

Job Satisfaction: Investigating The Role of Experience & Education

KEYWORDS

Ajay Tita

Research Scholar (Commerce) CMJ University

INTRODUCTION:

This paper explores the force of experience and education level on the satisfaction related to job. For many years researchers have examined relationships between organizational properties, attitudinal and behavioral responses of employees. Empirically, organizational attributes have regularly been assessed by the content and background dimension of the work setting. Categorization of the task content has often been scored by the level of job enrichment, while the place of work structural properties has often been determined by the extent of centralization and formalization (Aiken and Hage, 1968; Brass, 1981). Several researchers have reported how the content of the task (e.g. skill, identity, significance, feedback and autonomy) can be changed or customized to influence the motivation of the person at work (Hackman and Lawler, 1971). Understanding about the associations between the organizational structural context and motivation, and how these associations are helpful to job satisfaction and organizational commitment have been developed and widely accepted (Buchanan, 1974; Pierce et al., 1979).

Demographic variables play an important role in the behavioral studies. These are widely used in the studies of turnover and absenteeism. Demographic variable are the societal aspect for an individual. Tenure, age, gender, education and job levels are the 5 most cited demographic variables by the Monday et al & Mobley models (1982).

The literature speculates that older worker will differ in performing ethicality business activity (Kholberg, 1984). Ones, Viswesvaran, & Schmidt, (1993) proposed an empirically evidence that younger workers score low in truthfulness tests perhaps due to youthful in discretion and commotion.

This is due to; older workers are more mature, less precipitate and more practical about their prospect (Cleveland & Shore, 1992). There are plentiful literature exists that older worker perform more ethically rather than new comers (Ruegger & King 1992, Callan 1992, Serwinek 1992).

They all support the older age ethicality but didn't raise the question what are the reason behind this, is that due to satisfaction that drive from job which they are perform or the aspects of job satisfaction threw which they are able to satisfy their need. Some researcher try to link various aspect related to development with age and experience, experience with older worker and be age and perceived organizational support (Rhodes 1983, Rosen & Jerdee 1976a, 1976b; Rosen, Jerdee & Lunn, 1981). Becker (1960) measured age and tenure as the imperative antecedents of organization commitment and job satisfaction. The relation between age, job satisfaction and commitment found positive in numeral studies (Salami, 2008). But all the studies have not confirmed this association (Chuqtai & Zafar, 2006; Igbal, 2010). Employee with long experience with the same organization tends to more liable and found more difficulty to shift job from one to another due to emotional attachment with the organization. This show an affective commitment and satisfaction of an employee towards organization (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer et al., 2002;).

Research evidence suggested that a person who stays in an organization for a long period of time is likely to become emotionally attached to the organization (Riordan, Griffith, & Weatherly, 2003). The widespread evidence recommended that age and job satisfaction are significantly related, although it is unclear that what kind of relationship it has. Some studies like Cohen (1993) found a U-shaped behavior among the age and job satisfaction. Practical support tremendously ropes a positive linear relationship between chronological age and global facet job satisfaction (Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, & Capwell, 1987; Rhodes, 1983).

Experience demonstrates the total of time an employee in the job. It is clearly indicated that an experienced employee can recognize their job in a better way rather than an inexperienced one. So, there is a lot of chance for an experience person to contain injury at job.

The concept of expertise and sensitivity of hazards dictates that experience should have negative relation with work injury. But Cooper and Phillips (2004) found that there exists important association between tenure and injury risk perception.

Huang et al. (2006) originate that protection organize is negatively related with work injury. But contradictory to this Maiti and Bhattacherjee (1999), Breslin et al (2007) found no relation. There are very few studies available that shows that experience matters at different level for job satisfaction. To find out the answer of the question, is experience with different level groups leads to job satisfaction or not. In its most basic sense, job satisfaction is a positive emotional state resulting from evaluating one's job experiences. Job satisfaction has many dimensions. Commonly noted facets are satisfaction with the work itself, wages, and recognition, rapport with supervisors and co-workers, and chance for advancement. Each dimension contributes to an individual's overall feeling of satisfaction with the job itself, but the "job" is defined differently by different people. Locke (1976) give a comprehensive definition of job satisfaction as pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experience. Job satisfaction is a result of employee's perception of how well their job provides those things that are viewed as important. Job satisfaction is defined more specifically in the literature, and several theorists have generated their own workable definitions. Smith et. al. (1969) defined job satisfaction as the emotions of an individual have about his or her job. Vroom (1982) defined job satisfaction as workers' touching orientation toward their current job roles.

H1: There is a significant difference between job satisfaction of Post graduates and under graduates.

