Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intention in Organizations : A Study across Sectors in Indian Perspective

* K. R. Sowmya

Abstract

Several organizations are facing a serious threat of employee turnover irrespective of sectors, across countries. This study is an attempt to identify the factors influencing job satisfaction and turnover intention of employees from multiple sectors in Chennai city. The researcher considered a sample of 598 employees across various sectors to find out the varied opinions about the levels of satisfaction experienced by them. The researcher adopted non probability convenience sampling for choosing the respondents from Chennai city in South India. Exploratory factor analysis, K-Means cluster analysis, and t-test were adopted for analysis of the collected data. As a result, three clusters of people influenced by five major factors of job satisfaction were identified. A negative relationship between turnover and job satisfaction was found, which is consistent with many of the previous studies conducted in this area.

Keywords: job satisfaction, employee turnover, turnover intention, employee satisfaction

JEL Classification: M54

ob satisfaction is an attitude rather than a behavior. Hoppock and Spielger (1938) defined job satisfaction as employees' emotions and attitude toward their jobs, and is their subjective reaction toward their jobs. It influences the emotional reaction of a person in the workplace. It leads to positive or negative outcomes in the workplace. It is usually influenced by very important factors like work environment, co-worker behavior, supervisor behavior, organizational policies, etc. However, if there is no job satisfaction, it leads to an increase in employee turnover. An employee who is satisfied will stay for long in an organization. However, it has been found that an employee who is not satisfied will also stay in an organization for some time or for a long time.

Objectives of the Study

- To identify the factors influencing job satisfaction in multi sector organizations.
- To classify the employees based on the employees' perception of job satisfaction in multi sector organizations.
- To identify the major reasons for employee turnover intention in organizations.
- * To identify the correlation between employee job satisfaction and turnover intention in organizations.

Review of Literature

Job satisfaction is a very usual and a familiar topic that has been researched extensively. However, its significance is not lost in spite of its repetition in the psychological literature scenario. The literature reviewed by me is discussed below:

Lam, Zhang, and Baum, T.G. (2001) examined the relationship between demographic characteristics of hotel employees, job satisfaction, and the importance of job variables. The study found that there were significant differences between demographic variables of employees and the six job descriptive index (JDI) categories. It was also suggested that training and development programmes, particularly for newcomers and well-educated employees, and a total quality management approach may help to improve employees' satisfaction levels with their jobs.

Kamal and Sengupta (2008-09) conducted a study and found that the overall job satisfaction of bank officers was not very high, but still, it was satisfactory. The study mainly focused on age as an important criteria and found that as the age of the employees increased, the satisfaction was more, and lower age led to lesser satisfaction due to high

^{*} Associate Professor, Department of Management Studies, Rajalakshmi Engineering College, Thandalam, Chennai- 602 105, Tamil Nadu. E-mail: saumiyaa@gmail.com

expectations of the employees.

Shrivastava and Purang (2009) used the job diagnostic survey by Hackman and Oldham (1975) to ascertain the level of job satisfaction of 340 public sector and private sector bank employees in India. Independent sample t-test and qualitative analysis were used to study the differences in employee attitudes, and it was found that private sector bank employees perceived greater satisfaction with pay, social, and growth aspects of a job as compared to public sector bank employees. On the other hand, public sector bank employees expressed greater satisfaction with job security as compared to private sector bank employees. The findings of the study highlighted important satisfiers and dissatisfiers present in the job and also suggested both the banks to take performance initiatives in the areas where employees have reported reduced satisfaction.

Wadhwa, Verghese, and Wadhwa (2011) studied the relationship between job satisfaction and behavioral, organizational, and environmental factors in the cement industry by using one-way anova, and it was found that all the three variables - environmental, organizational, and behavioral factors - had a positive influence on job satisfaction. The job satisfaction of the employees was influenced by the environmental, organizational, and behavioural factors.

Sowmya and Panchanatham (2011a) studied the factors influencing job satisfaction among banking sector employees. The researchers adopted multistage random sampling method to choose the respondents and conducted exploratory factor analysis through the principal component method and found that the bank employees were influenced by five factors namely - pay and promotion, organizational factors, supervisor behavior, job and work conditions, and co-worker behavior. Borah (2012) examined the satisfaction level of pipeline department employees. The study was conducted among 60 employees using a structured questionnaire, and the study found that pay structure was the key determinant of job satisfaction in the workplace.

