

# FACTORS INFLUENCING JOB SATISFACTION AMONG NON-MANAGERIAL EMPLOYEES WITH AN AUTO COMPONENT MANUFACTURER

**Dr. Praveen Paul J**

*Associate Professor, Management Studies, Mepco Schlenk Engineering College, Sivakasi*

## **ABSTRACT**

*This research paper measures and presents the impact of various antecedents of job satisfaction of the non-managerial employees of an auto component manufacturer. A total of 193 non managerial employees were included for the survey. The factors considered to impact the job satisfaction of the employees were the feeling of achievement, job attachment, organisational support, physical work environment, peer relations, rewards and recognition, and work schedule. The data was analysed using IBM® SPSS Statistics®. The reliability of the measurement tool using Cronbach's alpha was found to be good. Multiple linear regression (MLR) was carried out and it was found that the factors feeling of achievement, peer relations and work schedule had a significant impact on the employees' job satisfaction. Simple linear regressions were done individually to find the impact of the various antecedents individually on the job satisfaction. It was found here that all the factors had a significant impact on the employees' job satisfaction.*

**Keywords:** *Job Satisfaction, Job Attachment, Organisational Support, Peer relations, Work Schedule*

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

Job satisfaction of employees is the very foundation of any business. Only satisfied employees are productive and stay in the job longer [1], [2]. Employee turnover is a costly problem that will continue as manufacturing organisations face the impending worker shortage [3]. To be successful, companies must be able to attract, recruit, and retain a competent workforce [4]. Organisations need to retain employees in order to reduce the cost associated with recruitment and training of new employees. To reduce employee turnover, organisations must understand how to shape proper employee job satisfaction [5], [6]. Job satisfaction is also important to increase employee intention to stay in their careers [7].

Without doubt, satisfied employees are inclined to outperform dissatisfied employees [8]. Dissatisfied employees exhibit negative traits such as increased levels of absenteeism, unpunctuality, low morale, and high intention to leave the job [9], [10]. Employees with low levels of job satisfaction and involvement are more likely to put in less effort for achieving the tasks assigned to them but put in more efforts to tasks outside the

scope of their job or engage in undesirable job-related activities [11]. Conversely, employees with high levels of job satisfaction are more likely to dedicate substantial efforts in achieving organizational objectives and these employees are considered to be better performers [11], [12].

The issues concerning job satisfaction of employees and job dissatisfaction and the importance of achieving satisfied employees have remained a management challenge over time [13].

## **II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

Job satisfaction is measured as a very important variable of organizational studies [14], [15]. Robbins [16] defines job satisfaction as an overall attitude toward an individual's job. Generally, scholars recognize job satisfaction as an aggregate concept with various dimensions [17]. Previous studies and literature on job satisfaction has significantly contributed to the understanding of antecedents of job satisfaction [7], [18], [19]. Further, there are several studies presenting various measurement methodologies for job satisfaction. A weighted model is evaluated by [20]; Schneider and Dachler [21] emphasized on the stability of the job descriptive index; Johnson et al., [22] assessed the reliability and validity of the response format of job descriptive index. Normally, job satisfaction is measured as a work place reaction, which is a psychometric way of measurement for organizational research [23]. There are many ways of studying and measuring this work place reaction and in turn job satisfaction [2]. The two main approaches to measure job satisfaction are 'single global rating' and 'summation score', which is constructed using a number of job facets [16].

The global single-item measurements is challenged by Scarpello, V. and Campbell [24]; job descriptive index measurement properties are examined by Roznowski [25]; Wanous et al., [26] examined the single-item measures; Stanton et al., [27] considered a compact job descriptive index measure; the construct validity of job descriptive index was evaluated by Kinicki et al., [14]; Furnham et al., [28] contests the facet importance of job satisfaction; the asymmetric effects on job satisfaction formation is assessed by Matzler and Renzl [29]; the facet importance of total job satisfaction was discussed by Skalli et al., [30]; and Carter and Dalal [31] presents a deliberation on the scale of job descriptive index.

As a response to the criticisms against global measurements of job satisfaction, researchers have established multifaceted job satisfaction scales [32], [33], [34]. The multifaceted job satisfaction scales indicate the antecedents of job satisfaction such as role ambiguity, role conflict, work-family conflict, family-work conflict, and emotional exhaustion [35], [36].

