks ‘officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age in Years</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22-30</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-59</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 depicts that one hundred and forty three (143) respondents are in the age group of 22-30, while seventy one (71) respondents are in the age group of 31-35. Sixty six (66) are in the category of 36-40 years followed by seventy (70) respondents who fall in the age group of 41-59.

Table 7: Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>74.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>25.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 indicates that out of 350 respondents, 261 are male and 89 female i.e. out of 350 respondents, 74.57% are male and 25.43% are female.

Table 8: Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>17.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>82.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8 shows the education level of 350 respondents. Majority of the respondents (288) have master degrees while (62) have graduate degrees.

Table 9: Total number of OG1, OG11 and OG111 banks’ officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of banks</th>
<th>OG1</th>
<th>OG11</th>
<th>OG111</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Self Created

Table 9 shows that out of 350 banks’ officers 62 (17.71%) fall in OG1 category, 154 (44.%) are OG11 officers and 134 (38.29%) are OG111 officers.

Table 10: Designation (OG1, OG11, OG111) according to Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>OG1</th>
<th>OG11</th>
<th>OG111</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 shows that total number of Female OG1, OG11, OG111 banks’ officers and total number male OG1, OG11 and OG111 banks’ officers.

Inferential Statistics

Table 11: Relationship between job satisfaction and motivators and hygiene factors. (Regression)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant) -.411 .181</td>
<td>-2.272 .024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achievement .145 .056</td>
<td>.110 2.589 .010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognition -.077 .049</td>
<td>-.078 -1.551 .122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nature of work .096 .037</td>
<td>.101 2.581 .010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsibility -.002 .051</td>
<td>-.002 -.048 .962</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advancement .044 .043</td>
<td>.035 1.022 .308</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Growth -.012 .056</td>
<td>-.011 -.214 .830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion .255 .051</td>
<td>.240 4.958 .000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy .168 .051</td>
<td>.161 3.282 .001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sup_vision .130 .049</td>
<td>.140 2.642 .009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IP_Relation -.022 .043</td>
<td>-.016 -.526 .600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work_Condition .150 .042</td>
<td>.171 3.592 .000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salary .089 .028</td>
<td>.105 3.217 .001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Status .116 .026</td>
<td>.140 4.500 .000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11 shows the t-value along with standardized coefficient, standard error and level of significance. By concentrating on motivators it can be seen that for achievement, nature of work and promotion the value of significance is less than 0.05. Therefore, hypothesis H1, H3 and H7 are accepted. On the other hand for recognition, responsibility, advancement and growth the value of significance is greater than 0.05, therefore Hypothesis H2, H4, H5 and H6 are rejected. So far hygiene factors are concerned for bank’s policy, Supervision, work condition, salary and status, the value of significance is less than 0.05, therefore hypothesis H8, H9, H11, H12 and H13 are accepted. On the other hand for interpersonal relationship and job security the value of level of significance is greater than 0.05, therefore hypothesis H10 and H13 are rejected.

**Discussion on the Findings**

The research was conducted to evaluate Herzberg’s two factor theory and indirectly highlighted those factors that can lead to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction experienced by KPK banks’ officers. Herzberg’s two factor theory suggests that there are two sets of factors that have different consequences for job satisfaction. One set of factors are motivators or intrinsic factors that can lead to job satisfaction. But their absence can cause “no satisfaction” but not dissatisfaction. Other set of factors are hygiene or extrinsic factors that if absence can cause dissatisfaction but their presence does not mean satisfaction.

Herzberg presented his theory in 1959 by interviewing 203 accountants and engineers in Pittsburg to assess their attitudes. At that time there was boom in the economy and almost there was full employment. But for present research the Scio economic situation is totally different. Our economy has been facing high level of unemployment and other macro economic problems. Therefore, the result of present research could be somewhat different from the findings of Herzberg research. The outcome of present research shows that many hygiene factors like relationship with supervisors, company policy, salary and social status have significant relationship with job satisfaction i.e. these factors have influence on job satisfaction. On the other hand many factors mentioned by Herzberg as intrinsic factors have no connection with job satisfaction.

In the past many researchers investigated the Herzberg’s two factor theory. The outcomes of their investigations in many cases did not match the result of Herzberg’s two factor theory. Research carried out by Lindsay, Marks and Gorlow (1967) produced different result from
Herzberg’s two factor theory. Farr (1967) investigation suggests that it would be incorrect to say that Herzberg exposed the causes of satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Maidani (1991) conducted research to investigate two factor theory. The outcome of research shows that Hygiene factors can also influence the level of job satisfaction. Ogunlana and Chang (1998) and Schroder (2008) investigated two factor theory and found different result from two factor theory. Dunaway (2009) conducted research on the job satisfaction of nurse practitioners. The research outcome did not support the Herzberg’s two factor theory finding in any area except the work itself which can influence the level of satisfaction experienced by nurses from their job.

**Recommendation and Conclusion**

The findings of research suggest that in banking sectors those factors should be enhanced that can lead to job satisfaction and increase the presence of those factors that may not increase the level of job satisfaction but their presence may help to avoid the job dissatisfaction. Moreover, Herzberg’s two factor theory should be put into further investigation to find the hygiene factors and motivators in our environment.

Banking sector can play very prominent role in the development of an economy. Therefore, all those measures should be taken that can increase the level of job satisfaction among the employees belonging to banking sector.

If there is an increase in job satisfaction of bankers, they will be able to increase the mobilization of funds and resources towards the prosperity of people of a country.

In the past Herzberg’s two factor theory has been tested many times and many times the findings were different from the two factor theory but this does not underestimate the contribution of Herzberg’s two factor theory. Main thing that should be kept in mind is that Herzberg’s two factor theory for the first time differentiates between motivators and hygiene factors. Therefore, investigations should be made to find these factors in the context of our socio economic situation so that job satisfaction can be increased and dissatisfaction can be avoided.
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