Rahman (2012) studied the job satisfaction levels of government college teachers in Bangladesh. The study was based on primary data collected from the respondents and was analyzed using one way anova and t-test. It was found that there was a difference in perceived satisfaction among the employees based on their personal and organizational variables. However, except for the demographic factors, the researcher did not analyze the specific factors leading to job satisfaction.

This section has highlighted seven studies that throw light on several similar factors such as demographic factors, pay, promotion, work environment, co-worker and supervisor behaviour etc. This has clearly revealed that since 2001 till the latest reviews, no new factors have contributed to satisfaction or job dissatisfaction of employees across various sectors.

Methodology

The study mainly depends on primary data collected through a well-framed and structured questionnaire to elicit the opinions of the respondents, and the secondary data were obtained from scholarly articles published in journals, websites, etc. The study was conducted among employees across sectors from Chennai city in order to have varied opinion about job satisfaction in various sectors during the period from 2010-2012. I adopted non-probability convenience sampling to select the sample for the study. As per this method, each member of the population does not have a known chance of being included. A total of 750 questionnaires were distributed, out of which 598 usable questionnaires were used for the present study. The remaining questionnaires were either unreturned or contained incomplete responses. In the scrutinizing process, it was found that the 598 respondents were from Education, IT, Automobiles, Hospitality, Hospitals, and Retail sectors respectively.

Research Measures

- ❖ Job Satisfaction: The job satisfaction scale developed by Dubey, Uppal, and Verma (1989) containing 25 statements was used for this study to measure the job satisfaction of employees in various sectors. It was measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, and strongly disagree with a pretested reliability score of 0.64. The same scale was applied here and its Cronbach's alpha coefficient reliability score was tested and was found to be 0.876. Sample items included "On the whole, I feel that I have good prospects for advancement in my job," "working conditions in this organization are satisfactory," "my job has helped me to acquire more skills". Sowmya and Panchanatham (2011a) used the same tool for studying the job satisfaction among bank officers in Chennai.
- 6 Prabandhan: Indian Journal of Management July 2013

❖ Turnover Intention: A six-item scale proposed by Leck and Saunders (1992) was used for this study. This scale was previously tested by Gadot and Kapun (2005), and it was found to be reliable and valid. It was measured on Likert's 5 - point scale ranging from strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, and strongly disagree. Its Cronbach's alpha coefficient reliability score was tested, and it was found to be 0.765. The items used were "I often think about quitting my present job," "I will probably not stay with this organization for much longer," "Of late, I have started checking out job offers in the newspaper," "I sometimes put in less effort in my work," "Sometimes, I postpone important duties for an unlimited period of time," "I do not work hard in my job".

Results and Discussion

❖ Demographic Profile: The study was conducted among employees from various sectors from Chennai city only, thereby forming a heterogeneous natured population in terms of various demographic factors. The respondents were not specific to any sector and ,therefore, it was essential to classify the respondents based on the various demographic factors, the details of which are presented in the Table 1:

| Table 1 : Frequency Distribution of Socio- demographic Variables (n=598) | | | | | |
|--|-----|------|--|--|--|
| Variable | F | % | | | |
| Gender :(1) Male | 340 | 57% | | | |
| (2) Female | 258 | 43% | | | |
| Total | 598 | 100% | | | |
| Age : (1) 21-30 years | 132 | 22% | | | |
| (2) 31-40 years | 180 | 30% | | | |
| (3) 41-50 years | 178 | 29% | | | |
| (4) >50 years | 108 | 19% | | | |
| Total | 598 | 100% | | | |
| Marital Status: Single | 249 | 42% | | | |
| Married | 349 | 58% | | | |
| Total | 598 | 100% | | | |
| Personal Monthly Income (₹) :<₹ 5 lakhs p.a | 287 | 48% | | | |
| ₹ 5-10 lakhs p.a | 213 | 36% | | | |
| >₹ 10 lakhs p.a | 89 | 16% | | | |
| Total | 598 | 100% | | | |
| Designation: Upper level | 92 | 15% | | | |
| Middle level | 258 | 43% | | | |
| Lower level | 248 | 42% | | | |
| Total | 598 | 100% | | | |
| Total Experience:< 5 years | 130 | 22% | | | |
| 5-10 years | 245 | 41% | | | |
| >10-20years | 148 | 25% | | | |
| >20 years | 75 | 12% | | | |
| Total | 598 | 100% | | | |
| Nature of job: Shifts | 389 | 65% | | | |
| No shifts | 209 | 35% | | | |
| Total | 598 | 100% | | | |
| Source: Primary Data | | | | | |