## **III. METHODOLOGY**

This research was intended to measure the non-managerial employees' job satisfaction in an automobile component manufacturer based in Tamilnadu. The main objective of this study is to identify the factors affecting the job satisfaction of the employees. A descriptive research design was used. The primary data for the study was collected from 193 non managerial employees of the manufacturing unit through a structured questionnaire which

was designed to include the items measuring job satisfaction. The instrument was developed by using the various dimensions and scales on job satisfaction using the literature from previous related research in this area. The opinion of the employees on the various factors is collected through a number of individual items on those factors. A five point likert scale (1 = completely disagree, 5 = completely agree) was used to measure these opinions from the respondents. A total of employees were included for the survey. The data was analysed using IBM@SPSSStatistics@. The data collected from the employees was subjected to factor analysis and the various items in the questionnaire was grouped into factors such as Work Schedule, Job Attachment, Physical work environment, Rewards and Recognition, Peer relations, Feeling of Achievement, Organisational Support.

Table 1: Factors in the study

Components	Code
Feeling of Achievement	JS1
Job Attachment	JS2
Organisational Support	JS3
Physical work environment	JS4
Peer relations	JS5
Rewards and Recognition	JS6
Work Schedule	JS7

#### IV. ANALYSIS AND OUTCOME

The measurement instrument was tested for its reliability. Cronbach's alpha is the most common form of reliability coefficient. Alpha measures the extent to which item responses obtained at the same time correlate highly with each other. By convention, alpha should be 0.70 or higher to retain an item in a scale. The reliability scores of this measurement tool was found to be 0.794 (Table 1) which is quite good.

Table 2: Reliability measure of the tool

Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	No. of Factors
0.794	7

Further the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy was found to be 0.895 (Table 2) which is an indication that the sample size considered for the study is adequate. Bartlett's Test of Sphericity also indicates that the data is fit enough for continuing with further analysis.

Table 3: KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy	0.895
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square 2582.426

	Degrees of Freedom	351
	Significance	.000

Tests for content validity may also be statistical. Many techniques are appropriate. Factor analysis is one such where it is employed in developing the questionnaire and to eliminate items that were least related to the intended constructs and to test whether response patterns reflected the intended conceptual structure. Content validity is established by showing that the test items are a sample of a universe in which the investigator is interested. Content validity is ordinarily to be established deductively, by defining a universe of items and sampling systematically within this universe to establish the test. Smit[37] observes that by means of factor analysis it is possible to construct a test giving a relatively pure measurement of a specific theoretical construct. This is achieved by a factor analysis of the items in the test that individually are considered as variables. It is the analysis of the internal statistical structure of these variables culminating in a factor loading which provides the researcher with a measure of a specific construct [37]. Construct validity in this research was ensured through incorporating the factors which were derived from the factor analysis on the schedule [38].

Table 4: Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues (Total)	$\bar{x}$	$\sigma$	Variance Explained	
				% of $\sigma^2$	Cumulative %
Feeling of Achievement	9.936	17.26	2.058	13.720	13.720
Job Attachment	1.912	12.76	1.632	11.164	24.884
Organisational Support	1.565	21.09	2.421	9.177	34.061
Physical work environment	1.299	12.74	1.537	8.520	42.581
Peer relations	1.216	12.79	1.565	8.344	50.925
Rewards and Recognition	1.084	8.38	1.220	8.129	59.054
Work Schedule	1.041	8.45	1.181	7.808	66.861
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis					

The mean, standard deviations and the total variance explained by the study is presented in Table 4. It can be seen from the table that the total variance explained by the factors considered for the study is 66.861%, which could be considered as adequate.

As a part of the analysis, the impact of the various antecedents considered for the employees' job satisfaction on their overall opinion is studied. This impact was measured through multiple linear regression with all the antecedents considered together and simple linear regression with individual antecedents separately.

#### 4.1. Impact of All the Factors Collectively Influencing Job Satisfaction of Non-Managerial Employees

For finding the impact of all the antecedents of job satisfaction together on overall feeling of an employee's satisfaction, a multiple linear regression (MLR) was done and the results were analysed. The results of the

multiple linear regression are presented in Table 5 and 6. Table 5 gives the model summary of the multiple regression.

