THE SATISFACTION IN THE FORMAL EMPLOYMENT IN CÔTE D'IVOIRE

N ' Gratier Antoine [1]

Félix Houphouët Boigny University (UFHB) of Abidjan_Côte d'Ivoire

ABSTRACT

This article addresses a subject that had long been a reflection field for sociologists and psychologists, the satisfaction in the employment. This notion, which is of increasing interest to economists, has been tackled here by seeking the explanatory factors that would influence it. More specifically, it was to analyze the determinants of satisfaction in formal employment in Côte d'Ivoire; employment assumed to contain features that will do motivating, at least that will satisfactory. In order to carry out this research, we have had recourse to data on the 2016 National Survey on the Employment Situation and the Informal Sector from the Youth Employment Agency in collaboration with the National Institute of Statistics. By using an ordinal logistic regression on the modalities of the satisfaction in employment performed by the maximum likelihood method, we come to the conclusion that a monthly salary of at least three times the guaranteed minimum wage (which is FCFA 60 000 currently in Côte d'Ivoire), as well as premium payments and benefits influence positively satisfaction in employment. Conversely, heavy weekly hours are likely to degrade the level of satisfaction in employment that one could withdraw. The introduction of incentive wage measures, the respect of working hours could help to reduce the rate of absenteism and strikes in the administrations related to dissatisfaction in employment and which are increasingly noted in Côte d'Ivoire.

Keywords: Ordered logit, pecuniary benefits, satisfaction in employment, strikes.

JEL Classification: C35, J28, J33, J82.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background and issues

If for a long time, satisfaction in employment has been of interest mainly to psychologists and sociologists, a growing number of economists are now interested in it, especially since the

pioneering work of Hamermesh (1977), Freeman (1978) and more recently Clark and Oswald (1996) [Razafindrakoto and Roubaud, 2005].

The notion itself is rich and worthy of study because, on the one hand, being linked to the well-being of the workers and, on the other hand, determining the performance of the workers (questionable). The satisfaction in employment [2] seen as the satisfaction of the workstation and its modalities of exercise or job satisfaction can have several definitions, in particular because of the subjective nature of the statements of the individuals on whom the study is being conducted. For several precursors who have reflected on the notion of job satisfaction, such as Beer (1964), Ivancevich and Donnelly (1968), Losquist and Dawis (1969) as cited by Larouche and Delorme (1972), job satisfaction or satisfaction in employment refers respectively to for the first: « the attitudes of the workers towards the company, their employment, their fellow workers and the other psychological objects present in the work situation », for the seconds, it designates: « a favorable perception of the worker vis-à-vis the work role he holds at the moment. » and for the third, it's about: « a function of the correspondence between the own system of incentives to the work situation and the needs of the individual. »

We could be said that job satisfaction can be defined as the attitude of an individual to his or her job. It is the perception that the latter has vis-à-vis his job. This perception may take several degrees depending on the individual, the circumstances, the periods, etc. A worker may say that he is satisfied with his job today and not be satisfied tomorrow because of a failed promotion, a social climate that has become disastrous, and so on. To this end, the construction of a scale of measure of the degree of satisfaction in employment remains a challenge. Most studies, ours is no exception to the rule, is interested in the self-declared responses of workers to a certain extent to arrive at a determination of the factors that would explain the differences in satisfaction.

Satisfaction in employment straddles several disciplines, which makes it rich. While initially, economists had little interest in the concept because of a reluctance to analyze and/or modeling some emotions and formulate difficultly economic policy recommendations, it should be noted that the emergence of some of the findings of studies high lighting the relationship between job satisfaction and absenteeism or productivity (Judge et al, 2001, as quoted by Razafindrakoto and Roubaud) has shown that the concept deserved special attention.

However, studies on such a topic are rare in Africa. Vigan and Glauque (2016) in their study of job satisfaction in public administrations in Africa say that the literature on the subject comes mainly from the countries of the North. They point out that although there is some research on the concept, the fact remains that measurement scales are borrowed from studies in developed countries. An adaptation to this effect would be very interesting. Moreover, they show that most

African studies on the concept are concentrated in English - speaking countries; they summarize in their reflection that out of a total of 22 articles on the concept, nearly 91% come from English-speaking countries.

In Côte d'Ivoire [3] , to our knowledge and so far, almost no article has been made on the subject. Razafindrakoto and Roubaud in their research from the *1-2-3 surveys* conducted in 2001-2002 in eight African capitals attempt to determine the explanatory factors of job satisfaction in these capitals. But, having no explicit question about job satisfaction, they have the approximent through a proxy : *What are your employment plans for the future ?* Thus, they say *we mainly retained to distinguish those who want to keep their job / activity status (modality 4 those who are, in principle, satisfied) and those who wish to change (modalities 1,2 and 3:those dissatisfied)* [4]. As they themselves note *the use of a different question from the usual one has the disadvantage of leading to results that are not completely comparable with those of the literature.* However, we hold that their work has the merit of addressing a crucial issue that determines business performance on the one hand, and on the other hand, it is an important support for our current research.

Because of the above, our research finds its particularity in the advantage we have of having the dependent variable that is posed explicitly. This allows us to choice an appropriate model for our estimates, and to add other explanatory variables that are different from those we have seen in the literature for economic policy recommendations. In addition, it deals with the satisfaction in formal employment in Côte d'Ivoire, that is to say in jobs with advantages that would make it easy to perform the tasks in other words jobs in accordance with the labor legislation. Anything that should a priori make the job satisfactory, unlike informal jobs.

The question of job satisfaction in an underdeveloped country like Côte d'Ivoire is of great importance. Indeed, if we assume that job dissatisfaction can lead to absenteeism and/or counter-productivity, as some studies have shown, we can deduce that it would be inappropriate for our economy through public and private enterprises offering formal jobs to count a considerable unsatisfied workers; the ideal would have been, as far as possible, to reach a marginal number of unsatisfied workers. However, this is not the case as we will show in the statistics and econometrics estimations of this research.

From there, this study is very necessary. Since it is not easy to find in any economy that all workers are satisfied, we can ask ourselves the following question.

1.2 Research Question

What would explain that some workers are satisfied with their jobs and others not ?