| | Table 2 : Employees' Perception of Job Satisfaction with respect to Organizational Aspects | | | | | |
|------|--|---------|-------------|---------------|------------------|--|
| S.No | Statement Statement | Loading | Eigen value | % of variance | Cronbach's alpha | |
| 1 | I have full confidence in the management of this organization. | .736 | 1.719 | 21.347 | .847 | |
| 2 | Favouritism does not have any role to play in this organization. | .745 | | | | |
| 3 | I feel proud working in this organization. | .742 | | | | |
| 4 | think this organization treats its employees better than any other organization. | .700 | | | | |
| 5 | I feel that I have an opportunity to present my problems to the management. | .654 | | | | |
| 6 | On the whole, I am satisfied with the general supervision in my department. | .565 | | | | |
| Sou | rce : Primary Data | | | | | |

| S.No | Statement | Loading | Eigen value | % of variance | Cronbach's alpha |
|-------|---|---------|-------------|---------------|------------------|
| 1 | I have been getting promotions as per my qualification and experience. | .897 | 1.765 | 22.456 | .842 |
| 2 | Promotions are made on the basis of merit in this organization. | .757 | | | |
| 3 Com | paring the salary for similar jobs in other organizations, I feel my pay is bette | r767 | | | |
| 4 | As per work requirement, my pay is fair. | .697 | | | |
| 5 | My pay is enough for fulfilling the necessary requirements of my life. | .685 | | | |

| | Table 4: Employees' Perception of Job Satisfaction with respect to Behaviour of Co-Workers | | | | | | |
|-------|--|---------|-------------|---------------|------------------|--|--|
| S.No | Statement | Loading | Eigen value | % of variance | Cronbach's alpha | | |
| 1 | There is high team spirit in the work group. | .897 | 1.890 | 22.630 | .897 | | |
| 2 | I am glad to work with all my co-workers in my department. | .768 | | | | | |
| 3 | Communication between me and my co-workers is free and open. | .687 | | | | | |
| 4 | My co-workers inform me of what happened in my department | | | | | | |
| | during my absence. | .689 | | | | | |
| 5 | I often take the opinion of my co-workers who work in my unit. | .657 | | | | | |
| Sourc | e : Primary Data | | | | | | |

| | Table 5: Employees' Perception of Job Satisfaction with respect to Behaviour of Boss/Superior(s) | | | | | |
|----|--|--------|-------------|---------------|-------------------|--|
| S. | No Statement L | oading | Eigen value | % of variance | Cronbach's alpha | |
| 1 | My boss/superior(s) keeps me informed about all the policies /happenings of the organization. | .797 | | | | |
| 2 | My boss/superior(s) behaves properly with me. | .731 | 1.007 | 20.632 | .867 | |
| 3 | My boss/superior(s) takes into account my wishes as well as the work done by me. | .614 | | Sour | ce : Primary Data | |

| | Table 6: Employees' Perception of Job Satisfaction with respect to Work Environment | | | | | | |
|-----|---|---------|-------------|---------------|------------------|--|--|
| S.N | o Statement | Loading | Eigen value | % of variance | Cronbach's alpha | | |
| 1 | My present job is compatible with my abilities/qualification and experience | 713 | 7.097 | 19.047 | .817 | | |
| 2 | On the whole, I feel I have good prospects for advancing in my job. | .764 | | | | | |
| 3 | Working conditions in this organization are satisfactory. | .749 | | | | | |
| 4 | My job has helped me to acquire more skills. | .713 | | | | | |
| 5 | I feel that my job is reasonably secure as long as I do good work. | .668 | | | | | |
| 6 | I usually feel fresh at the end of a day's work. | .587 | | | | | |
| Sou | rce : Primary Data | | | | | | |

Job Satisfaction

* Factor Analysis: Exploratory factor analysis was applied to reduce the 25 statements and also to measure the validity of the job satisfaction scale. Principal component analysis and Varimax method were used for the extraction of the factors and for the rotation respectively. Factors with more than one Eigen value were considered for further analysis and the statements scoring a loading value of less than 0.5 were suppressed.

