

The Role of Factors on Job Satisfaction of Employees – An Empirical Study

Ramandeep Kaur

(M.Com; PG Diploma in Statistics; UGC-NET)

(Assistant Professor in Commerce)

Khalsa College for Women, Civil Lines, Ludhiana

Abstract: Job satisfaction is an important indicator of how employees feel about their jobs and predictor of work behaviors such as organizational citizenship, absenteeism, and turnover. The analysis of impact of certain factors on employee job satisfaction is an important yet relatively neglected area of inquiry within the field of human resource management (HRM). This study suggests that the factors that has impact on job satisfaction are perceived to be promoted in the organization too and that this impact tends, on the whole, to be positive than negative. In particular, the results indicate that the factors need to be give importance in the organization are not necessarily the same as those that make up high productivity but still helps in improving the performance. Moreover, the perceptions of work conditions have proven to be important to the well being of workers.

Key Words: factors, job satisfaction, organization, perceived, productivity.

I. Introduction

Job satisfaction has been defined as a pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job; an effective reaction to one's job; and an attitude towards one's job. Weiss (2002) has argued that job satisfaction is an attitude but points out that researchers should clearly distinguish the objects of cognitive evaluation which are affect (emotion), beliefs and behaviors. This definition suggests that we form attitudes towards our jobs by taking into account our feelings, our beliefs, and our behaviors.

One of the biggest preludes to the study of job satisfaction was the Hawthorne studies. These studies (1924-1933), primarily credited to Elton Mayo of the Harvard Business School, sought to find the effects of various conditions (most notably illumination) on workers' productivity. These studies ultimately showed that novel changes in work conditions temporarily increase productivity (called the Hawthorne Effect). It was later found that this increase resulted, not from the new conditions, but from the knowledge of being observed. This finding provided strong evidence that people work for purposes other than pay, which paved the way for researchers to investigate other factors in job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction can also be seen within the broader context of the range of issues which affect an individual's experience of work, or their quality of working life. Job satisfaction can be understood in terms of its relationships with other key factors, such as general well-being, stress at work, control at work, home-work interface, and working conditions.

The old view that 'a *happy worker is a productive worker*' does not clarify the complex relationship between job satisfaction and productivity in today's world. It was traditionally said that high job satisfaction leads to improved productivity, decreased turnover and less stress in long run. But the relationship between job satisfaction and productivity is not definitely established.

II. Literature Review

The relationship between the job satisfaction and productivity is complicated. But the content theories of motivation assume a direct relationship between job satisfaction and improved productivity. Job satisfaction does not necessarily lead to improved work performance. For example, from the results of twenty studies, Vroom (1964) found no simple relationship, and only a low median correlation (0.14) between satisfaction and performance. Iaffaldano & Muchinsky (1985) backed this up, suggesting that the average correlation was around 0.15. More recently, a definitive meta-analysis by Tim Judge and his colleagues (2001) reported an uncorrected average correlation of 0.18, and a corrected correlation of 0.30. These studies boost the argument that there is little association between job satisfaction and productivity, at least at the individual level.

The paper studies the different factors (categorized as individual, social, cultural, organizational, and environmental) has impact on job satisfaction and to what extent relevance should be given to these factors for better productivity. Certain factors are intrinsic and some are extrinsic and if both the factors bear very little relationship to the performance level of individual, the resultant correlation between satisfaction and performance tends to be weak. In such a situation management should follow two things (Porter and Lawler): (1) Modify the job and (2) Correct the reward system so that it acts as an incentive for higher productivity.

There have been several studies in the past that shows the relation between job satisfaction and productivity. These are: In 1997, Development Dimensions International (DDI) conducted focus groups, customer interviews, and surveys to determine the drivers of an effective service environment. DDI found evidence of a circular relationship between employee satisfaction, and customer satisfaction, and increase in company profitability. A 2001 study published in *Personnel Psychology* examined whether positive employee behaviors and attitudes influence business outcomes or if the opposite, that positive business outcomes influence employee behavior, is true. Study findings include that employee satisfaction, behavior, and turnover predict the following year's profitability, and that these aspects have an even stronger correlation with customer satisfaction. So these studies predict certain relation between satisfaction and productivity. The job satisfaction can be measured with several methods. By far, the most common method for collecting data regarding job satisfaction is the Likert Scale. In this study Likert Scale has been used to measure satisfaction. The other method Job Descriptive Index (JDI), created by Smith, Kendall, & Hulin (1969), is a specific questionnaire of job satisfaction that has been widely used. It measures one's satisfaction in five facets: pay, promotions and promotion opportunities, coworkers, supervision, and the work itself. The scale is simple; participants answer either yes, no or can't decide in response to whether given statements accurately describe one's job. The use of JDI has also been applied in this study.