1.3 Objective of the study

Analyze the explanatory factors of satisfaction in formal employment in Côte d'Ivoire.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW ON SATISFACTION IN EMPLOYMENT

In this review of literature we will expose some theories that underlie the notion of job satisfaction. Will be mobilized theories from the psychosociology of work and job economic theories. Subsequently, we will attempt to explain the factors that would be responsible for job satisfaction. Finally, through past studies we will discuss potential relationship may exist between job satisfaction and performance of workers.

2.1 Theories of job satisfaction [5]

Some psychosociological and economic theories have tried to formalize satisfaction in employment. Among the first, Comeau (1992) lists four scientific conceptions : the School of Physico-Economics, the School of Human Relations, the School of Causality Models and the Critical School.

The physico-economic School emphasizes the fatigue and monotony of work that determine productivity. To make work less difficult (therefore pleasant and satisfying) and more productive, the thinkers of this School advocate a physical layout of workplaces, the modification of body movements of workers (chain work) and a salary modification. Taylor (1911), which is one of the thinkers publishes principles supposed to make work better and more optimal.

For Mayo (1933) and the School of Human Relations (1933), job satisfaction leads to an improvement in productivity and human relations would largely influence this satisfaction. Hoppock (1935) notes that the absence of certain factors would lead to dissatisfaction. Herzberg will question Hoppock's idea based on Maslow's hierarchy of needs. Herzberg, Mausner and Synderman (1959) will show that job satisfaction is a function of two main factors. As such, they develop the theory of both factors. In firt time, they define extrinsic factors called preventive factors or hygiene related to external conditions in which the employee performs his employment: salary, benefits, seniority and job security, etc. These factors are to prevent the occurrence of dissatisfaction. Secondly, Herzberg et *al* (1959) define intrinsic factors related to the content of the task performed by the worker, that is to say the promotion opportunities, the nature of the task, etc. The School of Human Relations by its reflections has been a great support in the development of research on job satisfaction to the extent that it has highlighted *the happiness of employees, the satisfaction of the needs of every human* at work *and the leading role*

of the organizer who thinks the work.

The School of Causality Models (Locke, 1976) has three models. The first explains satisfaction with worker-specific variables, work-related variables, and other organizational variables. The second model explains job satisfaction from the *weight (...) of different facets of work* and the third model *takes into account motivations or values.* From these models, *Locke (1976) identifies seven principles for job satisfaction : a stimulating and successful work, a personal interest in the work (...), a job not too demanding physically, fair rewards and related to the aspirations of workers, the working conditions compatible with physical needs and personal goals in term work, the esteem of colleagues, and the presence of agents in the company helping workers to achieve their goals, sharing their values and minimizing conflict.*

Karl Marx is considered one of the precursors of the Critical School, who prefers the term of alienation, which better describes the conflicts between employees and employers. He is followed in his research by the supporters of the Frankfurt School, including Horkheimer, Adorno and Habermas, among others, who *criticize modern society and question the different methods of repression that make subjects passive by subjecting them to powers that they do not understand ...* The main idea of this school is that job satisfaction is understood through social relations.

For Holländer (2001) as cited by Davoine (2006) the study of job satisfaction in economics has amended and revised the traditional utility function and give full value to the work of Veblen and Duesenberry. In economic theory, job satisfaction (respectively dissatisfaction at work) is approached by the notion of utility at work (respectively disutility).

The theory of compensating differentials has been mobilized to explain the different levels of satisfaction, with the assumption that wage differences were the factors that would explain job satisfaction. However, with the developments that have taken place in labor economics, this way of explaining levels of satisfaction has been limited, salary being not the only factor capable of explaining job satisfaction. As we will see in the next section several parameters can explain the levels of satisfaction.

Moreover, Freeman (1978) shows that job satisfaction is an explanatory factor for mobility in the labor market, and this because it makes it possible to capture the aspects of work and its exercise modalities not taken into account by the standard variables.

What should be noted is that works in economics on job satisfaction is becoming more important and economists have realized that the subject deserves particular attention. And this, especially as with the standard variables mobilized to explain the performance of employees (income,

working conditions, etc.) it was necessary to add another, the satisfaction in employment ; although one might think (not always true) that there would a link between income level and high level of satisfaction, for example. Analyzes of pioneering works permit to consider job satisfaction as a separate variable the occurrence of which could be explained by a number of parameters not known *a priori*. However, what exactly explains job satisfaction?

2.2 What would explain job satisfaction ?

We can see from the empirical studies that satisfaction in employment can be explained globally from three criteria: the job itself, the conditions of its exercise and the socio demographic factors of the worker.

- The job itself

If yesterday, satisfaction in employment was interpreted through extrinsic factors and intrinsic factors (see School of Human Relations), it is not the same today. Yesterday, one might say, the difficulties to obtain a job after school were not more increase than today. In history, many economic theories such as human capital theory, discrimination in hiring, signalment, the theory of insiders-outsiders have shown the limits of the neoclassical model of the labor market. Not all individuals have access to employment. Or at least some those have access because of the characteristics acquired and developed (level of education, curricula, professional experience, etc.). Not with standing, these developments subsequent to the standard model of the labor market, we note today that the acquisition of the characteristics mentioned above no longer guarantees one hundred percent obtaining a job. Indeed, the high rate of unemployment, the development of technology, robotization, computerization, the desire to achieve performance at lower costs by limiting hiring, for example, come to give employment its importance. The worker could not discuss the extrinsic and intrinsic factors of employment for first explained his satisfaction that results if he had previously obtained employment !

The level of unemployment in most developed and underdeveloped countries makes it difficult to make choices in the face of scarcity of jobs. The job is first desired for itself. The lack of occupation is today synonymous with laziness, infantilization, even suspicion. Satisfaction in employment is thus explained by the job itself. The worker is satisfied with his job, first because he owns it and not because of what surrounds him. Employment in itself is good and owning it is a privilege.

Social science thinkers such as Locke and Herzberg point out that employment in itself provides satisfaction in that it more or less guarantees a desire for fulfillment, it allows one to grow mentally, to learn new things, etc.

In addition to the satisfaction that employment itself can provide, we have the conditions for the exercise of this job and the characteristics of the workers who contribute to their satisfaction.

- The conditions for the exercise of the job or the quality of employment and the factors specific to the worker

The literature discusses several conditions of employment and factors specific to the worker that would explain job satisfaction. In some studies, working conditions refer to the quality of employment.