The Table 2 consists of six statements which represent the job satisfaction of multi-sector employees representing the organizational aspects, with an Eigen value of 1.719, and it accounts for 21.347 percent of the variance. Six statements in the table had a very strong relationship among them and were grouped under a single factor. Based on the meaning of the statements, this factor was named as "Organizational Factors". Factor loading for organizational factors varies from .565 to .745. The reliability was measured by using Cronbach's alpha, and it was found to be 0.847, which is within the acceptable limit.

The Table 3 shows that the second factor contains five statements that had a significant correlation between them. Factor loading for these statements is high, with the score in between 0.685 and 0.897. The statements reveal "Employees' opinion about pay and promotion in an organization". Eigen value for this factor is 1.765, and this explains 22.456 percent of the variance. The reliability coefficient is 0.842. The Table 4 discusses the third factor consisting of five statements which represent the "Satisfaction level of employees with respect to co-workers" behaviour". The loading factor for these five statements ranges from 0.657 to 0.897, and the Eigen value is 1.890, which accounts for 22.630 percent of the variance. The reliability is 0.897, which is considered to be acceptable. The Table 5 discusses the fourth factor consisting of three statements, which represent the "Satisfaction of employees with respect to the behaviour of their superiors". The loading factor for these five statements ranges from 0.614 to 0.797, and the Eigen value is 1.007, which accounts for 20.632 percent of the variance. The reliability is 0.867, which is considered to be acceptable. The Table 6 discusses the fifth factor consisting of six statements, which represent the "Satisfaction level of employees with respect to work environment". The loading factor for these five statements ranges from 0.587 to 0.764, and the Eigen value is 7.097, which accounts for 19.047 percent of the variance. The reliability is 0.817, which is considered to be acceptable.

 Cluster Analysis: K-Means cluster analysis was exploited to classify the employees of multi-sector organizations based on the factors influencing job satisfaction. The employees were classified into three clusters based on high, medium, and low level of satisfaction experienced by them in their work environment. As depicted in the Table 7,

| Table 7 : Employees' Classification on the basis of Perception of Job Satisfaction in the Work Environment | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|---------|--|--|--|
| S.No Classification of employees Cluster wise contribu | | | | | |
| Cluster 1 | Annoyed Employees | 57.000 | | | |
| Cluster 2 | Fulfilled Employees | 159.000 | | | |
| Cluster 3 | Impulsive Employees | 382.000 | | | |
| | Total | 598.000 | | | |
| Source : Primary Data | | | | | |

| Table 8: Examining the Mean Wise contribution of the Factors that Led to Satisfaction among | | | | | |
|---|---------------|----------|---------|--|--|
| | the Employees | | | | |
| Statements | Mean | S.D | t test | | |
| Pay & promotion | 2.77862 | 1.225414 | -1.291 | | |
| Organizational Aspects | 3.9425 | 0.769388 | 20.0281 | | |
| Behaviour of Boss/Superior(s) | 3.1165 | 0.778673 | 32.649 | | |
| Work Environment | 1.9467 | 1.020848 | 24.394 | | |
| Behaviour of Co-Workers | 3.3037 | 1.516012 | 15.8034 | | |
| Source : Primary Data | | | | | |

employees were classified into three clusters based on their satisfaction in their workplace. The study identified that 63 percent of the employees were moderately satisfied with the work environment, and were named as "Impulsive employees" and hence, this group needed to be concentrated upon with respect to each factor leading to their satisfaction. Only 27 percent of the employees were fully satisfied with their work environment, and were named as "Fulfilled employees". Ten percent of the employees who were least satisfied, were named as "Annoyed employees".

I saw the need to conduct an item wise satisfaction study of the employees so that it would enable me to concentrate on the moderate and the least satisfied employees. For this purpose, I conducted the t-test and obtained the results as discussed in the Table 8. Sowmya and Panchanatham (2011a) found similar results in the banking sector, but with a slight deviation among the satisfaction levels of the moderately satisfied employees in the banks. The previous study was conducted exclusively among the bank employees, whereas the present study was conducted among employees from various sectors. However, the grouping of the people based on their perceptions was almost similar.