Table 5: Impact of job satisfaction antecedents on overall opinion of satisfaction

Factors	R	Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	Change Statistics		
			R <sup>2</sup> Change	F Change	Sig. F Change
All	0.546	0.271	0.298	11.206	.000
Dependent Variable: Overall Feeling of Job Satisfaction					

Observing the results in Table 5 it can be seen that the overall regression model predicts the outcome variable both statistically and significantly at  $p < 0.01$ . The R value indicates a high degree of correlation. The R<sup>2</sup> value indicates that 29.8% of the total variation in the dependent variable can be explained by the independent variable. The regression coefficients of the MLR are presented in Table 6.

Table 6: Coefficients of the MLR for all employees

Model	Regression Coefficients	t	Sig.
(Constant)	5.733	11.685	.000
Feeling of Achievement (JS1)	0.267	3.332	.001
Job Attachment (JS2)	-0.088	-1.084	.280
Organisational Support (JS3)	0.000	-.003	.998
Physical work environment (JS4)	-0.070	-.875	.383
Peer relations (JS5)	0.196	2.526	.012
Work Schedule (JS6)	0.315	3.939	.000
Rewards and Recognition (JS7)	-0.105	-1.276	.204

The regression outcomes in Table 6 show that only the antecedents feeling of achievement, peer relations and work schedule have a significant impact on the overall job satisfaction of employees at  $p < 0.05$ . The regression equation will be in the form of  $y = a + \beta x_1 + \beta x_2 + \dots + \beta x_n$ , where Y is the overall feeling of job satisfaction in the organisation and  $\beta$  is the regression coefficient of the respective antecedent and x is the antecedent of job satisfaction. The regression equation thus formed from the coefficients presented in Table 6 is as follows.

$$y = 5.733 + 0.267 JS1 + 0.196 JS5 + 0.315 JS6 \quad (1)$$

The regression equation signifies the fact that when the factors feeling of achievement, peer relations and work schedule increase to the magnitude shown in the equation, the job satisfaction of the employees also increases.

#### 4.2. Impact of the Individual Factors Influencing Job Satisfaction of Non-Managerial Employees Separately

To find the impact of the various antecedents individually on the job satisfaction of the employees, simple linear regressions were done individually and the outcomes were consolidated in a single table (Table 7). The regression equations for each factor will be in the form of  $y = a + \beta x$ , where Y is the overall feeling of an employee's satisfaction in the organisation and  $\beta$  is the regression coefficient of the respective antecedent and x is the antecedent of job satisfaction.

Table 7: Compiled output of individual linear regressions of factors influencing job satisfaction

Factors	R	Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	Constant	RegCoeff	t	Change Statistics		
						R <sup>2</sup> Change	F Change	Sig. F Change
Feeling of Achievement	0.416	0.169	4.343	0.146	6.318	0.173	39.912	.000
Job Attachment	0.245	0.055	3.203	0.109	3.488	0.060	12.164	.001
Organisational Support	0.347	0.116	4.009	0.104	5.120	0.121	26.210	.000
Physical work environment	0.343	0.113	3.876	0.162	5.044	0.118	25.440	.000
Peer relations	0.374	0.136	4.033	0.173	5.578	0.140	31.118	.000
Rewards and Recognition	0.192	0.032	2.775	0.114	2.706	0.037	7.322	.007
Work Schedule	0.434	0.184	4.066	0.266	6.654	0.188	44.281	.000

Dependent Variable: Overall Feeling of Job Satisfaction

The regression outcomes in Table 7 show that when considered separately, all the antecedents of job satisfaction have a significant impact on the satisfaction of all the employees at  $p < 0.05$ . The person correlation coefficients of all the factors except rewards and recognition are above 0.3. Even though the correlation coefficients are quite low they could be considered as significant. The R<sup>2</sup> values are also very low. This indicates that these factors are not so important for explaining the job satisfaction of the employees. The regression equations are presented below.

$$y = 4.343 + 0.146 JS1 \tag{2}$$

$$y = 3.203 + 0.109 JS2 \tag{3}$$

$$y = 4.009 + 0.104 JS3 \tag{4}$$

$$y = 3.876 + 0.162 JS4 \tag{5}$$

$$y = 4.033 + 0.173 JS5 \tag{6}$$

$$y = 2.775 + 0.114 JS6 \tag{7}$$

$$y = 4.066 + 0.266 JS7 \quad (8)$$

The regression equation signifies the fact that when the antecedents of job satisfaction increase individually to the magnitude shown in the equation, the job satisfaction of the employees also increases