We note the following variables as part of the working conditions: salary, career prospects, promotion opportunity, arduous tasks, relationships with colleagues and hierarchy, workplace safety, and so on.

Parvin and Kabir (2011) in a study of the factors influencing job satisfaction in the pharmaceutical sector in Bangladesh conclude that relations with colleagues, job security and wage level and promotion are the main factors that impact job satisfaction.

In his working document: « Salary, conditions and job satisfaction », Daniel (2008) shows that in France *freedom, cooperation, the opportunity to discuss with its leaders and having to learn new things are job satisfaction factors ... However, the tight deadlines and the repetitive work reduces the well-being felt at work.* Paradoxical as it may seem, he points out in the results from his econometric estimates that *wages appear to have a negative impact on the level of satisfaction.* The explanation he gives to this paradox is that *a higher salary is also associated with more stress and fatigue.*

Hinks in his study of job satisfaction in South Africa concludes that while wages have a positive effect on job satisfaction, this effect is not significant in all of its models.

The results of Bakan and Buyukbese (2013) on British data do not depart from the previous ones. However in terms of salary, their results are contrary to those found by Daniel (2008). Indeed, they show that a high salary is synonymous with job satisfaction. However, they cannot conclude on the meaning of causality; is it because workers say they have received a high salary that they are very satisfied or is it because they have received for their efforts other compensations (in addition to a higher salary) as a promotion, congratulations, etc.

With respect to the factors specific to the workers likely to influence job satisfaction, Vigan and Glauque (2016) show through African research on the question that the individual characteristics of the agents have little influence on job satisfaction.

The study of job satisfaction in eight African capitals conducted by Razafindrakoto and Roubaud (2005) shows that overall in most capital cities, women are satisfied with their jobs compared to men. In plus, the number of years of study do not appear to have a positive influence on job satisfaction. On the other hand, income has a positive and significant influence for all capitals.

These equally varied results enrich the debate on the notion. If job satisfaction is important, can we say that it has a positive impact on workers' performance ?

2.3 Job satisfaction and worker performance

Several studies have attempted to establish a link between job satisfaction and worker performance. While it may seem reasonable to believe that a high level of satisfaction can increase forces and thus increase worker performance, studies of the causality of either of these variables do not always prove it so strong.

Jalagat (2016), in a review of critical literature on the relationship between job satisfaction, job performance and motivation shows that research on that relationship does'nt unable to conclude formally that satisfaction in employment causes performance as well as motivation of employees. However, he notes, the three notions are interdependent, interact and interconnect so that the process is circular and non-linear. In groups of workers, however, the group effect seems to have an impact on the relationship. It shows that satisfied workers belonging to the same group are able to increase their work performance. Particularly, Ouedraogo and Leclerc (2013) conclude on Canadian data for the banking sector there is a link between job satisfaction and worker performance. But, they specify that the organizational performance results directly from a sum of the individual performances and indirectly of the satisfaction with the work.

In a completely different way, Berghe (2011) through three models can not conclude on a certain relationship between job satisfaction and job performance. In fact, whether it was his first model that postulated that job satisfaction would be the cause of job performance, or the second model that considered job performance as a contributor to job satisfaction, or the third model that postulated job satisfaction the two notions influenced each other, none of it has brought results concludings.

Thus, in general, most studies on the link between job satisfaction and work performance can not establish a strong causality or at the limit that is less open to criticism. But these mixed results do not make these studies of the potential link between these notions meaningless research; on the contrary, they open the way for further developments because the issues related to business performance; a lack of job satisfaction could have a negative impact on job performance.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 The theoretical model of job satisfaction

The theoretical model of job satisfaction is inspired by the canonical model of the efficiency salary as proposed by Solow (1979) and taken up by Lesueur and Sabatier (2008).

It is in our adaptation to relate the function of satisfaction in the employment of the workers, noted ψ assumed to be positively correlated with the pecuniary benefits of salary level and relative bonuses, noted ω_R received by them during the employment relationship. In this model, it is a question of determining the optimal levels of wages and relative bonuses that maximize the profit of the companies related to the performance of the workers, itself a function of the satisfaction in the employment.

ω_R is the ratio between the monetary benefits (salary and bonus) paid by the company, ω and the level of pecuniary benefits that can be expected in the market, $\bar{\omega}$ We have :

$$\psi = \psi(\omega_R), with\ \omega_R = \frac{\omega}{\bar{\omega}},\ \psi^{\cdot} > 0.$$

Assuming that employers know that pecuniary benefits positively influence workers' satisfaction, they include in their production function the volume $n\psi\ (\omega_R)$ efficace employment. In a competitive environment where the producer sells his product at the market price p, he will seek to maximize his profit function by determining the level of pecuniary benefits ω^* and the volume of employment n^* (which we will not determine here) associated with these pecuniary benefits according to the following program:

$$Max\ \pi = pf\big(n\psi(\omega_R)\big) - \omega n$$

The first order optimality conditions are as follows :

$$- \qquad \frac{\partial \pi}{\partial \omega} = 0 \Leftrightarrow pf^{\cdot}\big(n\psi(\omega_R)\big) \times \frac{n}{\bar{\omega}}\psi^{\cdot}(\omega_R) - n = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow pf^{\cdot}\big(n\psi(\omega_R)\big) \times \psi^{\cdot}(\omega_R) = \bar{\omega} \qquad (1)$$

$$- \qquad \frac{\partial \pi}{\partial n} = 0 \Leftrightarrow pf^{\cdot}\big(n\psi(\omega_R)\big) \times \psi(\omega_R) - \omega = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow pf^{\cdot}\big(n\psi(\omega_R)\big) \times \psi(\omega_R) = \omega \qquad (2)$$

From equations (1) and (2), we can establish that :

$$\frac{\psi^{\cdot}(\omega_R^*)}{\psi(\omega_R^*)} = \frac{1}{\omega_R^*},\ that\ is : \frac{\omega_R^*\psi^{\cdot}(\omega_R^*)}{\psi(\omega_R^*)} = 1.$$

This report defines the elasticity of job satisfaction to pecuniary benefits. At equilibrium, this elasticity is equal to 1. This condition of optimality, indicates that if the company pays pecuniary benefits ω such as $\omega_R < \omega^*_R$ it can improve the efficiency of the work by increasing the pecuniary benefits until they lead to ω^*_R.