| Table 9: Identifying the Item Wise Contributions to Job Satisfaction of the Sample Employees | | | | | |
|--|--------|---------|--------|--|--|
| Statements | Mean | S.D | t test | | |
| Pay & promotion | | | | | |
| I have been getting promotions as per my qualification and experience. | 3.0001 | 1.21931 | 2.494 | | |
| Promotions are made on the basis of merit in this organization. | 3.1401 | 1.01981 | 2.006 | | |
| Comparing the salary for similar jobs in other organizations, I feel my pay is better. | 2.9800 | 1.00032 | -1.612 | | |
| As per work requirement, my pay is fair. | 3.5510 | 1.11029 | 2.130 | | |
| My pay is enough for fulfilling the necessary requirements of my life. | 1.2219 | 1.77734 | -6.309 | | |
| Organizational Aspects | | | | | |
| I have full confidence in the management of this organization. | 4.1020 | .08512 | 29.029 | | |
| Favouritism does not have any role to play in this organization. | 4.8075 | 1.83201 | 26.055 | | |
| I feel proud working in this organization. | 3.7889 | 0.36046 | 10.193 | | |
| I think this organization treats its employees better than any other organization. | 4.2880 | .78379 | 35.685 | | |
| I feel that I have an opportunity to present my problems to the management. | 3.1686 | .75643 | 5.300 | | |
| On the whole, I am satisfied with the general supervision in my department. | 3.5000 | .79852 | 13.907 | | |
| Behaviour of the Superiors/Boss | | | | | |
| My boss/superior(s) keeps me informed about all the policies/happenings of the organization. | 3.0000 | .95653 | 18.257 | | |
| My boss/superior(s) behaves properly with me. | 3.2201 | .59401 | 43.905 | | |
| My boss/superior(s) take into account my wishes as well as the work done. | 3.1295 | .78548 | 35.784 | | |
| Work Environment | | | | | |
| My present job is compatible with my abilities/qualification and experience. | 3.0596 | .66797 | 16.556 | | |
| On the whole, I feel I have good prospects for advancing in my job. | 1.5151 | .90218 | 38.612 | | |
| Working conditions in this organization are satisfactory. | 0.0255 | 1.2059 | 12.439 | | |
| My job has helped me to acquire more skills. | 2.8885 | .64576 | 33.465 | | |
| I feel that my job is reasonably secure as long as I do good work. | 3.1868 | 1.0675 | 23.129 | | |
| I usually feel fresh at the end of a day's work. | 1.0049 | 1.63578 | 22.062 | | |
| Behaviour of Co-workers | | | | | |
| There is high team spirit in the work group. | 4.0005 | 1.80603 | 27.178 | | |
| I am glad to work with all my co-workers in my department. | 2.1000 | 1.03500 | 21.209 | | |
| Communication between me and my co-workers is free and open. | 2.8125 | 1.76442 | 20.185 | | |
| My co-workers inform me of what happened in my department in my absence. | 4.5985 | 1.90529 | 15.645 | | |
| I often take the opinion of my co-workers who work in my unit. | 3.0068 | 1.06932 | -5.200 | | |
| Source : Primary Data | | | | | |

From the Table 8, it can be ascertained that the organizational aspects contributed the most towards the satisfaction levels of the employees in an organization. The employees from various organizations felt that the behaviour of their superiors as well as that of their co-workers were the next important factors influencing the employees' satisfaction at the workplace. These findings are consistent with the findings of Doughty, May, Butell, and Tong (2002) as well as that of Lane, Esser, Holte, and McCusker (2010), who expressed that supervisors' support determines employee satisfaction in the workplace. Pay, promotion, and the work environment were primarily preferred beyond the satisfaction with respect to other aspects, and the subsequent satisfaction derived from these (secondary) factors. Although pay and promotion are very significant aspects for any person, the organizational aspects such as management interference, organizational policies, supervisor and co-worker influence are given more importance than the direct monetary benefits enjoyed by the employees. This is consistent with the finding of Ambrose, Huston, and Norman (2005), who also stated that coworkers are quite influential in determining the satisfaction levels of employees in a workplace. These findings are commensurate with the findings of a study conducted by Truell, Price Jr., and Joyner (1998) as well as the study conducted by Lane et al. (2010), who found that salary and supervision were important factors related to job satisfaction, but were certainly not the most important factors. Whatever be the preference level of the various factors, I felt a definite need to analyze (item-wise) the various factors that influence the satisfaction level of employees respectively. The findings are presented in the Table 9.