## V. RESULTS AND CONCLUSION

From this study it was found that the non-managerial employees at the automobile component manufacturer are satisfied with the various factors impacting their job satisfaction such as feeling of achievement, job attachment, organisational support, physical work environment, peer relations, rewards and recognition, and work schedule. However when the factors were considered together in the multiple regression it was found that only the factors such as feeling of achievement, peer relations and work schedule have a significant impact on the overall job satisfaction of employees. It was also found that the factor rewards and recognition has the least impact because the organisation follows an equitable approach to the compensation of its employees. This research did not look into the differences that could happen in the job satisfaction between different groups of employees discriminated on their age, department they work in etc. There could be differences in their job satisfaction if this was considered.

## REFERENCES

- [1.] Deery, M. (2008), "Talent management, work-life balance and retention strategies", *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 20 No. 7, pp. 792-806.
- [2.] Schermerhorn, J.R., Hunt, J.G. and Osborn, R.N. (2002), *Organizational Behavior*, Wiley, Phoenix, AZ.
- [3.] The Advisory Board Company. (2000), *Flexible scheduling drives low turnover at Memorial South Bend*. Washington, DC: Advisory Board Daily Briefing, February 7, 2000.
- [4.] Rhoads, G.K., Swinyard, W.R., Geurts, M.D. and Price, W.D. (2002), "Retailing as a career: a comparative study of marketers", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 78 No. 1, pp. 71-76.
- [5.] Arndt, A., Arnold, T.J. and Landry, T.D. (2006), "The effects of polychronic-orientation upon retail employee satisfaction and turnover", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 82 No. 4, pp. 319-30.
- [6.] Booth, S. and Hamer, K. (2006), "Labour turnover in the retail industry: predicting the role of individual, organisational and environmental factors", *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, Vol. 35 No. 4, pp. 289-307.
- [7.] Kim, H., Knight, D. and Crutsinger, C. (2009), "Generation Y employees' retail work experience: the mediating effect of job characteristics", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 62 No. 5, pp. 548-56.
- [8.] Labatmediene, L., Endriulaitiene, A., & Gustainiene, L. (2007), "Individual correlates of organizational commitment and intention to leave the organization", *Baltic Journal of Management*, Vol.2, pp.196-212. doi:10.1108/17465260710750991

- [9.] Rad, A., & De Moraes, A. (2009), "Factors affecting employees' job satisfaction in public hospitals", *Journal of General Management*, Vol. 34, pp.51 - 66. Retrieved from EBSCOHost.
- [10.] Williams, D., Harris, C., & Parker, J. (2008), "I love you- goodbye: Exit interviews and turnover in New Zealand hotel industry", *New Zealand Journal of Employment Relations*, Vol.33, pp.70-90. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/233249915?accountid=28180>
- [11.] Rotenberry, P., & Moberg, P. (2007), "Assessing the impact of job involvement on performance" *Management Research News*, Vol.30, pp.203-215. doi:10.1108/01409170710733278
- [12.] Chughtai, A., (2008), "Impact of job involvement on in-role job performance and organizational citizenship behaviour", *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*, Vol. 9, pp.169-183. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/196727114?accountid=28180>
- [13.] Tillman, C., Smith, F., & Tillman, W. (2010), "Work locus of control and the multidimensionality of job satisfaction", *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communication and Conflict*, Vol.14, pp.107-125. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/763234809?accountid=28180>
- [14.] Kinicki, A.J., Mckee-Ryan, F.M., Schriesheim, C.A. and Carson, K.P. (2002), "Assessing the construct validity of the job descriptive index: a review and meta-analysis", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 87 No. 1, pp. 14-32.
- [15.] Rice, R.W., Markus, K., Moyer, R.P. and Mcfarlin, D.B. (1991), "Facet importance and job satisfaction: two experimental tests of Locke's range of affect hypothesis", *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, Vol. 21 No. 24, pp. 1977-1987.
- [16.] Robbins, S.P. (1996), *Organizational Behavior: Concepts, Controversies, Applications*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- [17.] Judge, T.A., Parker, S., Colbert, A.E., Heller, D. and Ilies, R. (2002), "Job satisfaction: a cross-cultural review", in Anderson, N., Ones, D.S., Sinangil, H.K. and Viswesvaran, C. (Eds), *Handbook of Industrial Work and Organizational Psychology*, Sage Publications, London, pp. 25-52.
- [18.] Arnold, T., Flaherty, K.E., Voss, K.E. and Mowen, J.C. (2009), "Role stressors and retail performance: the role of perceived competitive climate", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol.85 No. 2, pp. 194-205.
- [19.] Babin, B.J. and Boles, J.S. (1996), "The effects of perceived co-worker involvement and supervisor support on service provider role stress, performance and job satisfaction", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 72 No. 1, pp. 57-75.
- [20.] Quinn, R.P. and Mangione, T.W. (1973), "Evaluating weighted models of measuring job satisfaction: a Cinderella story", *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, Vol. 10 No. 1, pp. 1-23.
- [21.] Schneider, B. and Dachler, H.P. (1978), "A Note on the Stability of the Job Descriptive Index", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 63, pp.650-653. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.63.5.650>
- [22.] Johnson, S.M., Smith, P.C. and Tucker, S.M. (1982), "Response format of the job descriptive index: assessment of reliability and validity by the multitrait-multimethod matrix", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 67 No. 4, pp. 500-505.