H2: There does exist a significant difference between job satisfactions of different experience groups.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY: DATA COLLECTION:

The data for this study were drawn from middle and senior level managers through convenience sampling. Some training session also has been conducted to obtain the data for the study.

Few online filled questionnaires also have been considered for the survey. The frame from which the firms were selected was turnover, which is more than 100 crores per annum. A total 250 set of questionnaire has been distributed, out of which 180 has been received, at last 160 found suitable for the study.

MEASURE:

Job satisfaction was assesses by using a scale of Spector's (1985) Job Satisfaction Survey (JŚS). The instrument measures an individual's job satisfaction on the dimensions of Pay (satisfaction with pay and pay raise) e.g. Raise are too few and far between, Promotion (satisfaction with promotion opportunities) e.g. I am satisfied with my chances for promotion, Supervision (satisfaction with the person's immediate supervisor) e.g. I like my supervisor, Benefits (satisfaction with fringe benefits Etc.) e.g. The benefits we receive are as good as most other organisations offer, Reward (satisfaction with reward (not necessarily monetary) given for good performance) e.g. When I do good job, I receive the recognition for it that should receive, Operating procedure (satisfaction with the rules and procedure) e.g. Many of our rules and procedure make doing a good job difficult, Co-worker (satisfaction with colleagues) e.g. I like the people I work with , Work-itself(satisfaction with the type of work done) e.g. I like doing the things I do at work, Communication (satisfaction with the communication within the organization) e.g. Communication seems good within this organization. The scale is a 5 point likert scale, which responses ranges from 1 = Disagree very much to 5= Agree very much. The all 9 dimension consist 36 items, 4 for each. Some reverse scoring items also exist in the measure. There score has been reverse for the accurate computation of the response of the respondent.

Table 2: Descriptive & Correlation result

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Mean | SD |
|-------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|--------|--------|--------|----|-------|------|
| Pay (1) | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 3.30 | 0.57 |
| Promotion(2) | .358** | 1 | | | | | | | | | 3.17 | 0.73 |
| Supervision(3) | .291** | .448** | 1 | | | | | | | | 3.59 | 0.75 |
| Benefits (4) | 2.12* | .191* | .232** | 1 | | | | | | | 3.09 | 0.85 |
| Rewards (5) | .224** | .318** | .294** | .258** | 1 | | | | | | 3.14 | 0.64 |
| Operating procedure(6) | .134 | 39 | .167* | .176* | .196* | 1 | | | | | 2.96 | 0.58 |
| Co worker(7) | .109 | .207** | .303** | .182* | .148 | 0.14 | 1 | | | | 3.39 | 0.75 |
| Work itself(8) | .348** | .432** | .462** | .247** | .257* | .175* | .381** | 1 | | | 3.76 | 0.75 |
| Communication (9 | .384** | .450** | .496** | .274** | .372** | .049 | .387** | .612** | 1 | | 3.34 | 0.78 |
| JS (10) | .518** | .653** | .666** | .557** | .574** | .145 | .543** | .706** | .787** | 1 | 29.68 | 3.76 |

^{*} Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 3: ANOVA & T-test Results

| Table 3. AIVOVA & I-test Results | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-------|----------|-----------|------|--|--|--|
| | ANOVA | 4 Result | T-test Re | sult | | | |
| Variable | F | Sig. | T value | Sig. | | | |
| Job Satisfaction | .941 | .392 | -1.330 | .185 | | | |
| Dimensions | | | | | | | |
| Pay | 5.107 | .007 | -1.685 | .094 | | | |
| Promotion | .064 | .938 | -362 | .718 | | | |
| Supervision | .858 | .426 | .960 | .338 | | | |
| Reward | 1.443 | .239 | .344 | .741 | | | |
| Benefits | 2.183 | .116 | .331 | .732 | | | |
| Operating procedure | 4.161 | .017 | -013 | .990 | | | |
| Co-worker | 1.505 | .225 | .865 | .389 | | | |
| Work-itself | 3.048 | .050 | -1.626 | .106 | | | |
| Communication | 3.712 | .045 | -2.158 | .032 | | | |

Source – Primary Response

The (table-3, ANOVA) results shows that there is no significant difference (f=.941, p>.05) exist between in various experience groups (in years 0-8, 9-16, and 17 onward) related to job satisfaction. And further t-test reveals that there is no significant different (T= -1.330, p>.05) exist between educational (UG, PG) level rated to job satisfaction. So, our hypotheses are not supported by study results.

RESULTS:

Correlation, T-test, ANOVA were employed on the collected data to find out the answer of research questions and to achieve the research objectives. Correlation was used to find out the association of various dimensions with job satisfaction. Independent sample t-test was employed when objectives was to compare the mean score of two different groups, in this case, educational level under graduate and post graduate.