An item wise study revealed that each item was important in its own way in determining the satisfaction level of the employees from various sectors. As the employees felt that the organizational aspects were the most important factors determining their satisfaction, the major reasons which led to such feelings needed to be identified. Hence, it was found that lack of favoritism was a very important aspect, as fair treatment given to all employees increased the level of trust placed in the management by the employees. Supervisors' treatment of the employees, a healthy working relationship among the workers increased the team spirit and hence, contributed to an increase in job satisfaction of the employees across sectors. Fair pay and merit based promotions, right designation as per qualification and experience increased the job security of the employees and ,therefore, increased the belongingness and loyalty felt by them towards their respective organizations.

❖ Turnover Intention: Turnover intention was studied among the multi-sector employees using the six item scale (ttest), the details of which are presented in the Table 10. The main item highlighting the turnover intent could be primarily ascertained by the quitting intention of the employees. It was observed that these employees appeared to be working with their organizations in a half-hearted manner, with an intention to quit anytime. Some people were also

| | Table 10: Examining the Turnover Intention of Employees from Various Sectors (N=598) | | | | | | | |
|--------|--|--------|---------|--------|------|--|--|--|
| S.No | Items | Mean | SD | t-test | SIG | | | |
| Q1 | I often think about quitting. | 2.6220 | 1.21007 | .716 | .342 | | | |
| Q2 | I will probably not stay for much longer with this organization. | 1.1435 | 1.22819 | .913 | .364 | | | |
| Q3 | Lately, I have taken an interest in job offers in the newspaper. | 2.0000 | 1.00500 | -2.053 | .054 | | | |
| Q4 | I sometimes put in less effort in my work than what is required. | 1.9700 | 1.17105 | .161 | .756 | | | |
| Q5 | Sometimes, I postpone important duties for an unlimited period of time. | 2.0000 | .70126 | 3.743 | .000 | | | |
| Q6 | I do not work hard in my job. | 2.1897 | 1.15173 | 184 | .732 | | | |
| Source | : Primary Data | | | | | | | |

| Table 11: Ascertaining the Correlation between Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intention in the Organizations | | | | |
|---|--|--------------------|--|--|
| | | Turnover Intention | | |
| Job satisfaction | Pearson Correlation | 532(**) | | |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | | |
| | N | 598 | | |
| Source : Primary Data | ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed) | | | |

searching for jobs with other organizations. Some employees did not put the required effort and hard work, and were always procrastinating their work.

From the Table 10, it can be inferred that the mean values ranged from 1.1435 to 2.6620, and the respective standard deviations also show the consistency of the opinion. The t-values are statistically significant at the 5% level. The significant t-test values and the respective mean values between 2 and 3 (Q1-2.6220, Q3-2.000, Q5-2.0000, Q6-2.1897) indicate the employees' intention for quitting or not staying with the organization for a long time. They also put in less effort than was required, and procrastinated their duties for an unlimited period of time. The significant t-test values and the respective mean values between less than 2 (Q2-1.1435, Q4-1.9700) indicate that the employees sometimes showed a rare interest in job offers and, therefore, did not put in the required effort to be successful in their job. Sowmya and Panchanatham (2011b) in an earlier study found that the factors "I often think about quitting" and "I will probably not stay for much longer with this organization" were the major forms of turnover intention possessed by the banking sector employees.

The Table 10 shows that a high level of quitting intention does not imply that dissatisfied employees would give up their jobs in reality, even when they have an intention to quit their present job, even when job satisfaction did not exist in the organizations. The Karl Pearson's coefficient of correlation was exploited to test the parametric relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention among the employees working in various sectors. It can be inferred from the Table 11 that job satisfaction (r = -.532) correlated negatively with turnover intention of the employees from various sectors in Chennai city. Major studies have already demonstrated a negative relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention in the workplace. The present study is also in correlation with the same. It is visible from Tables 8 and 9 that the workers were satisfied with most of the items in their workplace (items with mean values > 3). This shows that the workers were, in some degrees, dissatisfied with their jobs, but the dissatisfaction level was not so extreme that would lead to turnover of the employees. Although there was some intent of turnover experienced by the employees, they had other aspects of job satisfaction that made them continue with their jobs in their present organization (Table 10).