Thus, we can notice that the pecuniary benefits do not result from a confrontation between the supply and the demand of jobs, but obey rules of internal efficiency of the company. This measure of in citation to increase the level of job satisfaction is difficult to apply in a period of unemployment where companies have less need to encourage workers because these latter have fewer opportunities for hiring.

3.2 The econometric model

The model econometric retained is the ordered logit that we will estimate by the maximum likelihood method. The choice of this model is related to the characteristic of the dependent variable, job satisfaction, which is ordinal in nature. The values taken by the dependent variable (y_i = 1, 2, 3, 4) will correspond to intervals in which there will be a continuous unobservable latent variable y_i^*. We pose the following modeling:

$$y_i = \begin{cases} 1 \ si \ y_i^* < \gamma_1 \ (not \ at \ all \ satisfied) \\ 2 \ si \ \gamma_1 \leq y_i^* < \gamma_2 \ (not \ very \ satisfied) \\ 3 \ si \ \gamma_2 \leq y_i^* < \gamma_3 \ (rather \ satisfied) \\ 4 \ si \ y_i^* > \gamma_4 \ (very \ satisfied) \end{cases}$$

where $y_i^* = X_i\beta + \varepsilon_i$ with $E(\varepsilon_i) = 0$ *et* $V(\varepsilon_i) = \sigma_\varepsilon^2$ and $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3$ *et* γ_4 are constants delimiting the intervals of the latent variable. X_i represents the characteristics (sociodemographic, working conditions, etc.) of the worker i.

From the threshold values of the estimate by the method of maximum likelihood, it is possible to calculate the probability associated with each modality. So we have:

$$Prob(y_i = 1) = Prob(y_i^* < \gamma_1) = Prob(X_i\beta + \varepsilon_i < \gamma_1)$$
$$= Prob(\varepsilon_i < \gamma_1 - X_i\beta)$$
$$= F(\gamma_1 - X_i\beta)$$

$$Prob(y_i = 2) = Prob(\gamma_1 \leq y_i^* < \gamma_2) = Prob(\gamma_1 \leq X_i\beta + \varepsilon_i < \gamma_2)$$

$$= Prob(\gamma_1 - X_i\beta \leq \varepsilon_i < \gamma_2 - X_i\beta)$$

$$= F(\gamma_2 - X_i\beta) - F_{ik}(\gamma_1 - X_i\beta)$$

$$Prob(y_i = 3) = Prob(\gamma_2 \leq y_i^* < \gamma_3) = Prob(\gamma_2 \leq X_i\beta + \varepsilon_i < \gamma_3)$$

$$= Prob(\gamma_2 - X_i\beta \leq \varepsilon_i < \gamma_3 - X_i\beta)$$

$$= F(\gamma_3 - X_i\beta) - F_{ik}(\gamma_2 - X_i\beta)$$

$$Prob(y_i = 4) = Prob(y_i^* > \gamma_4) = Prob(X_i\beta + \varepsilon_i > \gamma_4)$$

$$= Prob(\varepsilon_i > \gamma_4 - X_i\beta)$$

$$= 1 - Prob(\varepsilon_i < \gamma_4 - X_i\beta)$$

$$= 1 - F(\gamma_4 - X_i\beta)$$

The likelihood function associated with the ordered logit model is as follows:

$$L(y, \gamma, \beta) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \prod_{k=1}^{m} [prob(y_i = k)]$$

$$L(y, \gamma, \beta) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \prod_{k=1}^{m} [F(\gamma_k - X_i\beta) - F(\gamma_{k-1} - X_i\beta)]$$

With $\gamma_0 = -\infty$ and $\gamma_m = +\infty$ where m is the number of modalities.

The associated log-likelihood is as follows:

$$L(y, \gamma, \beta) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{k=1}^{m} [F(\gamma_k - X_i\beta) - F(\gamma_{k-1} - X_i\beta)]$$

With $\gamma_0 = -\infty$ and $\gamma_m = +\infty$.

The distribution of ε_i is such that $\varepsilon_i \sim l(0, \frac{\pi}{3})$ and the probability of choosing each modality in the ordered logit is the following:

$$Prob(y_i = k) = \left(\frac{e^{(\gamma_k - X_i\beta)}}{1 + e^{(\gamma_k - X_i\beta)}} \right) - \left(\frac{e^{(\gamma_{k-1} - X_i\beta)}}{1 + e^{(\gamma_{k-1} - X_i\beta)}} \right)$$

With $\gamma_0 = -\infty$ and $\gamma_m = +\infty$

$\forall\, k = 1,2,3,4.$

3.3 The data source and variables of the model

The data we use for our research come from the Côte d'Ivoire National Survey on the Employment Situation and the Informal Sector of 2016 conducted by the Ministry of Employment and Protection through the National Institute of Statistics and the Youth Employment Agency. These are questionnaires administered to workers in the formal sector and those in the informal sector. The answers from these surveys are therefore self-declared. The data from this survey is reliable because of the quality and the signature of the Institute that collected them. In addition, this survey responds to a key priority of the Ivorian government whose ambition is to achieve strong, sustainable, inclusive and job-creating growth for all parts of the country.

To arrive at the total number of individuals in our sample, we extracted from the base all individuals who are not of working age and retained workers with formal employment.

The variables of the model were thus coded [6] :

The variable explained, *satisfaction in employment* : 1 for « not at all satisfied », 2 for « not very satisfied », 3 for « rather satisfied » and 4 for « very satisfied ».

The explanatory variables :

Sex: this variable was coded in binary mode, 1 for men, 2 for women. It is difficult for us to predict the sense of satisfaction between these two categories of workers.

The marital situation: coded 1 for married, 2 for divorced / separated, 3 for widowed, 4 never married / cohabiting / single. Married people might be expected to be more satisfied with their jobs than other workers.

The age: coded in four classes ; 1 for 15-25 year olds, 2 for 26-35 year olds, 3 for 36-60 year olds and 4 for over 61 year olds. With this variable it is expected to observe that the probability of being satisfied with one's job increases with age.

Seniority in employment: coded into four classes; 1 for 0-2, 2 for 3-10, 3 for 11-20 and 4 for 21 and over. Same effect as age.