- [23.] Brewerton, P. and Millward, L. (2001), "Organizational Research Methods: A Guide for Students and Researchers", Sage Publications, London.
- [24.] Scarpello, V. and Campbell, J.P. (1983), "Job satisfaction: are all the parts there?", *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 36 No. 3, pp. 577-600.
- [25.] Roznowski, M. (1989), "Examination of the measurement properties of the job descriptive index with experimental items", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 74 No. 5, pp. 805-814.
- [26.] Wanous, J.P., Reichers, A.E. and Hudy, M.J. (1997), "Overall job satisfaction: how good are single-item measures?", *Journal of Applied psychology*, Vol. 82 No. 2, pp. 247-252.
- [27.] Stanton, J.M., Sinar, E.F., Balzer, W.K., Julian, A.L., Thoreson, P., Aziz, S., Fisher, G.G. and Smith, P.C. (2001), "Development of a compact measure of job satisfaction: the abridged job descriptive index", *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, Vol. 61 No. 6, pp. 1104-1122.
- [28.] Furnham, A., Petrides, K.V., Jackson, C.J. and Cotter, T., (2002), "Do personality factors predict job satisfaction?", *Personality and Individual Differences*, Vol. 33 No. 8, pp. 1325-1342.
- [29.] Matzler, K. and Renzl, B. (2007), "Assessing asymmetric effects in the formation of employee satisfaction", *Tourism Management*, Vol. 28 No. 4, pp. 1093-1103.
- [30.] Skalli, A., Theodossiou, I. and Vasileiou, E. (2008), "Jobs as Lancaster goods: facets of job satisfaction and overall job satisfaction", *Journal of Socio-Economics*, Vol. 37 No. 5, pp. 1906-1920.
- [31.] Carter, N.T. and Dalal, D.K. (2010), "An ideal point account of the JDI work satisfaction scale", *Personality and Individual Differences*, Vol. 49 No. 7, pp. 743-748.
- [32.] Churchill, G.A. Jr, Ford, N.M. and Walker, O.C. Jr (1974), "Measuring the job satisfaction of industrial salesmen", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 11 No. 3, pp. 254-60.
- [33.] Smith, P.C., Kendall, L.M. and Hulin, C.L. (1969), *The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement: A Strategy for the Study of Attitudes*, Rand McNally, Chicago, IL.
- [34.] Wood, V.R., Chonko, L.B. and Hunt, S.D. (1986), "Social responsibility and personal success: are they incompatible?", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 14 No. 3, pp. 193-212.
- [35.] Boles, J.S., Wood, J.A. and Johnson, J. (2003), "Interrelationships of role conflict, role ambiguity, and work-family conflict with different facets of job satisfaction and the moderating effects of gender", *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, Vol. 23 No. 2, pp. 99-113.
- [36.] Rutherford, B., Boles, J., Hamwi, G.A., Madupalli, R. and Rutherford, L. (2009), "The role of the seven dimensions of job satisfaction in salesperson's attitudes and behaviors", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 62 No. 11, pp. 1146-1151.
- [37.] Smit.G.J., (1991) "Psychometrics: Aspects of testing", Pretoria, HAUM, pp449.
- [38.] Fred.N.Kerlinger, (1995), "Foundations of behavioral research", 3e, Harcourt Brace College Publishers, New York.