Conclusion

Job satisfaction and its relationship with turnover intention is a topic of prime importance in human resource management literature. Several studies have been conducted on job satisfaction and its influence on turnover intention, and studies have found that there is no positive relationship between the two. The study done by Cotton and Tuttle (1986) tested the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover, and found a negative relationship between the two variables. Similarly, studies carried out by Arnold and Feldman (1982), Bluedorn (1982), Mobley (1982), and Price (1977) consistently found a negative relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention in the work setup. Studies conducted by researchers exclusively from Singapore like Lam, Foong, and Moo (1995), Koh and Goh (1995), and Aryee (1991) also showed a negative relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention. However, most of the studies primarily focused on the main aspects like pay and promotion, co-worker behavior, supervisor behavior, organizational aspects, etc. Certain studies also concentrated on only three factors such as pay, supervision, and the nature of work. The study by Borah (2012) also found that pay is the most important factor determining the job satisfaction of employees. Unlike many other studies, the study done by Koh and Goh tested eight variables of job satisfaction such as supervision, career future, company identity, nature of work, financial rewards, amount of work, physical working conditions, and co-workers' behavior.

The present study is, however, an Indian contribution testing five variables namely co-worker behavior, supervisor behavior, organizational aspects, pay and promotion, and work environment. In the present study, I have made an effort to identify the factors influencing job satisfaction of employees from various sectors in Chennai city, and then clustered the employees based on their perceived job satisfaction. There were certain groups of people who perceived very less and moderate job satisfaction in their organizations respectively. In order to identify the reasons for their dissatisfaction, an item-wise test was carried out to ascertain their reasons for dissatisfaction. This enabled a factor wise job satisfaction analysis also. The employees were found to be satisfied with almost four factors as shown in the Table 8, with items showing a mean value of more than 3.0000. I also made a valid attempt to test the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention, and found that there was a negative relationship between these two variables. Although several studies have found that job satisfaction and turnover have a negative relationship, still,

their significance is not less and hence, I made an attempt to study the relationship between these two variables. Mobley (1982) was also of the same opinion regarding the various factors that affect job satisfaction, thereby leading to turnover.

The study, however, has some limitations like it is confined to Chennai city only, but its findings can be applied to the Indian scenario as the respondents have been taken from multi sector companies within the city. This study also tested similar aspects like co-worker behaviour, supervisor behaviour, organizational aspects, etc. which were not tested in previous studies. The present study has identified the factors influencing job satisfaction, but job satisfaction's influence on turnover can be studied more extensively in the future. Although several studies have been done on turnover and job satisfaction, no universal solution could be arrived at in this context because a negative relationship was found between the two variables. On the whole, it can be concluded that all major studies undertaken in this area have showed that several similar factors influence the turnover intent and because of less satisfaction, employees do not leave the organizations where they are currently employed.

The contributions of this study can be summarized as follows:

- 1) The study has identified the major factors influencing the job satisfaction level of employees.
- 2) The employees were classified into groups based on their perception of job satisfaction in their workplace. This will enable the organizations to concentrate on the respective groups based on their perception of job satisfaction.
- 3) The study also ascertained the reasons as to why employees consider leaving their present organizations. This will enable the organization to focus on the needs of the employees, but within the organizational norms.
- 4) A negative correlation was found between job satisfaction and turnover intention. This shows that employees do not leave their jobs because of job dissatisfaction. Hence, organizations can take steps to ascertain the reasons for employees' intent to leave their jobs, and focus on eliminating or reducing the reasons for their dissatisfaction instead of solely concentrating on factors affecting job satisfaction.

Managerial Implications

The present study has shown that job satisfaction is a consistent worry for organizations, irrespective of sectors based on demographic aspects, and other influencing factors like pay and promotion, work environment, organizational aspects, etc. These factors are perceived differently by different individuals. Hence, whatever steps the organization takes in order to improve with respect to these aspects, it rests with the employees to perceive it rightly and get satisfied. Therefore, it is clear that the employees' intent to leave their present organizations need not occur only if the employees are not satisfied. The employee may intend to leave an organization even if he/she is satisfied. The organizations, therefore, need to be on the same level with the employees with respect to the factors that deal with their satisfaction, and if turnover intent is visible, such issues need to be addressed independently.