Seniority in the company: coded in four classes; 1 for 0-2, 2 for 3-10, 3 for 11-20 and 4 for 21 and over. Same effect as age.

The level of education: coded in four classes; 1 for no level, 2 for primary level, 3 for secondary level, 4 for higher level. Not easy to predict the meaning of satisfaction.

Religion: coded 0 for no religion, 1 for Muslim, 2 for Catholic, 3 for other Christians, 4 for other religion and 5 for animist. Religious belief could have a positive effect on job satisfaction, assuming that for revealed religions work is of divine origin. Work could therefore be interpreted as a continuity of creation and therefore beneficial.

Monthly salary (in thousands of FCFA): coded 1 for less than 60 (SMIG), 2 for [60; 120 [, 3 for [120; 180 [, 4 for [180; 240 [and 5 for [240 and [. With this variable, we expect that a high level of income increase the satisfaction in employment.

Premium: 1 for Yes, 2 for No. Satisfaction should increase with the given premium.

Benefits in kind (housing, electricity, water, transport): 1 for Yes and 2 for no. Same effect as the premium.

Weekly working hours: 1 for [less than 48H [and 2 for [48H and + [. Hours of work longer than 48 hours are expected to degrade the level of job satisfaction.

Activity branch: coded in 4 classes; 1 for agriculture, 2 for commerce, 3 for industry and 4 for service. Difficult to make a prediction at this level.

Type of enterprise: coded 1 for general government, 2 for public and parastatal enterprises, 3 for private non-agricultural enterprises and 4 for agricultural enterprises. Difficult to predict the meaning of satisfaction whatever the modality taken by this variable.

Size of the company: coded 0 for do not know, 1 for one person, 2 of (2-5) people, 3 for (6-9) people, 4 for (10-199) people, 5 for more 199 people. The group effect could have a positive or negative effect on job satisfaction.

Time spent in unemployment before obtaining employment: it is difficult to define the effect of this variable on job satisfaction. A long period of unemployment could have a detrimental effect on the dependent variable. However, a worker who has been employed after this long period of time

may feel satisfied simply because he or she has been employed.

The residence environment: coded in binary mode 1 for Urban and 0 for rural. Satisfactory jobs could be in the urban environment.

4. RESULTS AND INTERPRETATIONS

We will comment and interpret the results of the descriptive statistics on the one hand and comment and interpret the results of the econometric table on the other hand.

4.1 Descriptive statistics

The analysis of the statistical table in the appendix shows that it was not a priori obvious to predict the categories of workers who would be satisfied with their jobs. Indeed, we find that women are more satisfied with their job compared to men. However, we note that 0% of widowers are very satisfied with their jobs. Being alone in the household can explain this situation. More generally, workers with long experience in the company and in their employment are the most likely to be satisfied with their jobs; the same applies to workers with a higher level of education. The level of monthly salary, the granting of premium and benefits in kind does great satisfaction in the job.

4.2 Econometric results

The logistic regression table in the appendix confirms some of the predictions made above. Overall, we note that significant explanatory variables are marital status, education level, religion, salary monthly, premium, benefits in kind, weekly hours of work and typology of companies.

We note that the variables that influence the very high satisfaction or at least satisfaction in employment are : marital status, education level, religion, salary monthly, premium, benefits in kind, hours of work and typology of companies.

Precisely, the probability that widow/widow workers are satisfied with their job would decrease with the degree of satisfaction. This result would certainly be related to the fact that they do not have a spouse to whom they could confide outside of work. Carrying alone the worries of professional and/or private life could have a negative effect on job satisfaction. Workers with a high school education are less satisfied with their jobs. This could be explained by the fact that the level of education would be correlated with a low level of remuneration likely to cause dissatisfaction.

Religion seems to play a neutral role on job satisfaction. In fact, the probability of not being satisfied at all with one's job decreases with religious belief and the probability of being very satisfied with its employment decreases with this same variable. The role of religion is ambiguous.

An increase in the salary level, as well as the payment of a bonus and benefits in kind are likely to improve the level of satisfaction. The numerous strikes in Côte d'Ivoire, especially in the public administrations, linked to dissatisfaction in employment due to the level of monthly wages and other payments of bonuses and benefits, remind us of the price that workers give to these explanatory variables.

Long hours of work beyond the standard result in job dissatisfaction. Work-life balance can be affected due to heavy work hours.

The typology of the companies seems to have no effect on the very satisfactory employment.

5. CONCLUSION AND ECONOMIC POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

This research aimed to analyze the explanatory factors of satisfaction in formal employment in Côte d'Ivoire. It is one of the first articles to interest such a problem in Côte d'Ivoire. After having used the job satisfaction theories to explain what would lead to job satisfaction on the one hand, and on the other hand, to establish the link between this satisfaction and the performance of the workers, this article has attempted to answer the follow research question : why some workers are more satisfied in their jobs compared to others. The use of an ordinal logistic regression on the different modalities of job satisfaction, made it possible to realize that several explanatory variables would be at the origin of a great satisfaction in the employment. These include marital status, monthly salary, bonuses and benefits in kind that accompany the practice of the profession. On the other hand, a heavy workload through hours of work exceeding the norm (more than 48 hours) would degrade the level of job satisfaction.

In light of these results, we make the following recommendations:

- Establishment by the public and private administrative authorities of pecuniary incentives for workers, particularly with regard to the regularity of the payment of their emoluments, the definition of a salary progress chart to be respected and the fight against dear life, all thoses that would help against the high rate of absenteeism due to numerous strikes often seen in recent years in Côte d'Ivoire.

- The regularization of working hours in certain sectors of activity deemed to be voracious in time and preventing a reconciliation between private life and professional life.

REFERENCES

Bakan, I., and Buyukbese, T., 2013. The relationship entre employees' income level and employee job satisfaction: an empirical study. *International Journal of Business and Social Science, Vol. 4 No. 7. pp. 18-25.*

Berghe, J., V., 2011. Job satisfaction and job performance at the workplace. *International Business*, N ° 8299.

Carrim, N., and al 2006. The relationship entre job satisfaction and locus of control in a South African call center environment. *South African Journal of Labor Relations: Vol. No. 2; pp 66-81.*

Chapuis, K., 2016. Happywork : modélisation multi-agents de la satisfaction au travail. Thèse de doctorat. Université Pierre et Marie Curie. <NNT: 2016PA066152>.