III. Objectives of the study

The objective of the study was to examine (a) If the different factors affect the job satisfaction of the employees (b) If the satisfaction of the employee has any relation with productivity

IV. Data base and methodology

4.1 Nature of Data: The present study is based on primary data.

4.2 Sources of Data: Primary data has been collected through the non-disguised structured questionnaire, which was converted into vernacular language so as to make it understandable. Subjects are required to fill in a questionnaire and analysis is done on 5-point Likert Scale. In order to make sample representative, a total of 100 people working as professionals, supervisory and managerial positions in different districts of Punjab.

4.3 Procedure: Participants were asked to rate the factors twice, first with respect to how important are given factors in their life from (1) Very important to (5) Not at all important, and second, in terms of factors to be promoted in the organization as from (1) Highly promoted to (5) Not at all promoted. The mean and standard deviation were computed of the factors in two distinct group i.e. importance of factors for job satisfaction and factors perceived to be promoted in the organization. The factors were rank ordered based on mean values having less than 2 and were separated. In step 2 Job Description Index was used in which the satisfaction percentage has been calculated under five facets: pay, promotions and promotion opportunities, coworkers, supervision, and work itself.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of Factors Important For Job Satisfaction

FACTORS	N	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	MEAN	STD. DEVIATION
Personality	100	1	4	1.32	0.581
Education	100	1	5	2.45	1.142
Intelligence	100	1	5	2.53	1.023
Marital status	100	1	3	1.43	0.634
Orientation at work	100	1	5	2.38	1.117
Group working	100	1	5	1.78	0.771
Relationship with coworkers	100	1	5	1.35	0.237
Opportunities for interaction	100	1	4	1.25	0.321
Informal relations	100	1	3	1.33	0.576
Attitudes	100	1	3	1.78	0.754
Beliefs	100	1	5	2.47	1.179
Values	100	1	5	2.67	1.321
Nature and size	100	1	4	1.45	0.745
Personnel policies and procedure	100	1	5	2.04	1.725
Supervision	100	1	5	2.25	1.165

Style of leadership	100	1	5	2.25	1.461
Working conditions	100	1	5	1.28	0.909
Economic factor	100	1	3	1.75	0.675
Social and technical	100	1	4	1.54	0.806
Management system	100	1	5	1.44	0.657

Table2: Descriptive Statistics of Factors Perceived to be Promoted in the organization

FACTORS	N	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	MEAN	STD. DEVIATION
Personality	100	1	5	1.61	1.038
Education	100	1	5	2.10	1.112
Intelligence	100	1	5	3.21	1.087
Marital status	100	1	3	2.33	2.567
Orientation at work	100	1	5	1.93	1.234
Group working	100	1	5	1.56	0.876
Relationship with coworkers	100	1	3	1.74	0.322
Opportunities for interaction	100	1	3	1.50	1.015
Informal relations	100	1	3	1.51	1.015
Attitudes	100	1	4	2.74	1.921
Beliefs	100	1	5	1.35	1.287
Values	100	1	5	2.81	1.259
Nature and size	100	1	5	1.65	1.654
Personnel policies and procedure	100	1	5	2.57	1.234
Supervision	100	1	5	1.13	1.198
Style of leadership	100	1	4	1.59	1.234
Working conditions	100	1	4	1.31	0.346
Economic factor	100	1	3	1.21	0.553
Social and technical	100	1	3	1.76	1.000
Management system	100	1	5	1.71	1.043