References

- Ambrose, S., Huston, T., & Norman, M. (2005). "A Qualitative Method for Assessing Faculty Satisfaction." *Research in Higher Education*, 46 (7), 803-830.
- Arnold, H.J., & Feldman, D.C. (1982). "A Multivariate Analysis of the Determinants of Job Turnover." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67 (3), 350-360, DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.67.3.350.
- Aryee, S. (1991). "Creating a Committed Workforce: Linking Socialization Practices to Business Strategy." *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 29 (1), 102-112, DOI: 10.1177/103841119102900111
- Bluedorn, A.C. (1982). "A Unified Model of Turnover from Organizations." *Human Relations*, 35 (2), 135-153, DOI: 10.1177/001872678203500204.
- Borah, S. (2012). "Employee Job Satisfaction: A Case Study on the Pipeline Department of Oil India Limited." *Prabandhan: Indian Journal of Management*, *5* (9), 32-36.
- Cotton, J.L., & Tuttle, J.F. (1986). "Employee Turnover: A Meta-Analysis and Review with Implications for Research." *Academy of Management Review, 11* (1), 55-70, DOI:10.5465/AMR.1986.4282625.

- Doughty, J., May, B., Butell, S., & Tong, V. (2002). "Work Environment: A Profile of the Social Climate of Nursing Faculty in an Academic Setting." *Nursing Education Perspectives*, 23 (4), 191-196.
- Dubey, B.L., Uppal, K.K., & Verma, S.K. (1989). "Further Validation of a Job Satisfaction Scale." *Indian Psychological Review*, *34*.
- Gadot, E.V., & Kapun, D. (2005). "Perceptions of Politics and Perceived Performance in Public and Private Organizations: A Test of One Model across two Sectors." Policy & Politics, 33 (2), 251-276.
- Hoppock, R., & Spiegler, S. (1938), "Job Satisfaction." Occupations: The Vocational Guidance Journal, 16 (7), 636 643, DOI: 10.1002/j.2164-5892.1938.tb00348.x
- Kamal, R., & Sengupta, D. (2008-09). "A Study of Job Satisfaction of Bank Officers." Prajnan, 37 (3), 229-245.
- Koh, H.C., & Goh, C.T. (1995). "An Analysis of the Factors Affecting the Turnover Intention of Non Managerial Clerical Staff: A Singapore Study." The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 6 (1), pp.103-125. DOI:10.1080/09585199500000005
- Lam, P., Foong, Y.Y., & Moo, S.N. (1995). "Work Life, Career Commitment and Job Satisfaction as Antecedents of Career Withdrawal Cognition among Teacher Interns." Journal of Research and Development in Education, 28 (4), 230-235.
- Lam, T., Zhang, H.Z., & Baum, T.G. (2001). "An Investigation of Employee's Job Satisfaction: The Case of Hotels in Hong Kong." Tourism Management, 22 (2), 160-177.
- Lane, K. A., Esser, J., Holte, B., McCusker, M.A. (2010). "A Study of Nurse Faculty Job Satisfaction in Community Colleges in Florida." Teaching and Learning in Nursing, 5(1), 16-26.
- Leck, J.D., & Saunders, D.M. (1992). "Hirshman's Loyalty: Attitude or Behavior?" Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 5 (3), 219-230, DOI 10.1007/BF01385049.
- Mobley, W.H. (1982). "Employee Turnover: Causes, Consequences, and Control." Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 212.
- Price, J.L. (1977). "The Study of Turnover." Ames, IA: Iowa State University Press.
- Rahman, S.M. (2012). "An Analysis of Job Satisfaction Teachers Working in Government Colleges in Bangladesh." *Prabandhan: Indian Journal of Management, 5* (12), 15 - 25.
- Shrivastava, A., & Purang, P. (2009). "Employee Perceptions of Job Satisfaction: Comparative Study on Indian Banks." Asian Academy of Management Journal, 14 (2), 65-78.
- Sowmya, K. R., & Panchanatham, N. (2011a). "Factors Influencing Job Satisfaction of Banking Sector Employees in Chennai, India." *Journal of Law and Conflict Resolution*, 3 (5), 76-79.
- Sowmya, K.R., & Panchanatham, N., (2011b). "Organizational Politics Behavioural Intentions of Banking Sector Employees." Journal of Commerce, 3(1), 8-21.
- Truell, A., Price Jr., W. T., & Joyner, R. L. (1998). "Job Satisfaction among Community College Occupational Technical Faculty." Community College Journal of Research & Practice, 22 (2), 111 - 122, DOI: 10.1080/1066892980220202.
- Wadhwa, D.S., Verghese, M., & Wadhwa, D.S. (2011). "A Study on Factors Influencing Employee Job Satisfaction A Study in Cement Industry of Chhattisgarh." International Journal of Management & Business Studies, 1(3), 109-111.