Cinar, O., and Karciogtu, F., 2012. The level of job satisfaction in public sector: a survey study in the province of Agri, Eastern Anatolia, Turkey *DOI: 10.5755 / J01.em.17.2.2203.   Researchgate*.

Comeau, Y., (-), Théories de la satisfaction au travail. *Collection Etudes théoriques, Cahier du   CRISES, N° ET9205.*

Daniel, C., (2008), Salaires, conditions et satisfaction au travail. *Document de travail du GRANEM, N°2008-06-006.*

Davoine, L., (2006), Les déterminants de la satisfaction au travail en Europe: l'importance du contexte. *Document de travail, N° 76, Décembre 2006. CEE.*

Evelyne, F., et Rioux, L., (2002), Elaboration de l'échelle de satisfaction de vie professionnelle (ESVP) en langue française: une démarche exploratoire. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science. DOI : 10.1037/h0087173.*

Freeman, R., B., (1977), Job satisfaction as an economic variable. *Working paper N ° 225. National Bureau of Economic Research. 1737 Cambridge Street, Mass. 02138.*

Giauque, D., et al (2013), Stress et satisfaction au travail des cadres intermédiaires dans les hôpitaux de Suisse Roamne dans un contexte de réformes. *De Boeck Supérieur @ GRH, 2013/4 N°9, p.123-155. DOI: 10.3917/grh.134.0123.*

Hinks, T., (-), Job satisfaction and employment equity in South Africa. *Bath Economics Research Papers, N ° 23/09. Department of Economics. University of Bath.*

Jain, M., (2013), A study of employees' job satisfaction and its impact on their performance. *Journal of Indian Research (ISSN: 2321-4155), Vol., No., October-December, pp. 105-111.*

Jalagat, R., (2008), Job performance, job satisfaction and motivation: a critical review of their relationship. *International Journal of Management and Economics, pp 36-42.*

Jones, M., K. and al (2008), Training, job satisfaction and workplace performance in Britain: Evidence from WERS 2004. *Institute for the Study of Labor. Discussion paper N ° 3677.*

Judge, T., A., et al (2010), The relationship between pay and job satisfaction: a meta-analysis of literature. *Journal of vocational behavior. pp 157-167.*

Larouche, V., et Delorme, F., (1972), Satisfaction au travail : reformulation théorique. *Relations Industrielles/Indusrial Relations, Vol 27, N°4, pp 567-602.*

Lesueur, J., Y, et Sabatier, M., (2008), *Microéconomie de l'emploi: théories et applications*. Collection De Boeck.

Mafini, C., and Pooe, D., R., I., (2013), The Relationship Between Employee Satisfaction and Organizational Performance: Evidence from a South African Government Department. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology / SA Tydskrif vir Bedryfsielkunde, 39 (1), Art. 1090, 9 pages.*

Mishra, P., K., (2013), Job satisfaction. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS) Volume 14, Issue 5 (Sep- Oct 2013), pp 45-54.*

Ouedraogo, A., and Leclerc, A., (2013), Job satisfaction and organizational performance: evidence from Canadian Credit Union. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict.*

Pandey, K., M., and Kumari, G., (2011), Job Satisfaction in Public Sector and Private Sector: A Comparison. *International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology, Vol. 2, No. 3, June 2011, pp 222-228.*

Parvin, M., M., and Kabir, M., M., N., (2011), Factors affecting employee job satisfaction of pharmaceutical sector. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research, Vol 1, No. 9 [113-123].*

Rabbanee, F., K., and Yasmin, S., (2012), Determinants of Job Satisfaction: A Study on Bangladesh Perspective. *Research Journal of Commerce and Behavioral Science. Vol 01, Number 08. pp 28-34.*

Randon, S., (2010), Actualisation 2011 de la revue de littérature sur la satisfaction au travail conduite par le CCECQA en 2000. <hal-00748863>.

Razafindrakoto, M., et Roubaud, F., (2005), La satisfaction dans l'emploi: une mesure de la qualité de l'insertion professionnelle en regard des aspirations. *In Les marchés urbains du travail en Afrique Subsaharienne. pp 125-149. IRD Editions, AFD.*

Saari, L., M., and Judge, T., A., (2004), Employee attitudes and job satisfaction. *Human Resource Management, Winter 2004, Vol.43, No. 4, pp395-407.*

Schneider, D., S., and Vaught, B., (1993), A comparison of job satisfaction between public and private sector managers. *Public Administration Quarterly. Flight. 17, No. 1, pp 66-83.*

Shukla, S., K., and Sinha, D., (2013), Study of job satisfaction of employees of private sector banks. *International Journal of Education and Psychological Research, Vol 2, Issue 2, pp   33-40.*

Vigan, A., et Glauque, D. (2016), Satisfaction au travail dans les administrations publiques en Afrique: une revue systématique de la littérature. *DOI 1.3917/risa.843.0615. Research gate.*

Wright, T., A., and Cropanzano, R., (2000), Psychological well-being and job satisfaction as predictors of job performance. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology. Vol 5, No. 1, 84-94.*