One way ANOVA was used to compare the job satisfaction level at different level of experience, in this case 3 groups has been formed on the bases of experience in years 0-8, 9-16, and 17 onward.

Table 1: Subgroup Demographics

| | | 9-16 17 on ward Post Graduate | 58 |
|------------|-------|-------------------------------------|----|
| Experience | N=160 | 9-16 | 42 |
| | | 9-16 17 on ward | 60 |
| Education | N=160 | Post Graduate | 90 |
| | N=100 | Under Graduate | 70 |

Source-Primary response

Correlation result (table.3) shows mostly all the dimensions have a strong association with satisfaction related to the job which is ranges from .51 to .78. Results also shows that communication (.787**) is the most associated dimension with job satisfaction. Where operating procedure (.145) of the organization the least associated dimension with job satisfaction of an employee. A significant association also found within the dimensions of the job satisfaction.

DISCUSSION:

The aim of the present study was to investigate how demographic variables, especially experience and educational level, effect job satisfaction. The study reveals that there is no significant difference in different experience groups as to job satisfaction. But to understand the basic thing that is there any dimension (Pay, Promotion, Supervision, Reward, Benefits, Operating procedure, Co-worker, Work-itself, Communication) of job satisfaction create any difference in existing experience groups. Further study reveals that pay (.007), operating procedure (.017), work-it (.50) and communication (.045) have the significant difference of experience in context of job satisfaction.

The reason behind this may be for pay, when an employee start with any organization his psychology will be difference like, he concentrate on his performance only.

At this stage he may negotiate with low salary but as the time goes on he get familiar with organization and got a plentiful experience his salary expectation must have increase. Operating procedure are the rules and regulations of the organization. At the entry level an employee may be not like the procedure of organization due to non attachment with the same organization. The study results are align the previous studies (Ruegger & King 1992, Callan 1992, Serwinek 1992) in which older worker are more faithful to organization rather new comer. Work itself is type of work done by employee. At the starting point employee may not like his work but as he

^{**} Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

RESEARCH PAPER

Volume: 3 | Issue: 2 | February 2013 | ISSN - 2249-555X

found him more proverbial with the work he is doing, then his thinking criteria will be differ from the previous experience. Communication plays an important role in analyzing the satisfaction of an employee because a good communication system cam flows all the rule and regulation at the very first stage. At initial he/she may have some objections but by the time employee got indulge with it and that makes a difference. That the perceived ethicality of various business practices differs across gender, age, and education level, suggests the possibility of Miscommunication and ensuing litigations.

As the demographic composition of the work force changes, such differences will command greater attention of human resource managers and consultants.

CONCLUSION:

A demographic study always demonstrates human behavior and expectations at different level.

The results of the present study indicate that there is a need to take into account changes in the job satisfaction antecedent associated with experience and educational level. The present study reveals that a small number of dimensions (pay, operating procedure, work-itself and communication) have significant difference in different educational and experience group. The reasons behind that these dimensions may affected by experience and education. So further studies may be conducted to find out the relation for the same and can find out the difference on the bases of experience and education.

This study is witnesses' linkage of job satisfaction with experience and education in tiny association but not for whole. So, in future similar studies on the same matter can be carried out to find out more relationship of experience and education with job satisfaction. Our study will contribute to existing literature of demographic studies of job satisfaction.

REFERENCE [1] Aiken, M. & Hage, J. (1968), "Organizational interdependence and inter-organizational structure", American Sociological Review, Vol. 33, pp. 912-29. | [2] Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1993). Organizational commitment: Evidence of career stage effects? Journal of Business Research, 26, pp 49-61. | [3] Brass, D.J. (1981), "Structural relationships, job characteristics, and worker satisfaction a performance", Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 26, pp. 331-48. | [4] Breslin, F.C., Pole, J.D., Tompa, E., Amick, B.C., Smith, P., Johnson, S.H. (2007), "Antecedents of work disability absence among young people: a prospective study". Annals of Epidemiology, Vol.17, pp. 814–820. | [5] Browning, J. & N.B. Zabriskie. (1983) 'How ethical are industrial buyers?'Industrial Marketing Management, Vol 12, pp.219-224 | [6] Buchanan, B. (1974), "Building organisational commitment: the socialisation of managers in work organisations", Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 19, pp. 533. [7] Callan, V.J. (1992), "Predicting ethical values and training needs in ethics," Journal of Business Ethics, Vol. 11, pp.761-769. [8] Chughtai, A. A., & Zafar, S. (2006), "Antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment among Pakistani university teachers" Applied Human Research Management Research pp. 1139-64