Table 3: Group Mean < 2

FACTORS IMPORTANT FOR JOB SATISFACTION		FACTORS PERCEIVED TO BE PROMOTED IN THE ORGANIZATION	
Factors	Mean	Factors	Mean
Personality	1.32	Personality	1.61
Marital Status	1.43	Orientation at work	1.93
Group Working	1.78	Group Working	1.56
Relationship with coworkers	1.35	Relationship with coworkers	1.74
Opportunities for Interaction	1.25	Opportunities for Interaction	1.50
Informal relations	1.33	Informal relations	1.51
Attitudes	1.78	Beliefs	1.35
Nature and size	1.45	Nature and size	1.65
Working Conditions	1.28	Working Conditions	1.31
Economic factors	1.75	Economic factors	1.21
Social and technical	1.54	Social and technical	1.76
Management system	1.44	Management system	1.71
		Supervision	1.13
		Style of Leadership	1.59

The above three tables has tried to show the factors that are important for job satisfaction. Now in the next step effort has been done to show the percentage increase in productivity by using Job Descriptive Index.

Table 4: Percentage increase in Productivity due to factors of job satisfaction (Using Job Descriptive Index)

FACTORS	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	PERCENTAGE INCREASE
Pay	1	5	75.20%
Promotions and Promotion Opportunities	1	5	75.23%
Coworkers	1	5	71.33%
Supervision	1	5	82.09%
Work itself	1	5	86.73%

V. Findings

The mean and standard deviation of both the scales are tabulated in Table 1 and 2. Factors having means less than 2 for both the scales are shown in Table 3. It may be seen from Table 3 that there are 12 out of 20 factors that has emerged as important for job satisfaction. Also, there are 14 factors which are perceived to be promoted to a high degree in the organization. It is also seen that 10 out of 12 values that are important for job satisfaction are also perceived to be promoted in the organization. So this shows that certain factors have great impact on the satisfaction of the employees. Now, in Table 4 factors are covered under five facets and the percentage increase in the productivity due to these factors has been shown. It is clearly defined that monetary factors though are important for job satisfaction but supervision and work itself has great impact on the productivity of the employee.

VI. Discussion

The results clearly indicate that monetary factors are not only responsible for the productivity of the employee but the work itself and supervision too play an important role. It is also evident that perception of congruence between personal factors and factors promoted in the organization definitely influences job satisfaction. Though the mean of the factors that are important and the ones perceived to be promoted are not exactly same, they are close enough to arrive at this conclusion. The other part shows the relation of job satisfaction on productivity. The effort has been made to show this. The study has used factors under five facets (job descriptive index) to show the percentage increase in productivity due to those factors. Though the main purpose left behind which was to show the degree of correlation between job satisfaction and productivity as Vroom set that figure as 0.14. This limitation will be overcome by enhancing the scope of this study suitably in the near future.

Bibliography

- [1] Andrew, J. DuBrins. (1988), 'The Practice of Supervision, Universal Bookstall,' New Delhi, p. 58
- [2] Argyle, M.(1974), 'The Social Psychology of Work, Penguin', Oxford, pp. 238-39
- [3] Blau, G.L. (1987). 'Using a person-environment fit model to predict job involvement and organizational commitment'. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, p. 30, pp. 240-257
- [4] Chatman, J.A. (1989). 'Improving interactional organizational research: A model of person-organization fit'. *Academy of Management Review*, 14,333-349.
- [5] Feldman, D.C. and Arnold H.J.(1983); *Managing Individual and Group Behaviour in Organisations*, McGraw Hill, New York, p. 192.
- [6] Locke, E.A. (1976). The nature and consequences of job satisfaction, *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. pp. 1297-1349.
- [7] Luthans, Fred, (1989), 'Organizational Behaviour', McGraw-Hill, New York.
- [8] Milkovich, G.T. and Boudreau, I.W. (1991). 'Human resource management (6th Ed.)', Homewood, IL: Irwin.
- [9] Porter, L.W. and Lawler, E.E. (1968), 'Management Attitudes and Performance', Richard D. Irwin Inc., Homewood, Ill., pp. 12-13.
- [10] Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology*, 40, 437-453.
- [11] Smith, F.J., "Work Attitudes as Predictors of Attendance on a Specific Day," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, February 1977, pp. 16-19.
- [12] T.N. Chhabra (2007), *Human Resource Management, Concepts and Issues*, Dhanpat Rai &Co. (P) Ltd., Delhi, pp. 690-694.
- [13] Vroom, Victor H. (1964), 'Work and Motivation', Wiley, New York.