www.ijsser.org
Page 2427

ANNEX

Table 1: Descriptive statistics on the modalities of job satisfaction

variables	modalities	Satisfaction in employment			
		Not at all satisfied	Not very satisfied	Rather satisfied	Very satisfied
Sex	Man	45 11.36%	90 22.73%	172 43.43%	89 22.47%
	Women	7 6.36%	20 18.18%	56 50.91%	27 24.55%
Marital status	Married	32 10.13%	60 18.99%	141 44.62%	83 26.27%
	Divorced / Separated	1 16.67%	1 16.67%	2 22.22%	2 33.33%
	Widower widow	1 11.11%	2 22.22%	6 66.67%	0 0 %%
	Never married / Cohabiting / Single	18 10.29%	47 26.86%	79 45.14%	31 17.71%
Age	[15-25] years	2 11.76%	6 35.29%	4 23.53%	5 29.41%
	[26-35] years	17 11.64%	37 25.34%	63 43.15%	29 19.86%
	[36-60] years	31 9.42%	64 19.45%	155 47.11%	79 24.01%
	[61 years and over [	2 14.29%	3 21.43%	6 42.86%	3 21.43%
Seniority in employment	[0-2] years	11 13.41%	25 30.49%	30 36.59%	16 19.51%
	[3-10] years	19 8.41%	54 23.89%	108 47.79%	45 19.91%
	[11-20] years	16 13.45%	22 18.49%	49 41.18%	32 26.89%
	[21 years and over [	6 7.59%	9 11.39%	41 51.90%	23 29.11%
Seniority in the company	[0-2] years	11 13.58%	26 32.10%	32 39.51%	12 14.81%
	[3-10] years	19 8.64%	53 24.09%	102 46.36%	46 20.91%
	[11-20] years	14 11.57%	21 17.36%	54 44.63%	32 26.45%
	[21 years and over [	8 9.52%	10 11.90%	40 47.62%	26 30.95%
Level of study	No	2 6.25%	8 25.00%	15 46.88%	7 21.88%
	Primary	6 21.43%	5 17.86%	14 50.00%	3 10.71%
	Secondary	34 12.32%	54 19.57%	132 47.83%	56 20.29%
	Superior	10 5.88%	43 25.29%	67 39.41%	50 29.41%
Religion	Any	1 4.17%	3 12.50%	11 45.83%	9 37.50%
	Muslim	15 10.87%	31 22.46%	61 44.20%	31 22.46%

	Catholic	16 8.79%	37 20.33%	9 50.00%	38 20.88%
	Other Christians	18 13.04%	30 21.74%	56 40.58%	34 24.64%
	Other religion	1 7.69%	5 38.46%	4 30.77%	3 23.08%
	Animist	1 9.09%	4 36.36%	5 45.45%	1 9.09%
Monthly income in thousands of FCFA	Less than 60	8 34.78%	6 26.09%	5 21.74%	4 17.39%
	[60; 120[	20 19.42%	28 27.18%	41 39.81%	14 13.59%
	[120; 180[	7 7.87%	27 30.34%	37 41.57%	18 20.22%
	[120; 240[	6 6.19%	15 15.46%	49 50.52%	27 27.84%
	[240 and+[	11 5.67%	34 17.53%	96 49.48%	53 27.32%
Premium	Yes	19 6.42%	58 19.59%	144 48.65%	75 25.34%
	No	33 15.71%	52 24.76%	84 40.00%	41 19.52%
Benefits in kind	Yes	19 10.16%	31 16.58%	84 44.92%	53 28.34%
	No	33 10.34%	79 24.76%	144 45.14%	63 19.75%
Weekly working hours	[-From 48H[	33 8.62%	72 18.80%	179 46.74%	99 25.85%
	[48H and + [	19 15.45%	38 30.89%	49 39.84%	17 13.82%
Existence of union	Yes	28 8.51%	68 20.67%	145 44.07%	88 26.75%
	No	24 13.56%	42 23.73%	83 46.89%	28 15.82%
Activity area	Formal	39 9.44%	81 19.61%	189 45.76%	104 25.18%
	Informal	13 13.98%	29 31.18%	39 41.94%	12 12.90%
Industry	Agriculture	6 40.00%	3 20.00%	4 26.67%	2 13.33%
	Trade	8 13.11%	21 34.43%	21 34.43%	11 18.03%
	Industry	5 10.87%	13 28.26%	23 50.00%	5 10.87%
	Services	33 8.59%	73 19.01%	180 46.88%	98 25.52%
	Public administration	15 5.58%	48 17.84%	121 44.98%	85 31.60%
Type of company	Public or parapublic enterprise	3 8.57%	7 20.00%	21 60.00%	4 11.43%
	Non-agricultural private enterprise	29 15.18%	52 27.23%	84 43.98%	26 13.61%
	Private agricultural enterprise	5 45.45%	3 27.27%	2 18.18%	1 9.09%
size of the company	Do not know	19 5.92%	62 19.31%	148 46.11%	92 28.66%

	One person	0 00.00%	1 33.33%	1 33.33%	1 33.33%
	(2-5) people	3 14.29%	5 23.81%	11 52.38%	2 9.52%
	(6-9) people	4 28.57%	3 21.43%	3 21.43%	4 28.57%
	(10-199) people	11 12.09%	28 30.77%	40 43.96%	12 13.19%
	More than 199 people	15 26.79%	11 19.64%	25 44.64%	5 8.93%
Middle of residence	Rural	42 9.63%	96 22.02%	198 45.41%	100 22.94%
	Urban	10 14.29%	14 20.00%	30 42.86%	16 22.86%

Source : Author calculations from ENSESI 2016.

Table 2: Ordinal logistic regression using the maximum likelihood method

Variables			Marginal effects							
			Not at all satisfied		Not very satisfied		Rather satisfied		Very satisfied	
	Coefficient	Standard deviation	Coefficient	Standard deviation	Coefficient	Standard deviation	Coefficient	Standard deviation	Coefficient	Standard deviation
Sociodemographic variables										
Sex [Ref. man]										
Women	.2093	.2244	-.0140	.0143	-.0287	.0304	.0089	.0078	.0338	.0375
Marital status [Ref. married]										
Divorced/Separated	-.5673	.8446	.0503	.0924	.0795	.1141	-.0559	.1167	-.0739	.0899
Widower/widow	-1.0365*	.6271	.1105	.0939	.1355**	.0633	-.1296	.1092	-.1164**	.0475
Never married/Single/Cohabitant	.0285	.2050	-.0020	.0143	-.0040	.0284	.0015	.0106	.0044	.0321
Age [Ref. (15-25) years old]										
(26-35) years old	-.4284	.5370	.0325	.0443	.0600	.0752	-.0294	.0450	-.0631	.0748
(36-60) years old	-.2380	.5551	.0162	.0367	.0328	.0757	-.0111	.0224	-.0379	.0904
61 years and over	-.3790	.7728	.0309	.0727	.0535	.1088	-.0317	.0866	-.0527	.0950
Seniority in employment [Ref. (0-2) years old]										
(3-10) years	-.4461	.4195	.0320	.0312	.0619	.0579	-.0254	.0261	-.0685	.0636
(11-20) years	-.5896	.4685	.0474	.0434	.0826	.0650	-.0466	.0489	-.0833	.0598
21 years and older	.0378	.5204	-.0026	.036	-.0052	.0720	.0019	.0253	.0059	.0824
Seniority in the company [Ref. (0-2) years old]										
(3-10) years	.5294	.4252	-.0362	.0289	-.0725	.0573	.0245	.0185	.0843	.0694
(11-20) years	.7336	.4806	-.0442*	.0255	-.0962	.0585	.0127	.0146	.1276	.0920
21 years and older	.5665	.5222	-.0340	.0270	-.0746	.0642	.0102	.0130	.0984	.1000
Education level [Ref. no]										
Primary	-.6056	.5250	.0534	.0571	.0848	.0710	-.0588	.0714	-.0794	.0568
Secondary	-.8901**	.4237	.0614**	.0300	.1201**	.0552	-.0393**	.0198	-.1423**	.0696
Superior	-.6595	.4492	.0511	.0388	.0918	.0619	-.0467	.0400	-.0962	.0614
Religion [Ref. any]										
Muslim	-.7061	.4393	.0572	.0415	.0984	.0600	-.0560	.0460	-.0996*	.0560
Catholic	-.7797*	.4341	.0607	.0383	.1079*	.0588	-.0549	.0386	-.1137*	.0595
Other Christians	-.9147**	.4390	.0775*	.0454	.1261**	.0577	-.0782	.0509	-.1254**	.0529
Other religions	-1.0874	.6773	.1174	.1022	.1407**	.0644	-.1373	.1168	-.1209**	.0492
Animist	-1.3294*	.7142	.1576	.1257	.1595***	.0480	-.1807	.1282	-.1364***	.0435
Variables related to working conditions										
Monthly Salary in thousands FCFA [Ref. [-From 60 []										
[60-120 [	.3731	.5128	-.0239	.0300	-.0504	.0672	.0122	.0087	.0621	.0907
[120-180 [	.7402	.5282	-.0428*	.0255	-.0956	.0623	.0062	.0222	.1321	.1058
[180-240 [	1.1234**	.5290	-.0603***	.0228	-.1382**	.0560	-.0121	.0407	.2106*	.1136
[240 and + [	.8295	.5235	-.0544	.0331	-.1110*	.0671	.0285*	.0152	.1369	.0912

Prime [Ref. Yes]										
No	-.5028***	.1919	.0367**	.0152	.0698**	.0271	-.0302**	.0152	-.0763***	.0284
Benefits in kind [Ref. Yes]										
No	-.4339**	.1945	.0291**	.0129	.0593**	.0264	-.0185**	.0092	-.0700**	.0325
Weekly working hours [Ref. [-From 48H []										
[48H and +[	-.6354***	.2203	.0515**	.0210	.0888***	.0312	-.0509**	.0248	-.0894***	.0282
Existence of union in business [Ref. Yes]										
No	-.1790	.2080	.0128	.0154	.0250	.0291	-.0104	.0134	-.0274	.0313
Business Line Variables										
Formal Sector [Ref. Yes]										
No	.1216	.2980	-.0082	.0196	-.0168	.0408	.0056	.0118	.0194	.0486
Branch of activity [agriculture]										
Trade	.3672	.6578	-.0229	.0365	-.0493	.0845	.0101*	.0060	.0621	.1200
Industry	.5260	.6716	-.0308	.0327	-.0688	.0813	.0069	.0201	.0927	.1319
Services	.4250	.6390	-.0328	.0543	-.0596	.0898	.0306	.0576	.0618	.0866
Type of company [Ref. public administration]										
Public enterprise or parapublic enterprise	-.6770*	.3578	.0609	.0406	.0943**	.0477	-.0677	.0507	-.0874**	.0377
Non-agricultural private enterprise	-.8483*	.5129	.0659	.0449	.1169*	.0687	-.0586	.0437	-.1242*	.0709
Private agricultural enterprise	-1.7274*	1.0039	.2345	.2107	.1723***	.0234	-.2501	.1700	-.1567***	.0448
Size of the company [Ref. do not know]										
1 person	.5370	1.2485	-.0301	.0550	-.0691	.1446	.0020	.0579	.0972	.2566
(2-5) people	.5302	.6280	-.0303	.0290	-.0688	.0744	.0042	.0250	.0949	.1265
(6-9) people	-.1010	.7368	.0074	.0560	.0141	.1039	-.0062	.0517	-.0153	.1081
(10-199) people	.0232	.5036	.0016	.0348	-.0032	.0698	.0012	.0255	.0036	.0792
more than 199 people	-.3039	.5503	-.0236	.0471	.0428	.0779	-.0224	.0515	-.0440	.0736
Time spent in unemployment before obtaining employment	-.0363	.0286	.0025	.0020	.0050	.0040	-.0019	.0016	-.0057	.0045
Middle of residence [Ref. rural]										
Urban	-.1877	.2806	.0139	.0221	.0263	.0397	-.0122	.0218	-.0280	.0401
Number of observations	506									
LR Chi2 (43)	111.09									
Prob > Chi2	0.0000									
Nickname R²	0.0870									
LogLikelihood	-583.25679									
Cut 1	-4.1276									
Cut 2	-2.4855									
Cut 3	-0.1964									

Source : Author calculations from ENSESI 2016.

*, **, *** : Significant coefficients at the threshold of 10%, 5% and 1%.

[1] Doctor in Economics and Assistant to the Training and Research Unit of Economic Sciences and Management of the University of Félix Houphoüet Boigny of Abidjan.

[2] In Anglo-Saxon research, *satisfaction in employment* refers to *job satisfaction*. In this article, satisfaction in employment will therefore be comparable to job satisfaction.

[3] N ' Gratier (2013) in a Master's thesis tries to analyze the determinants of job satisfaction in relation to corporate governance in Côte d'Ivoire. His analysis is limited since he does not hold an explicit question for the variable of interest. So he approaches by having a permanent contract and normal weekly working hours.

[4] The different types of proxy are : 1 Getting a first job; 2 Getting a new job in the same company (promotion in employment); 3 Get a new job at another company ; 4 Keep the job you currently have, or stay inactive.

[5] This part of you is inspired in part by papers Comeau (1992) on the theories of satisfaction and Larouche and Delorme (1972) on job satisfaction : theoretical reformulation.

[6]   For some variables, we selected the coding of the survey.